

Dr. Roger Green, Reformation to the Present, Lecture 23, Fundamentalism to Evangelicalism

© 2024 Roger Green and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Roger Green in his Church History course, Reformation to the Present. This is session 23, Fundamentalism to Evangelicalism.

Fundamentalism, and we're talking about those. So, I'll go back on those in just a minute. But for Friday, I'd like to read something for devotional. So today, because it's the Reformation Conference, I know a couple of you heard Mark Noll last night, a pretty interesting fellow.

I mean, an interesting argument that he made last night. So, because we're kind of in the middle of this Reformation Conference, I thought I'd read from Martin Luther. This is a treatise that he wrote in 1520.

So, here's what Luther said: furthermore, to put aside all kinds of works, even contemplative contemplation, meditation, and all that the soul can do, does not help. One thing, and only one thing, is necessary for Christian life: righteousness and freedom. That one thing is the most holy word of God, the gospel of Christ. As Christ says in John 11:25, I am the resurrection and the life.

He who believes in me, though he dies, yet shall he live, in John 8.36. So if the Son makes you free, you'll be free indeed. In Matthew 4.4, man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God. Let us then consider it certain and firmly established that the soul can do without anything except the word of God and that where the word of God is missing, there is no help at all for the soul.

If it has the word of God, it is rich and lacks nothing. Since it is the word of life, truth, light, peace, righteousness, salvation, joy, liberty, wisdom, power, grace, glory, and of every incalculable blessing, this is why the prophet in the entire Psalm 119, and in many other places, yearns and sighs for the word of God, and uses so many names to describe it.

So, from Martin Luther, there's his word on the word, his word on the word, as it were. Okay, I just wanted to remind you where we are. We've taken a pretty good look at fundamentalism.

We've seen how it, you know, we've seen the historical roots, and what it was reacting against, and how it got shaped and formed. People thought fundamentalism was dead after the Scopes trial, but lo and behold, fundamentalism was pretty actually pretty savvy about, even though it kind of despised the culture, it was pretty

savvy about ministering with cultural means to the culture, like the use of media, and so forth. So, people found out fundamentalism was not dead.

So, there are three results, and I'm working on the first one now. The first one is criticisms of fundamentalism. So, I'm still there because we haven't finished it.

So, someone will have to tell me where we kind of left off. Inability or unwillingness to be self-critical, odd view of scripture, showed, is that where we stopped with the odd view of scripture? Did we show judgment rather than love? And I said I was going to, the judgment rather than love, I'm going to come back to that one. Preach a truncated gospel of health and wealth.

Is that where we stopped in terms of the kind of criticisms of fundamentalism? Criticisms were made by people who were actually reared in this tradition but needed to step away from it, but we'll see that later. Okay, let's say I'm going to come back to the show of judgment rather than love. I've got an illustration, but I'll, I'll come back to that at the end.

Number, another one is ahistorical. Fundamentalism often, not always, but often, was ahistorical. That is a lack of a sense of the grand history of Christianity.

And kind of a belief, in fact, Mark Noll kind of referred to this in a sense last night, I thought, when he was talking about the emerging church, but, not, not to be aware of the great and glorious rich history of Christendom, of Catholicism, Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy, the richness of the Protestant traditions. Fundamentalism was often unaware. It was ahistorical.

It was as though God started; God spoke to me this morning. I'm speaking to you tonight. We're forming our church tonight.

it doesn't. It may not have any relationship to the whole broad historical church, but we're starting it. And so very often this kind of ahistorical, view of fundamentalism. So, all right.

Fundamentalism also another criticism that these people brought to it is that fundamentalism was often built around superstars. There was this kind of cult of personality that fundamentalism did. And I, I have to say, at times, still does propagate that kind of cult of personality.

And you look at some of the television preachers, not all, but you look at some of the television preachers, and everything revolves around them and their personalities. When their personality is taken out of commission for one reason or another, I think of Jim and Tammy Baker. I think of not Jerry Falwell, but another evangelist, who is from Louisiana.

But anyway, when they are taken out of commission, then the thing collapses because everything was built around them and built around their superstar value and so forth. So that becomes a problem. Jimmy Swaggart is who I was thinking of.

Jimmy Swaggart. Now, you don't know these names. You're too young to know Jim and Tammy Baker and Jimmy Swaggart.

But when these superstars were taken out of commission for one reason or another, their whole enterprise just caved in because it was all built around them. And that becomes problematic for fundamentalism. often condemns the entire church.

I'll, maybe I'll come back to that one as well, but it often castigates the entire church. Whole denominations are apostates for many fundamentalists. That was true.

It is still true among some fundamentalists. The whole denominations are apostate. so, often, often, there was no social responsibility, lack of social responsibility because of this fear that by taking on some kind of social responsibility, we're going to kind of lose the heart of the gospel, and we're not going to be preaching the gospel anymore.

So, I am very fearful of social responsibility and loving your neighbor. So, that was true of fundamentalism and lack of engagement with modern intellectual trends. often lacks engagement with modern intellectual trends and is not trained to do so sometimes.

And sometimes, if trained to do so, not wanting to engage with, with philosophy, with art, with history, you know, and so forth, not wanting to do the kind of things and Mark Know did so well last night. So that became, became problematic. There are some, just a couple more, that Carl Henry mentioned, and we mentioned Henry the other day, but there are a couple more that Carl Henry mentions that are not on my list here.

But I think, oh, there are just a couple more that he mentioned. Let me just say one was for him anyway, and remember he grew up in this; one was an improperly balanced prophecy about the second coming of Christ. and Ted mentioned that, too.

So, they reminded us of how important the second coming of Christ is. And I think in some churches, we've forgotten that we're not kind of standing on tiptoes waiting for the second coming of Christ. But on the other hand, for many of them, that became the sole thing that they were concerned about.

It seems like other doctrines, like the doctrine of atonement, for example, took a secondary place and Carl Henry kind of got after his own people for that in a sense.

Then he also mentioned that, in their Bible schools and in their seminaries, there was often a lack of biblical theology and training in biblical theology. They were trained maybe in preaching.

That's fine. They were trained maybe in the administration of the church. That's fine.

They were trained in church polity. That's fine. But all of these things without a solid biblical theology to support all of that, Carl Henry said, that's all kind of bad news.

So, what we're saying here under results, under D results, is that there were three major results coming out of fundamentalism. The first result was, in a sense, criticisms of fundamentalism. So yeah, Jesse.

biblical theology going through the biblical text and, really carefully understanding, monotheism, the Trinity, Christology, and so forth, letting the biblical text speak the word of theology to the church and so forth. So, he takes the Bible pretty seriously and takes the biblical text seriously and what the biblical text has to teach us, which he found lacking in fundamentalist schools, that they just did. And, and, and yeah, so that, right.

Some of them wouldn't have offered Greek or Hebrew to help students with exegesis and so forth. But he found that lacking in their schools. Okay.

Illustration time. I've got, boy, I've had some interesting; I keep files on everything, and I have a file on fundamentalism and, that, this is, this is an interesting file. We could talk a lot about what's in my file, but I'm only going to use two illustrations.

This kind of shows judgment rather than love. I'll use two illustrations from my voluminous file here, which I think are very interesting. one illustration comes from Bob Jones University.

This was years ago when members of the Evangelical Theological Society were in correspondence with Bob Jones University. Bob Jones University wrote a letter on February 17th, 1971, to the Evangelical Theological Society. Now, long story short, in the Evangelical Theological Society, this was a society formed by evangelicals to study scripture seriously, church history seriously, and so forth.

Many of us here belong to the Evangelical Theological Society. Here is the letter that the society received back from Bob Jones University when it had written to Bob Jones University. It says, would you please extend to the entire New England section of the Evangelical Theological Society our appreciation for taking issue with Bob Jones University? We would be most concerned if you had anything good to say about us.

Let me make it eminently clear that we could not care less what the Evangelical Theological Society thinks of Bob Jones University. Whether you realize it or not, you disassociated yourself from the position of Bob Jones University a long time ago when you associated yourself with the new evangelical stance, a position of social reform and ecumenical orientation. And there again, those are two of the fears of fundamentalism, any kind of social ministry or ecumenical ministry.

Therefore, I am not the least bit surprised that a separatist approach is offensive to you. You have long since forgotten what the word means as it is applied to the word of God. In closing, may I suggest that the Evangelical Theological Society start doing something theological for a change, or if not, a name change to something like the Evangelical Social Society for the Furtherance of the Kingdom of the Antichrist would be in order.

In the meantime, your recursion into the affairs of Bob Jones University School has nothing in common with you theologically, positionally, and organically; is unwarranted, unjustifiable, improper, and meddlesome. So that was an interesting letter received from Bob Jones University, the Evangelical Theological Society. At Barrington, at one time, it's about the same time. Bob Jones had a media center, and they may still do that, but at one time, for one of our programs, we wanted to rent one of their films.

So, we asked, we said, can we rent your film and show it in our class? They wrote us a letter back saying they could never possibly rent a film to Barrington College because Barrington College was of the devil. And because it was of the devil and satanic, they felt they would be kind of condoning our satanic life so they wouldn't rent us the film. But one other illustration is very interesting.

This is kind of as close as I've come, I guess, to real fundamentalism. And there's a little bit of a story about this, but I'll give the story real quick. But I think I was flying to Toronto, as I recall.

I think I was flying to Toronto for a conference or something back in 1989. And I'll confess, I confess, confession's good for the soul. When I fly, I don't talk to people when I fly.

Maybe you do, but I don't talk to people when I fly. For me, when I get on the plane and get settled in my seat, that's a time to read, study, and to focus on everything. I don't talk to my neighbor.

So, I'm not a very good evangelist in that way. I think I'm a good evangelist, maybe in other ways, but I'm not a good evangelist in that way. So, I actually remember the book I was reading.

I was reading Fox's biography of Reinhold Niebuhr, which, by the way, is a great book if you ever get a chance to read it. I saw this fellow looking at my book and so forth, and I just knew he was going to say something to me. I just had this feeling that he was going to say something.

So he started talking and introducing himself. His name was Mr. Andy Vandenberg, and he started talking to me. He saw the book I was reading and probably knew a little bit about Niebuhr maybe, and he started talking to me about Christianity and how he was a Christian.

Now, the great revelation he wanted to share with me was that he belonged to a church in Armadale, Nova Scotia, which he was convinced was the only true church in the world. That all other churches and all other Christians were apostates. And he wanted to convince me of that.

He wanted to show me how his church was the true church. And talk about showing judgment rather than love. Talk about some of the things we've got up here. So I just, you know, please give me a break.

Anyway, we started talking a little bit about it, and he got a little angry and nervous about everything. And then he asked for my address, and I never asked why I did this. I gave him my address at Gordon College. And so I don't know why I did that, but oh yikes.

And then he started talking to me about how he was really an angry person and not a very nice person. Then he started talking to me about how in the factory where he works, nobody likes him, and everybody's against him. And I, so my only kind of pastoral advice I could offer was that, well, and he thought it was nobody liked him because he was always witnessing to Christ about Christ.

And I said, well, you have to. There is a distinction between being persecuted for the sake of the gospel, that is, persecuted for righteousness's sake, and being persecuted because you're just obnoxious. I mean, you've got to understand that kind of a distinction here. And I don't think he was being persecuted for righteousness' sake.

I think he was being persecuted for being obnoxious. That's my own opinion anyway. I don't think he liked that, so he wrote me a letter.

He said, Dear Roger, further to our recent conversation during our Chicago-Toronto flight, I am pleased to forward the enclosed information in the hope that you will turn to the true and living God. Unless you repent, you will continue to be deceived by the spirit of this world and will never understand what I am telling you, as a natural man receives not the things of the spirit of God. The hope I have is that you will acknowledge that you are a sinner, which I am glad to do, and under the power

thereof, so that your eyes may be opened and that you will turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God.

I don't think he liked what I said over there. That you may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them that are sanctified of faith in Christ; once God leads you to repentance and acknowledgment of the truth, he will show you how all this time you have been deceived and how you have been under the bondage of sin.

Also, the church you belong to is not founded on the wisdom of God but on men's wisdom. However, the gospel which I preach is not after man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ, and would look forward to answering any questions you may have, which of course I don't, in the love and service of my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, Andy Vandenberg. So then he sends me all his literature.

This is all stuff on repenting, how to repent, and so forth. I mean, it goes on forever. He then talks about popes, the Shroud of Turin, and so forth.

But then the thing that I was most happy to see was the company I was in because he sent me a copy of a letter he sent to Billy Graham. And I won't read the whole thing because Billy Graham got a longer letter than I did, of course. But the first, to Mr. Billy Graham, as a soldier for my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, I have not only been rejected as he was, that's his confusing being, you know, but above all hated by the religious authorities of this world, Satan strong, who claim to be his disciples but have been deceived as I was for 38 years.

Thanks be to God. Yes, Mr. Graham, you yourself are a servant of sin, of Satan, and serve those who by nature are no gods and use the name of Christ in vain. Unless you repent, you will die in your sin and under the power of evil.

Satan has transformed you into an apostle of Christ, while in truth, you serve the ruling spirit of this universe. By nature, you still believe that sin is an act like a prostitute drunkard or a dope addict, while it is the fruit of every man, woman, and child. You don't know this, for you yourself are a natural man under the power of Satan.

That is why you must repent, become a new man, and be born again. During my recent travels, I tuned into one of your so-called crusades, deceiving all those who were present. How you roll up the crippled and the handicapped, and how people applaud them while they go on explaining their relationship to their God, and so forth.

This goes on forever. So, Billy Graham got it. The Billy Graham Evangelistic Association sent me a copy of a very long letter to the whole association.

I thought that was interesting. World Challenge got it. Dave Wilkerson's group, they got it.

Jimmy Swaggart, he got a chop. Faith Tabernacle in Halifax, Nova Scotia. The Catholic Archbishop in Halifax, now you would think he's really going to get it, and he did.

Ralph Woodrow, Evangelistic Association, Riverside, California, and writes letters to newspapers telling them how bad everything is in life. So, there's my file on Andy Vandenberg. I'd never had an experience quite like that before in my life, and I'd never met anyone who would actually say that their church is the only true church.

That's the only time. I think occasionally I've met people who believe their denomination may be the only real true denomination, but I don't think I've ever met anyone who says that their little church of a hundred believers or so is the only true church in the world. I mean, you've got to be pretty narrowly focused to believe that, and he was pretty narrowly focused.

So, that is American fundamentalism. It can get to the extreme. Andy Vandenberg is the extreme, probably.

It can get to the extreme, no doubt about that, but anyway, the first result of fundamentalism was it brought criticism onto itself, and rightly so. I thought I saw your hand, Jesse. Did I? No.

Okay, is anybody on this first result, or is there anybody on these criticisms of fundamentalism? I don't know if any of you have had firsthand encounters with fundamentalism or in any way, but... Yes, if I had just been reading some mystery novel or something, he might not have, but he saw he was making a connection, and then once he did, we were talking for the whole two or three hours, and oh yikes, it was an experience. Yeah. Then I got this whole pile of letters from him, so I've saved it in my file.

Okay, result number one is criticisms. All right, second result. The second result is that out of this movement of fundamentalism came a movement called evangelicalism.

So, evangelicalism was a very conscious separation from fundamentalism, and as we mentioned, by people, some of whom were reared in that fundamentalist tradition, but they wanted out. And one man who wanted out, we'll be talking about later, but he called fundamentalism, he said of fundamentalism, he said, they emphasize minor virtues while cultivating major vices. And so, some people wanted out, and they formed a group called evangelicalism.

Now, that's our whole next lecture. Evangelicalism is our next lecture, so I'm not going to talk about that here. So, result number two is evangelicalism.

Okay. Result number three of all of this is a liberal reaction to fundamentalism, a liberal reaction to fundamentalism. And probably one of the strongest reactions came from a man by the name of Harry Emerson Fosdick.

Okay. So, Harry Emerson Fosdick. Did I give his dates? I did.

1878, 1969. Harry Emerson Fosdick was probably the best-known radio preacher of his day. He had a huge church in New York City called Riverside Church in New York.

It was built by the Rockefellers. Have any of you been to Riverside Church? If you've never been there, you should go there sometime. It's really remarkable to see.

It's like a cathedral. It's amazing. And Harry Emerson Fosdick eventually ended up as the pastor of Riverside Church.

In the 40s, 50s, and 60s, he died in 69, but he was probably one of the best-known preachers in America, hands down. Now, there were other preachers more in the evangelical cause, too, who were quite well known, but Harry Emerson Fosdick was known for his preaching. Harry Emerson Fosdick preached a very important sermon called, Shall the Fundamentalists Win? Shall the Fundamentalists Win? That sermon and it was republished and everything after he preached it, that sermon was the liberal, the more kind of the liberal side, the more kind of left-wing of American Protestantism, throwing down the gauntlet saying, Shall the Fundamentalists Win? And, of course, Fosdick's answer to that was, No, they will not win because I, as a preacher, I'm going to go into battle with them.

So, he did. And he was pretty remarkable in bringing the foibles of American fundamentalism to light. So, the three results are the criticism, one, evangelicalism coming out of fundamentalism, and the other, the liberal reaction to fundamentalism, Harry Emerson Fosdick being a great example of that.

All right. So, let me stop there now with three results. Are we all set there with fundamentalism? Okay.

So as far as Christian theology is concerned, right now, the period of time we're talking about now, there's been a little bit of a shift from Europe into America. America is becoming very important in terms of the development of Christian theology. So we're all set with that.

Okay. Let's go to lecture number 12, the emergence of evangelicalism in the 20th century. Let's see what happened with evangelicalism in the 20th century, which came out of fundamentalism.

You can see we're going to do five things here, and we're going to start with the background here to all of this. All right. So, background.

All right. I heard a great. This was at the conference that Ted and I are going to attend in a couple of weeks or in a week, I guess. Let me get this set.

Sorry about that. This is a rehearsal. This is quick, and I could mute this thing so you guys don't have to watch this, but okay.

Here we go. I don't want that. Okay.

All right. Background to evangelicalism. I was at the kind of conference Ted and I will be going to. I was at a conference, I don't know; it was about 10 years ago, and a fellow was lecturing on evangelicalism.

He gave a great lecture on the foundations of evangelicalism and what formed and shaped what we call the evangelical movement in the 20th century. So it was a day I didn't have a laptop or anything, so I was writing as fast as I could. So, I'm going to give him credit because he said, and I love this, there were five basic foundations that formed evangelicalism.

There were five basic, I don't know, groups that helped to form evangelicalism. So what are they? Okay. Number one, there is what he called the classical tradition, which helped to form evangelicalism.

By classical tradition, he meant the tradition of the reformers, the tradition of Luther, and of Calvin. And evangelicalism today still bears the weight of Luther Calvin and the other reformers. A perfect example of this is the paper you heard last night, or some of you heard the paper from Mark Noll last night.

He talked a great deal about Luther, Luther's sola scriptura, and how it got shaped and formed. He talked about Zwingli, Calvin, and Wycliffe. It was great.

And so, he was going back as a historian to this classical reform tradition, which has shaped modern evangelicalism, no doubt. So that's one tradition that has brought about what we call evangelicalism. The second tradition is the pietist movement that we've already talked about.

But there's no doubt that pietism was a good shaper of modern evangelicalism. Modern evangelicalism looks back at its roots and does look back to the pietist

tradition. So that is a second tradition, this wonderful 17th-century renewal movement, which, by the way, was just a reminder, was a movement of the head and the heart.

It was not just some kind of an experiential movement. These people were very serious about the intellectual life of the believer. So, we need to remember that because pietism gets wrongly interpreted as kind of just an experience, kind of a thing that came with Lutheranism.

And that's not true, pietism. Number three, of course, would be the Wesleyan movement of the 18th century from John Wesley and then the Wesleyan revival. A lot of evangelicalism today has its roots in that Wesleyan tradition.

And that's an interesting discussion among evangelicals, too, but no doubt Wesleyan. Number four, of course, would be fundamentalism because evangelicalism carried with it, carried into evangelicalism, a lot of the doctrines of fundamentalism. What it didn't like about fundamentalism was its spirit, its spirit of kind of fighting, infighting, that kind of thing.

But the doctrines of fundamentalism carried over into evangelicalism, no doubt about that. And then the fifth category that he gave was what he called progressive. And I like that, progressive.

And what he meant by progressive was a conscious sense of the modern world. And evangelicals have that sense of the world in which we live and of ministering to that world, a conscious sense of the modern world. So I think, I hope at Gordon College as an evangelical institution, we give you kind of a sense of the world that you're going to be entering into, and we're training you to be servant leaders in that world and to bring about a real kind of revolution in the field of education or the field of law or the field of medicine or whatever field you so choose, or that God has laid upon your heart.

So, a conscious sense of the modern world is certainly another tradition that forms and shapes evangelicalism. Now, what he then said, and still by way of background, what he then said was that what holds these people together are two things. First of all, a set of theological convictions.

They are committed to historical theology and historical orthodoxy. And by orthodoxy, we don't mean a church. We mean orthodoxy in terms of doctrine and so forth, and that came up last night as well. But a set of theological convictions.

There's a, in a sense, Mark Noll referred to that last night because it's those theological kind of creedal doctrinal convictions that brings Protestants together, even though there's a lot of different Protestant denominations. The second thing is

simply what the author or the person who was doing the paper called ethos. There's a spirit of renewal, conversion of individuals and churches in the world, a movement of spiritual renewal.

That ethos is what binds these people called evangelicals together, no matter what denomination they belong to. So, a certain set of theological convictions and an ethos. And you know, when you're among evangelicals with this ethos because you've got kind of the same language in a sense, you know, about God working your heart, conforming to the image of Christ, the Holy Spirit ministering to you, and so forth.

And again, in last night's lecture, we got all that language, which was the great language of the evangelical community, and how we understand, you know, not only theology but also how we understand the evangelical life. So, okay. So that's just in terms of background.

All right. The second thing I'd like to do is 20th-century forces shaping the church. These are forces shaping the church to which evangelicalism would be especially interested.

So, I'm not going to get to the more sociological things shaping the church and the sociological forces shaping the church. I'm not going to talk so much about, as we talked about before, science, philosophy, and so forth. So, I've chosen four things that would shape the church in the 20th century when evangelicalism was formed, and these are probably still true today.

So, okay. Number one, there certainly was, in the middle of the 20th century, an age of affluence. No doubt about that.

There was an age of affluence following World War I, the Depression, and World War II. And this age of affluence brought people into a place in their life in terms of home ownership, owning cars, running businesses, and so forth that they had never known before. It is a new world for them.

And the question that evangelicals wanted to ask themselves is, how do we minister to those people in that new world? How do we minister to them so that we're not preaching some kind of a health and wealth gospel to them? And how do we minister to them so that they will be sharing what their affluence has brought to them? But how do we minister to people who are living out this age of affluence? How do we do that? What's the best way to do it? So, that's kind of one thing. The second thing was, of course, urbanization. A lot of people were moving into the cities in the middle 50s, or after the Second World War, First World War, Depression, Second World War, a lot of people were moving into the cities.

There was this great movement, migration into the cities, and great urbanization taking place. All right? The problem is that, of course, urbanization created its own problems. The evangelical world wanted to know how we minister to people who live in the major cities around the world. How does evangelicalism minister to those people? Can we bring the gospel to them in as powerful a way as we've been doing in the agrarian world? Is that possible? I think at first, some thought it wasn't, but then along came Billy Graham, who we'll be talking about.

Along comes Billy Graham. He ministers in the cities, and he has a tremendous ministry there. So, he reaches people, certainly reaches people in the cities, no doubt about that.

But that is certainly a second force to which evangelicalism would have to minister to, I guess you could say. Okay? Number three. The third thing that they would have to come to grips with would be what were called home missions.

Home missions. Evangelicalism has always been very concerned about foreign missions, sending out missionaries, and so forth, since the late 18th and 19th centuries. Now you've got evangelicals in the 20th century.

And if you are part of an evangelical denomination, you would know that with that denomination, the missionary enterprise is a pretty major, pretty important thing. I think you could even say that's true even today. And here at Gordon College, the short-term missions, have any of you been on the short-term missions program here at Gordon? So, even here at Gordon, an evangelical institution, the short-term missions programs help you to get a taste of missionary work in other fields other than the American field.

However, where did you go, Jesse? I was just going to say home missions. Okay. You went to the Dominican Republic, Mississippi.

Okay. Home missions. Home missions evangelicals started to sit down and say, foreign missions are fine, but what is happening in our own home, in our own backyard? Both in the city and in urban places, suburban places, and agrarian places.

And home missions became really, really, really important in the evangelical community. Jesse, could I ask you what you did in Mississippi? What was the focus of the ministry there? We go down, we serve a ministry that's engaged with the community, and they have a multi-faceted ministry. Right.

Was it in the city, or was it more agrarian outside of the city or country? Right. Right. Right.

Right. But a lot of poverty. Yeah.

And a lot of need, a lot of need, and so forth. And that was a particular church community that you were... It was actually an organization. An organization.

It was in the area. Right. Oh, right.

Right. Right. Yeah.

And I don't know, Grant, what did you do? I'm just curious now that we've talked about this a little bit, but what did you do? What was your ministry? Right. Right. Oh, right.

Mm-hmm. Right. Right.

Right. And was it in an urban area or more of a poverty-stricken kind of outside the city area? More of a city. Right.

Yeah. Right. Yeah.

Well, it's not surprising that an evangelical community like Gordon would have these kinds of missions because home missions, not exactly home missions, but a home mission in Mississippi, became a very important focus of evangelicals. So that's a third kind of thing. A fourth thing, and maybe the most important of all of this, because this gets us into theology in a sense, but a fourth thing facing the church, a force facing the church, was what I call a crisis of confidence.

There was, in the middle of the 20th century, a crisis of confidence, and the crisis of confidence came because of liberalism. Liberalism had become kind of bankrupt, and there was no confidence in the church and in the message and ministry of the church. And so evangelicalism is going to have to face that crisis of confidence that people are having about the church and say to people, we can provide you with a church with a very well-developed ministry, well-developed theology, with great preaching, and so forth.

We can give you the church life you are looking for because you are no longer confident that the church can deliver that. So, evangelicalism wanted to speak to that kind of crisis of confidence because of the nature of liberalism, which was eventually bankrupt. And I remember that quotation from H. Richard Niebuhr.

Number five, finally, is the 20th-century forces facing the church, which is another crisis of confidence because of a loss of authority. Crisis of confidence because of a loss of authority. The church had lost its authority to preach the good news of the gospel because it no longer believed in the gospel.

It didn't hold any longer to a gospel. It had so criticized the biblical text that it didn't have anything anymore to preach to people. So, what is the authority, if not the Bible, if that's not going to be your authority for what you're doing in the church, what is going to be your authority? Evangelicalism responds by saying the authority for everything we do is the Bible.

And again, I go back to last night, Sola Scriptura, and how Sola Scriptura could be both; both had positive effects. It did have negative effects, no doubt. But the positive effect of Sola Scriptura, Mark Knowles so well told us last night, the positive effect was the Bible, authority of the Bible, and the Bible kind of as a living word brings people to Christ and shapes the community called the church.

So, with this loss of confidence because of a loss of authority in the church, evangelicalism was able to speak to that and say, we have an authority that's tried and tested and true, and it's the authority of the scriptures that helps us to understand who Christ is as the living word, and so that's the authority. So, evangelicalism comes with the sense of authority that people are looking for. So 20th-century forces facing the church, there's no doubt about that, that those 20th-century forces are what helped to shape evangelicalism, I guess.

Now that, yeah. The first crisis of confidence was because liberalism had gone bankrupt; liberalism had become bankrupt, so people didn't have any confidence in the church anymore. They didn't have any confidence in the church as a place where they could feel at home anymore.

Liberalism had nothing to give them. It had gone bankrupt. It had nothing to provide for them.

So evangelicalism is going to step into that gap in a sense and say, we've got something to shape your life. Okay, now what I'd like to do is, I've said, forces shaping 20th and 21st-century evangelicalism, but some of those forces are people. So I don't know. Maybe I need to use a better word here.

So, okay, I'm going to choose, to begin with, a couple of people who were quintessential in the shaping of 20th-century evangelicalism, a few people. At the top of my list is William Franklin Graham, who was born in 1918. Now, I'm sorry I have to do this, but William Franklin Graham was born in 1918.

So, let's see now. So, he's 95 now, still alive, just preached over the weekend. So there's William Franklin Graham.

Now, Ted and I would remember William Franklin Graham preaching like this. You guys wouldn't, of course, but we would turn on television or go to a Billy Graham

rally, and that's what it would look like in the 50s and 60s and so forth. So, there is Billy Graham preaching in his heyday.

Now, have any of you ever been to a Billy Graham crusade? Probably not. Anybody, any hands, Billy Graham crusade? No, bless your heart. Sorry.

So, you can't imagine. This was very, very interesting. But this is such a typical photo of Billy Graham preaching.

However, as Billy Graham, you know, as he got older, it's very interesting that he became an icon for the general public, whether you're a Christian or not. In America and somewhat in Western Europe, Billy Graham became an icon. Billy Graham became one of the most respected men, you know, of all times.

I mean, he won all kinds of awards. And this just gives you an illustration of that. Here is Time Magazine, and their cover story is on Billy Graham, a Christian in winter, Billy Graham at 75.

So, this is Time Magazine from 20 years ago. But here's a non-Christian, non-religious publication looking at Billy Graham and giving Billy Graham credit for what he's contributed to the broader American public, not only to the Christian life but to the cultural life as well. So certainly, probably the first force that I would choose to talk about would be Billy Graham and all that he has stood for and all he kind of means, not just to Christians and not just to evangelicals, but to the public as well, to the general public.

So, I would choose him. A second name I would choose would be the name of Harold John Ockenga. And here are his dates: 1905, 1985.

Harold John Ockenga. Very important, and we're going to give some reasons, some things that he and others did. But let me just mention, how do you know Harold John Ockenga? When I mention the name of Ockenga, you know him because he was a president of Gordon College when his dad was here.

So that's how he knows Harold John Ockenga. He's one of our presidents. Now, Harold John Ockenga was a pretty remarkable person because he was Mr. Evangelical, kind of, in a sense.

If you were going to list all the things about Harold John Ockenga, besides being president of Gordon College, he was, for example, the pastor of Park Street Church for 33 years. He was the first president of Fuller Theological Seminary. He was one of the founders of the National Association of Evangelicals, which was founded in 1942 as a group that kind of distinguished itself from fundamentalism.

He was one of the founders of Christianity today. He orchestrated the merger of Gordon and Conwell to form Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, and then he became the president of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary after that merger. So, I mean, you name something that has to do with evangelicalism, and up until the time he died, Harold John Ockenga would have been part of that, no doubt.

And I can tell you two personal stories of Harold Ockenga. First, one quick story, and then one story that hits me more at home. But when he died in 1985, Billy Graham came to town to do his funeral at the Hamilton Congregational Church.

So, you know that the traffic going into that church was really pretty brutal. It was a day when everything here in the North Shore got kind of jammed up because this was a big day. This was a major event.

And his friend, Billy Graham, who, by the way, long story short, it was Harold John Ockenga who brought Billy Graham to Boston for the first time and supported his ministry. One of the reasons Billy Graham became so popular was his Boston campaign. And it was really pretty remarkable, thousands of people coming out to hear Billy Graham every night.

They had to extend the crusade and so forth. So here was a pretty remarkable person, Harold John Ockenga. And the personal, kind of the personal story, do I have time? Well, I'll tell it anyway.

It's Friday. I was teaching. Marv Wilson hired me to teach at Barrington College 1970.

Now, Marv came here in 71. So, he had been at Barrington for seven years, and then he hired me, and then he left a year later. But he had been planning to do that anyway.

I was sorry to see him go. But Barrington College was giving Gordon College a run for its money. We're in Rhode Island, seven miles east of Providence.

We were giving Gordon a real run for its money in terms of students, developing faculty, and so forth. In fact, when I went to Barrington, I went there in 1970, there were still kind of talks about, not serious anymore, but there had been talks back in the early 60s about the possibility that we might have to take over Gordon College because Gordon College was pretty much on the ropes. It had some really tough days in the 60s and so forth.

So, Barrington was very strong, and maybe we're going to have to take over Gordon. Maybe it'll be. That's how it's going to, so we'll all end up in Rhode Island. So, everything, and when I got there, it was very strong.

But then what happened was when Harold Ockenga came here to Gordon to become the president, everything changed because everybody knew him as Mr. Evangelical. Parents wanted to send their kids to Gordon College because Gordon is run by Harold John Ockenga. And we really were losing students, losing students, losing students, and the scales were being tipped.

And finally, in 1985, we couldn't really compete anymore with Gordon, so Gordon took us over in 1985. And that's when the merger took place. Then, five of us, five faculty members, and about four or five staff members were brought up with the merger.

And are any of you in Farrin Hall? I forget if any of you live in Farrin Hall. And Farrin Hall is named after the president who was president for 40 years. They didn't have it, by the way. I'm watching my clock, but I am probably going to forget it.

They didn't have a dorm. We were going to bring up 130 students, and there was no dorm. What are we going to do? Well, they said, what we're going to have to do is build a dorm because they announced the merger in October 1984, and then the merger was going to take place in the fall semester of 85.

What are we going to do? So I said, what we're going to have to do is build a dorm during the winter. So they put a huge bubble over the site, and that way, all winter long, they could build that dorm regardless of what the weather was like. The dorm was ready by the time we brought 130 students with us.

It was ready. We actually had to start school a little bit later that year, but school was ready by, I'd say, Labor Day of 85 to bring all those students. So this is another long story short.

I'll just tell you the story, then we can go. But anyway, it's interesting. I find it fascinating.

What did we do with the bubble? Does anybody know what we did with the bubble? We took the bubble and put it over our hockey rink because we used to have a hockey team at Gordon Cog. Did you know that? I know that. I took the bubble and put it over the hockey rink so that you wouldn't have to stand out there freezing watching Gordon play hockey.

You could go inside the bubble, and it was nice and much warmer in there to watch the bubble. Then, a big snowstorm came on top of the bubble. The bubble collapsed.

They took the bubble down, and there was no more hockey team. So, hockey was out at Gordon. I don't know if it was out as a result of that or if they've been talking about that.

I'm not sure. But there was no more hockey after that. So that's the story of us coming up here, I guess you could say.

He was president, I would say, in the early 70s. I forget exactly, but I'd say 70 to maybe 74, something like that, 75, something like that. I'd have to check to be sure about that, but that's my recollection.

And then I was still teaching in Barrington, of course, and then Dick Gross followed him as the president, and I came to Dick Gross's inauguration. I think that was about 75, maybe something like that. So that's the story.

I was very interested in the merger at the seminary because my alma mater was Temple University in Philadelphia. That's where Conwell Seminary was on the campus of Temple University. But Gordon Divinity School, as long as we're doing this, where was Gordon Divinity School located? Frost Hall.

Frost Hall was the Gordon Divinity School. When the merger came, Gordon had all the students, but Conwell had all the money, and there were no students because I used to go into Conwell's library to study because I was a student at the university.

I'd go there to study, and I went there to study because it was so quiet. There was never anybody there, and there were no students, hardly any students. So it was a nice, quiet place to study. So, Conwell had the money, Gordon had the students, the merger came and off we go.

So anyway, I don't know, there we are. Have a great weekend.

This is Dr. Roger Green in his Church History course, Reformation to the Present. This is session 23, Fundamentalism to Evangelicalism.