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If there is a “forgotten front” in the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy, it is the battle that took place among the Disciples of Christ. Compared to the attention given to the Baptist and Presbyterian conflicts, to the antievolution crusade, and to interdenominational Fundamentalist efforts, the Disciples/Christian Churches controversy appears to be little more than a footnote, if it is recognized at all. Not the least of the reasons for this situation is the disdain with which most contemporary Fundamentalists view the doctrinal position of even the conservative Disciples and with which many conservatives from Disciples circles view Fundamentalism.¹

Yet consider one of the most famous editorials of the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy. In Christian Century in 1924, C.C. Morrison wrote,

“Blest be the tie” can be sung until doomsday but it cannot bind these two worlds together. The God of the fundamentalist is one God; the God of the modernist is another God. The Christ of the fundamentalist is one Christ; the Christ of modernism is another. The Bible of fundamentalism is one Bible; the Bible of modernism is another. The church, the kingdom, the salvation, the consummation of all things—these are one thing to fundamentalists and another to modernists. … that the inherent incompatibility of the two worlds has passed the stage of mutual tolerance is a fact concerning which there hardly seems room for any one to doubt.²

What is often missed is that Morrison was a member of the Disciples of Christ, that his periodical was a former Disciples publication, and that these observations came in the midst of a heated controversy among the Disciples.

As little as this controversy may be remembered, it is far from unimportant. The conflict forms a window for viewing several aspects of American religious history. Most obvious, it provides a fuller picture of the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy. In addition, the conflict gives further insight into the nature of the Disciples of Christ and related groups. Finally, the controversy helps clarify the relationship of the Disciples to the overall history of the Fundamentalist movement and the attitudes of Fundamentalists and Disciples toward each other.

Early History of the Restoration Churches

The groups under discussion here often go under the umbrella term “Restoration churches.” A major problem in discussing the Restoration groups is simple nomenclature. Often the labels “Disciples of Christ,” “Churches of Christ,” “Christian Church,” and “Christian Churches” are used imprecisely. For this study, the name “Disciples of Christ” will refer to the mainline denomination, today generally liberal in its orientation. “Churches of Christ” will be reserved for the noninstrumental faction which had become a separate group by 1906; it will play only a supporting role in this study. Finally, the term “Christian Churches” or “Independent Christian Churches” will designate the conservative faction which separated from the Disciples of Christ after the struggles of the early twentieth century.³

Barton Stone

The Restoration churches trace their history to several movements from early nineteenth-century America, notably those led by Barton Stone and by Thomas and Alexander Campbell.⁴ Stone was originally a Presbyterian minister who was deeply involved with the early frontier camp meetings, including the famed Cane Ridge camp meeting near Lexington, Kentucky (1801). Stone became disenchanted with denominationalism and with Presbyterian doctrine and practice. He led a faction out of the Presbyterian Church and rallied his supporters under the simple banner “Christians.”⁵ Stone himself stirred controversy by adopting antitrinitarian views, a stance that he did not insist on for his followers but one that has led to consistent charges of Trinitarian heresy against his successors. The Stone group established connections with other protest groups in the West (at that time Kentucky and the eastern Great Lakes region), the South, and the Northeast.
These groups shared a general distrust of established denominations and a professed belief in Christian unity.

**Thomas and Alexander Campbell**

Barton Stone was an important figure in Restorationist history, particularly for the later Churches of Christ. But the men commonly perceived as shaping and dominating the Restorationist churches were Thomas Campbell and his son Alexander. So significant are they that opponents of the Restorationist churches often refer to the movement as “Campbellism” and its adherents as “Campbellites.” Like Stone, the Scottish-born Campbells left the Presbyterian church, dismayed by the splits and schisms that rent Scottish Presbyterianism. They repudiated creeds and issued a call for Christian unity and simplicity. For a time they identified with the Baptists, but Alexander Campbell’s teachings (discussed below) led to controversy, and in 1825 their local Baptist association ousted Campbell and his followers. The movement nonetheless continued to attract churches in Ohio, Kentucky, and Virginia—often at the expense of the Baptists. The group most often preferred the title “Disciples.” When it became apparent that Stone’s Christians and the Campbells’ Disciples shared similar views, the two groups began discussing cooperation and union. They finally united in 1831. From that point Alexander Campbell became the most visible leader of the movement.

**Teachings of the Movement**

The Disciples movement took as its theme a return to gospel simplicity. As Thomas Campbell said in a famous dictum, “Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent.” The group eschewed all creeds and confessions as not only usurping the place of the New Testament as the Christian’s guide but also being hindrances to Christian unity. The Disciples were “restorationists,” believing that New Testament Christianity had been thoroughly corrupted through the passing of years. Their professed goal was to restore the church to its pristine condition by a rigorous adherence to pure New Testament teaching. They also laid great stress on the goal of Christian unity. With the passing of time, the Disciples found that their twin principles of restoration and Christian union sometimes appeared to militate against each other. The Fundamentalist controversy of the 1920s highlighted this tension.

Although they reject creeds and claim to follow only pure New Testament teaching, the Disciples do hold to distinctive doctrines. A thoroughgoing Arminianism characterizes their overall system, beyond even the Wesleyan version most familiar in American Protestantism. Rejecting Calvinistic teaching concerning total depravity, the Disciples hold that humans naturally possess an ability to respond to the gospel. They disagree with the definition of saving faith as a heartfelt trust brought about by the work of the Holy Spirit. Rather, faith is a mental assent to the truth set forth in Scripture. In line with this emphasis, the Restoration churches normally do not speak of the Spirit convicting or drawing the sinner or of His imparting new life through regeneration. Instead, the Spirit begins to work in a believer’s life after he has believed and been baptized. As with classic Arminianism, a person can “lose one’s promise of salvation” by disobedience. Richard Hughes of the Churches of Christ argues that significant segments of the Restoration churches in the group’s earlier days downplayed the concept of grace in favor of rationalistic legalism, although he does not consider this legalism endemic to the movement.

The Disciples’ baptismal teaching is probably their most controversial doctrine, providing one of the main reasons for Baptist opposition to Alexander Campbell. As commonly understood, it is a form of baptismal salvation, for baptism of the professing believer by immersion is necessary for the forgiveness of sins. Some call this “baptismal regeneration,” but Disciples’ teaching differs from that of Catholics, Anglicans, Lutherans, and other groups that teach baptismal regeneration. In Disciples’ teaching, baptism does not wash away the corruption of original sin (for there is none) and does not impart the Holy Spirit. Instead, it is obedience to the gospel pattern set down in the New Testament, and it is necessary for salvation. Paul Conkin calls their teaching “baptismal remission.” One should note, however, that even on this distinctive tenet, some in the highly decentralized Restorationist churches question this teaching.
Eventually the doctrine of the Disciples was distilled into a simple, informal system. It is epitomized in the “five-finger exercise” developed by Walter Scott, an early leader in the Disciples movement. The name derives from the five simple points that one can enumerate on the fingers of one’s hand. The points vary somewhat in presentation but can be summarized as “faith, repentance, baptism, remissions of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit and eternal life.” The simplicity of this system was appealing and undoubtedly helped foster the group’s growth on the frontier.

**Early Rumblings of Controversy**

From the union of 1831, the Campbell-Stone movement saw steady growth, but the group also experienced controversy. Some of the conflict came from without, as other denominations opposed Disciples teachings. The Baptists in particular criticized the Disciples, resenting their “sheep stealing” (proselytizing of Baptists) and wanting to differentiate their baptismal teaching from that of the Campbell-Stone group. Controversy came from within as well, especially after the Civil War. On the one hand were tensions that resulted in the separation of the Churches of Christ from the Disciples of Christ. More relevant to the present topic was the growth of liberal theology that eventually led to full-fledged conflict within the group.

**The Churches of Christ Division**

The break of the Churches of Christ from the Disciples was not a liberal-conservative schism, at least in a strictly theological sense. The ostensible reason was opposition to innovation. To be specific, the Churches of Christ opposed the use of musical instruments in worship and the establishment of mission societies, neither of which, they said, were commanded in the New Testament. The arguments over these issues resounded in Disciples pulpits and publications from the end of the Civil War to the close of the nineteenth century. The major leader of those opposing the innovations was David Lipscomb. An editor and major leader of the southern opponents of innovation, Lipscomb was personally more mediating in his position. But when no workable compromise seemed possible over these issues, Lipscomb was willing to lead the secession. The division was likely complete by the dawn of the twentieth century, but it did not become official until the 1906 United States religious census, in which the noninstrumental Churches of Christ, at Lipscomb’s suggestion, were listed separately for the first time.

Although musical instruments and mission societies were the announced reasons for the split, historians have noted other factors. Commenting on the obvious fact that the Churches of Christ were predominantly southern, David Harrell has identified several sectional factors. Harrell notes the sectional tensions that go back to the Civil War. The main mission society, for instance, took a pro-Union stance during the war, alienating the group’s southern constituency. He also highlights socio-economic issues, pointing out differences in social status and even more in income between the two sides in the schism. Without discounting the sincerity with which the Churches of Christ opposed innovations, there were clearly other issues contributing to the conflict.

**Early Liberals**

The controversy over liberalism developed in a different manner from that over instruments and mission societies, although those issues sometimes surfaced too. As liberal theology entered America from Europe, it began to affect the Protestant denominations in America. The Disciples were no exception. At first, liberalism appeared only among eccentrics. L. L. Pinkerton was perhaps the earliest “liberal” in that he certainly embodied what conservative Disciples opposed. In 1859 he introduced instruments into his church in Midway, Kentucky. More dramatically, in 1869 he renounced the doctrine of biblical inspiration, and in 1873 he advocated “open membership,” i.e., dropping the requirement of baptism by immersion for church membership. It is not clear whether Pinkerton was really affected by the European currents or came to these views from other sources. Nonetheless, his positions represent three major features of “liberalism” in Disciples’ circles: the use of musical instruments, questioning orthodox doctrine (especially advocating liberal views of the Bible and higher criticism), and open membership.

An even greater controversy was in 1889-90 over the views of Robert C. Cave of the Central Christian Church in St. Louis. Cave preached a
series of sermons setting forth liberal views, such as the denial of the virgin birth and the resurrection of Christ. He was eventually forced to resign his pulpit. As interesting as Pinkerton and Cave may be as symbols of early liberalism among the Disciples, they actually had little long-term impact. James North describes both men as lone wolves whom no one defended or followed. The real impact of liberalism on the Disciples was to come a few years later.

Chicago: Center of Disciples Liberalism

The city of Chicago was the scene of many early conflicts in the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy. The University of Chicago was at the point of liberal Baptist efforts, and conservatives widely regarded its president, William Rainey Harper, as the quintessential Modernist. An important battlefield in liberal-conservative conflicts generally, Chicago became one of the most important centers of Disciples liberalism particularly. "While theological liberalism was not completely unheard of among Disciples ministers and leaders prior to the emergence of the Chicago group," notes Kragenbrink, "it generally had been found only in isolated individuals who had little visible support among the churches of the Restoration movement. These new leaders were different. They were popular and influential among the people of the churches and ... among the growing number of university-educated Disciples."

Two expressions of Disciples liberalism had direct connection to the University of Chicago itself. In 1894 the university opened the Disciples Divinity House. The Disciples intended the school to become the preeminent seminary that the denomination lacked. It also became a means of disseminating liberal ideas throughout the church. The first dean was Herbert L. Willett, a student of Harper who earned his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. Willett had previously promoted his views in the Sunday school department of The Christian Standard, a leading Restorationist periodical. Unease and outright dismay with his theological views among many Disciples brought an end to the Standard's association with Willett. Later, The Christian-Evangelist, which was more open toward critical views, hired Willett to do its Sunday school commentary. As a result of his position at the Disciples Divinity House, Willett became a lightning rod for conservative criticism. When he was scheduled to address the Centennial Convention of the Disciples in 1909, conservatives debated whether he should be permitted to speak. After Willett did speak, the Standard Publishing Company included his address in the official publication of the convention but inserted a disclaimer concerning his inclusion.

Other leaders of Disciples liberalism also emerged from the University of Chicago. Edward S. Ames, who had received his Ph.D. from the university, became pastor of the Hyde Park Christian Church in Chicago. There he scandalized the conservatives by moving to open membership, dropping the requirement of immersion. Although this practice attracted attention, it was but the public expression of Ames’s thoroughly liberal views. Disciples churches in the Chicago area became a debating circle over the open membership question.

One of the more intriguing Chicago liberals was W. E. Garrison. He was the son of J. H. Garrison, a theological conservative but a centrist in denominational politics. Despite his conservative upbringing, Garrison embraced liberal views and attended Yale before earning his Ph.D. at the University of Chicago. Garrison succeeded Willett as dean of the Disciples Divinity House and promoted the liberal cause in the denomination while achieving a scholarly reputation through his work as a historian. Willett, Ames, and Garrison are but three of the influential figures from the University of Chicago who typified Disciples liberalism.

The University of Chicago also played a large role in the second major expression of Disciples liberalism. In 1896 a number of graduates from Chicago and from Yale founded the Campbell Institute. This was a theological fellowship, devoted to academic pursuits. It was also, however, a liberal body, made up of academics already committed to liberal views. Its high standards of scholarship (a college degree was required for membership) lent its members prestige among the Disciples, and they became major figures not only educationally but also in denominational leadership and influence.

A third important expression of Disciples liberalism in the Chicago area was a periodical
and its editor: *The Christian Century*, published by Charles Clayton Morrison. Started as *The Christian Oracle* in Iowa in 1884, the magazine moved to Chicago in 1891 and took on its new name at the turn of the twentieth century. Morrison, a pastor in Chicago and a graduate of the University of Chicago, took over the operation in 1908. Although *The Christian-Evangelist* was considered more “open” theologically than *The Christian Standard*, *The Christian Century* was committed to outright liberalism. It became a major voice of Disciples liberalism, even after it dropped its Disciples ties and became an independent religious publication in 1917.19

**Conservative Counterattack**

Conservatives among the Disciples of Christ did not confront these liberal trends without protest. Although the conservative response was a reaction, it would be unfair to label these conservatives “reactionary.” Aside from the connotations of the term *reactionary*, the conservative viewpoint was almost certainly dominant among the Disciples before the rise of liberalism. The core of their position already existed. But the appearance of modernism shaped the manner in which these conservatives responded, and their responses took many forms. As mentioned before, *The Christian Standard*, the leading denominational publication (founded 1866), became a major voice of the conservative party. Its columns and other literature coming from the Standard Publishing Company took the conservative side against liberalism.

Perhaps the most important early major leader of the conservatives was J. W. McGarvey. He was for many years a professor at the College of the Bible in Lexington, Kentucky. A staunch conservative, McGarvey opposed the introduction of musical instruments to the church, although he did not consider it an issue worthy of division and did not join the Churches of Christ. McGarvey was perhaps the movement’s pre-eminent opponent of higher criticism. He attacked criticism in his classroom and, from 1893, in a regular column in *The Christian Standard*.20 In 1895 McGarvey became president of the College of the Bible, making him one of the most prominent conservative leaders in the denomination.

Generally, the conservatives tended to emphasize the restorationist aspect of Disciples ideology, but they did not necessarily forget the traditional emphasis on unity. Rather, they saw unity as based on the restorationist vision, which was in turn based on an authoritative Bible. Kragenbrink notes, “The debate over higher criticism hit the Disciples as hard [as] or harder than it did any of America’s churches. The Disciples’ plea for Christian unity based upon a restoration of the New Testament church required an authoritative and absolutely trustworthy Bible. Anything that challenged the Bible challenged not only their personal faith, but their very reason for existence as a movement separate from the denominations.”21

**Centralization**

Prior to the 1910s, there were many debates and discussions over growing liberalism, sometimes heated ones. The clashes became more obvious, however, after the turn of the century as the Disciples took on greater visibility in the American religious scene. In the split with the Churches of Christ, the decentralized structure obscured the divisions (and sometimes the fighting) until the 1906 federal census made it public. The limited centralization that the Disciples undertook early in the twentieth century also had the ironic result of heightening tensions and publicizing battles.

In 1907 the Disciples associated with the Federal Council of Churches (forerunner of the National Council of Christian Churches). This step was an unusual one for the normally standoffish Disciples. Their action meshed with historic Disciples emphasis on Christian unity but reduced the claim for the uniqueness of the Restorationist vision. The move raised conservative fears of diluting the goal of “restored New Testament purity” that had characterized the movement.

More important for the internal workings of the group was the decision in 1917 to organize the International Convention of the Disciples as a central clearinghouse for Disciples agencies. Its annual meetings gave a more formal structure and regularity to the government of the Disciples. Now, every year would see an official national meeting for handling the business of the group and airing issues. But it also raised conservative fears of centralized denominational power interfering with the independence of local churches.
One should be cautious in ascribing too much authority to the International Convention. It was still a very loose organization and was voluntary in nature. Certainly the Disciples had nothing like the hierarchy of the Methodist or Presbyterian denominations. But it was more structure than the group had possessed before that time. As a result, it raised questions and fears among the conservatives and provided a more public forum for working out the group’s difficulties.

Early Skirmishes

The stage was set for conflict. In 1918 the Christian Century (possibly with tongue in cheek) gave its view of the composition of the group. It said that of the one million Disciples in the United States, a tenth were progressives, a tenth were anti-progressives, and eight-tenths were ignorant of the issues involved. Of the pastors, Christian Century claimed, fifteen hundred were progressive, fifteen hundred were middle of the road, and three thousand were conservatives. Regardless of the accuracy of these numbers, observers clearly felt that the group was polarizing.

Yet even conservatives were so opposed to creeds and so committed to freedom of conscience that they sometimes appeared uncertain of how to press their cause. Two schools in the 1910s made controversial attempts at establishing creedal standards: Phillips Bible Institute in Canton, Ohio, and the Brite College of the Bible, associated with Texas Christian University. The outcry against these actions revealed that opposition to creeds was hardly limited to liberals. North notes an even clearer example of ambivalence. In 1914 a convention of Christian Churches in northern California expelled a congregation that practiced open membership. Conservatives applauded the disapproval of the practice but asked where this convention received the authority to practice such discipline over an autonomous local church.

Presaging the warfare of the 1920s was the 1917 battle at the College of the Bible, which Kragenbrink calls “a critical turning point” in the controversy. As mentioned before, that school had been the headquarters of J. W. McGarvey, the leading conservative scholar among the Disciples. After McGarvey’s death in 1911, his friend and fellow conservative Hall L. Calhoun became dean. The new president and the faculty that the school brought in, however, were liberals. Dismayed at this situation, Calhoun leveled charges against his colleagues that sparked an investigation. The seminary’s board, however, cleared the professors. Calhoun left the school and joined the Churches of Christ. The College of the Bible, previously a bulwark of Restorationist conservatism, became an outpost for liberal views.

The Fundamentalist-Modernist Controversy

The 1920s were the decade of the great denominational conflicts over Fundamentalism and Modernism. The Northern Baptist Convention and the predominantly northern Presbyterian Church in the USA both underwent severe struggles. Other groups, such as the Methodists, endured smaller conflicts. In the South, where theological liberalism was less of a problem, the crusade against the teaching of evolution in public schools became the main battleground of the Fundamentalist-Modernist conflict. The Disciples of Christ did not avoid this conflict. In fact, their internal difficulties were perhaps as great as those of the Baptists and Presbyterians.

Issues Involved

As one might expect, the Disciples experienced their own distinctive version of the controversy, as shown by the focus on baptism as a major issue. North notes, “To make up a list of ‘basic New Testament teachings’ would mean to construct a creed, which was anathema in Disciples circles. One ‘basic’ about which they [conservatives] felt sure, however, was immersion—and so the battle was fought there. Nevertheless, the conservatives were forced to fight over the symptom of the underlying difficulty, rather than the cause itself.”

For some, however, the doctrinal battle did not appear to differ significantly from the conflicts among the Baptists, Presbyterians, and other groups. John Brown, writing in 1924 over the controversy in Chinese missions, said that the root problem was Modernism and that a Modernist is “one who does not believe in the deity of Christ, one who does not believe in the miracles of the Bible, one who does not believe in the inerrancy of the Scriptures—hence does not recognize the authority of Christ or the fall of man.” Likewise, as will be seen later, Disciples
Fundamentalists shared many of the cultural concerns that characterized Fundamentalism.

Yet there usually remained a tension between the Disciples’ sense of their own distinctive position and the emphases that generally characterized Fundamentalism. Kragenbrink notes how R. C. Foster of the Disciples attacked Modernism in Christian Standard and defended Fundamentalist tenets (such as the virgin birth and inspiration of the Bible) but was typical of other Disciples conservatives in distancing himself from Fundamentalist reliance on creeds and links to denominationalism.28

Whatever slant one takes on the relationship of Disciples conservatives to Fundamentalism, one must note the centrality of doctrinal issues to the battle. One should not dismiss personality conflicts or political goals as factors, but neither should one lose sight of the theological clash. “While it would be inaccurate to suggest that the doctrinal and theological concerns of the modernist/fundamentalist dispute were the only issues creating pressure in these gatherings,” notes Kragenbrink, “they were often the primary issues and, perhaps more significantly, they were never absent.”29

The Fight over Missions

Among the reforms of centralization was the decision in 1919 to combine the various Disciples missions agencies into one organization: the United Christian Missionary Society (UCMS). Almost as soon as it was formed, the UCMS became the focal point of the Disciples’ major conservative-liberal conflict of the 1920s. One cause of dissent was comity agreements by which the UCMS agreed not to station its missionaries in areas where they would compete with the missionaries of other denominations. Such agreements appeared to conservatives to abandon the distinctiveness of the Disciples’ message and, in some cases, to accommodate the liberalism of other groups. The central issue, however, was open membership—whether missionaries should require baptism by immersion for church membership. Year by year through the 1920s, the Disciples underwent the same kind of parliamentary battles that rocked both the Northern Baptist Convention and the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

The conflict began at the 1920 International Convention in St. Louis when the Disciples debated allegations that missionaries in China were practicing open membership. Rather firmly, the convention passed the Medbury Resolution (proposed by Charles S. Medbury of Iowa) which condemned open membership and asked missionaries who dissented from this position to resign from the UCMS. The reactions to this resolution revealed a range of opinions among the Disciples, opinions that went beyond the question of open membership to underlying theological, social, and cultural issues. North comments wryly, “The Christian Century said there was open membership in China, and it was a good thing. The Christian Standard said there was open membership in China, and it was a bad thing. The Christian-Evangelist, reflecting its status as the ‘official paper,’ said there was no open membership in China, and everyone ought to support the missionary societies.”30

Intentionally or not, the Disciples disarmed the sternness of the Medbury Resolution in 1921 at the International Convention in Winona Lake, Indiana. A committee reported that missionaries in China denied practicing open membership. Furthermore the missionaries would not abide by the Medbury Resolution insofar as it required them to conform to American practices; they said they must be bound only by the Word of God. At the same time that they asserted their freedom of conscience in this matter, the missionaries agreed not to actually practice open membership. The convention then voted to accept the committee report.

Yet this act was far from the end of the matter. In January 1922 in a meeting of the UCMS in St. Louis, the board voted 48-2 to affirm a resolution offered by Z. T. Sweeney of Columbus, Indiana. The “Sweeney Resolution” again insisted on both baptism by immersion for church membership and on the missionaries’ belief in this policy. But later that year at the International Convention (again held in Winona Lake), mission officials denied any evidence of open membership in China. They maneuvered around the Sweeney Resolution by saying that missionaries could believe in open membership as long as they did not practice it.
Tensions remained, so in 1924 the International Convention in Cleveland set up a “Peace Committee” to investigate the question and try to find a solution. In 1925 a majority at the International Convention in Oklahoma City overwhelmingly passed a “Peace Resolution” requiring all UCMS missionaries to foreswear open membership. The UCMS, however, eventually repeated the qualification of 1922 as its interpretation of the resolution, namely, that a missionary could believe in open membership as long as he did not practice it. Furthermore the UCMS said it considered this vote simply advisory because, it claimed, no such practice was occurring.

By the mid-1920s the conservatives were massing their forces in defense of their cause. Throughout the 1920s they had been holding Restoration Congresses just prior to the International Convention to rally their supporters and to plan strategy. In 1925 the conservatives established the Christian Restoration Association (the Clarke Fund), formed as a clearinghouse for missionary and educational endeavors among conservatives to take the place the UCMS and other official Disciples agencies. Conservatives had founded both the McGarvey Bible College and Cincinnati Bible Institute in 1923, and in 1924 merged them as the Cincinnati Bible Seminary, the major school of the conservative faction.

Although their numbers were strong, conservatives enjoyed only mixed success in promoting their agenda. These inconsistent resulted in part from the historic Disciples stress on freedom of conscience and resistance to creeds. North notes, “Whenever the situation was simply open membership, the overwhelming majority of the Disciples voted strongly against it. … But when the convention or missionary society leadership reinterpreted the issue into terms of freedom or liberty, the middle of the road moderates and uninformed followed this line of interpretation.”

The climax came in 1926. At the International Convention in Memphis, conservatives launched a series of efforts against the UCMS. They repeated charges of open membership—against official denials—and offered resolutions aimed at breaking up the UCMS. These efforts all failed, and the majority approved a report exonerating the mission board. Despairing of ever winning in the International Convention, conservatives accelerated their formation of conservative agencies to counter those of the International Convention, now generally considered to be in the hands of the liberals. In 1927 the conservatives held a North American Christian Convention in Indianapolis in distinction to the International Convention. This action marked the reality of the split, even though it did not become final for a number of years.

**Aftermath**

Although in retrospect 1927 seems a reasonable date for marking the division of the group into the Disciples of Christ and the Independent Christian Churches, it was by no means so obvious at the time. Writing in 1954, Norman Furniss even stated that the Disciples, unlike the Baptists and Presbyterians, had avoided a schism. The sides drifted apart more than they split asunder. North describes a process of replacement that took place among the conservatives: “The Cincinnati Bible Seminary to replace College of the Bible, Christian Restoration Association to replace the United Christian Missionary Society, and the North American Christian Convention to replace the International Convention.” This gradual building of a separate network revealed a de facto separation that eventually grew into a genuine division apparent to all observers.

In 1948 a Commission on Restudy abandoned efforts to find some basis for healing the breach between the groups. The Commission reported, “Our study of the history and ideals of our people has led us to the conclusion that a basic cause of our divisions and our more serious dissension, both past and present, lies in a difference of understanding with respect to the fundamental purpose of our movement.” The “fundamental purpose” being debated reflected the historic Disciples tension between restoration and unity.

As the years passed, the gap widened. In 1950 the North American Christian Convention became an annual rather than an occasional meeting, underscoring the fact that the conservatives saw it as the counterbalance to the International Convention. The gap widened even more in 1968 when the Disciples of Christ approved a major denominational reorganization. Gone was all thought of an informal association as the
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) established itself as a regular mainline denomination with all the bureaucracy and hierarchy that Disciples had historically claimed to oppose. For many conservatives who thought of themselves as still connected with the major Disciples agencies, this was the last straw. In 1971 the Yearbook of American Churches gave separate listings for the “Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)” and the “Christian Churches and Churches of Christ.” The split of 1927 was unquestionably final.

The Independent Christian Churches emerged as a clearly conservative group. The heart of the Christian Churches lies in the Midwest but, as Conkin notes, it is not as sectional as the predominantly southern Churches of Christ. In numbers, the Christian Churches eventually outstripped the Disciples. In 1999 the Yearbook of Canadian and American Churches listed an inclusive membership for the Independents as 1,071,616 members in 5,579 churches. By contrast, the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) had an inclusive membership of only 879,346 in 3,818 churches. Yet both were smaller than the Churches of Christ, which had an inclusive membership of 1.8 million in 14,400 churches.

Within the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) remain some conservatives who hope to serve as a Puritan faction within the denomination to yet rescue it. Despite the thorough liberalism of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), this remnant still holds out hope for evangelical renewal. These conservatives support organizations such as the National Evangelistic Association of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), the Conference on Spiritual Renewal, and—probably the most important of these groups—Disciple Renewal. These groups have been able to claim some victories. They led efforts in 1991, for instance, to defeat the candidacy of Michael Kinnamon for president of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), because of his support for the ordination of homosexuals to the ministry. But they have not fundamentally altered the direction of the denomination.

The Churches of Christ and the Fundamentalist Controversy

One cannot discuss the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy among the Disciples without at least glancing at the effects of that controversy on its sister group, the Churches of Christ. There was, really, little internal controversy among the Churches of Christ. As James Stephen Wolfgang notes, to have a Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy, one must first have Modernists. The Churches of Christ were rigorously, thoroughly conservative and experienced little influence from liberalism in the early twentieth century. Murch charges that this lack of controversy resulted from isolation: “The right wing of the movement, the Churches of Christ, had so isolated itself from the mainstream of the Christian world and from the cultural and scientific movements of society in general that it was almost wholly unaffected by the controversy over liberalism.”

Even among the Churches of Christ, however, the controversy had some effects. Wolfgang notes a kind of “heresy trial” involving William Webb Freeman, a Bible professor at Abilene Christian College. Freeman stirred up controversy by criticizing the infallibility of the Bible and denying strict creationism. Conservatives responded sharply to Freeman’s views, and the president of Abilene dismissed him. Wolfgang notes as well the heavy involvement by the Churches of Christ in the anti-evolution crusade. The crusade against evolution was probably the major theater of the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy in the South. The Churches of Christ could eagerly support efforts against evolution, especially since this crusade involved lobbying state legislatures for anti-evolution laws and other activities that would not involve the denominational cooperation that the Churches of Christ generally resisted.

But complicating the identification of the Churches of Christ with Fundamentalism is the fact that the Churches of Christ have normally proved the most overtly sectarian of the Restorationist churches. Representing this tendency is the comment of a Church of Christ pastor in the Appalachians: “I want to emphasize that the Church of Christ is not a new religion. I can’t help but to say that we are the only church. If we are to please God, we’ve got to be a member of that church.” As a result, the Churches of Christ were suspicious of the Fundamentalist movement. Wolfgang notes parallel activities and similar language of the
Churches of Christ with Fundamentalists, but he also notes the criticism that they leveled against Fundamentalism, and he sees almost no open cooperation with Fundamentalists.  

Richard Hughes dissents from this view. He sees a commonality of viewpoint that characterizes the Churches of Christ and Fundamentalism and says that as a result of World War I, “Churches of Christ quite naturally began to make common cause with fundamentalists in a number of areas. … Many leaders among Churches of Christ in this period routinely attacked biblical criticism, upheld theories of biblical inerrancy, scorned the theory of Darwinian evolution, defended and praised William Jennings Bryan, fraternized with fundamentalists in informal ways, and generally cast their lot with fundamentalism on almost every critical issue with the single exception of dispensationalism.”  

Still, one notes that even Hughes characterizes such ties as “informal” and that parallel views and practices, rather than joint efforts, characterize any relationship of the Churches of Christ to Fundamentalism.  

Perhaps as close a link as one can discover between the Churches of Christ and Fundamentalism is seen in the career of R. H. Boll. Wolfgang calls Boll “perhaps the most consistently pro-Fundamentalist writer among Churches of Christ.” Born in Germany in 1875, Boll emigrated to the United States at the age of fifteen. He became a preacher and editor among the Churches of Christ, most notably through his forty years as editor of *Word and Work*. Boll adopted first premillennial and then dispensationalist views, which were rare among the Churches of Christ. Richard Hughes suggests that not only Boll’s millennial views but also his “theology of grace” differentiated him from the majority of his group, as he rejected the legalistic views common in the group in his day.  

Boll was clearly less sectarian than most other leaders of the Churches of Christ, publishing articles by various dispensationalist authors and writing approvingly of the Fundamentalist cause. Eventually, the majority of the Churches of Christ rejected Boll and his views, leading to the formation of a small, separate premillennial Churches of Christ centered in Kentucky, Indiana, and Louisiana. Boll’s designation as a kind of Fundamentalist results from not only his doctrinal views but also his openness to conservatives outside his own denominational circles. In light of the general perception of Fundamentalism as narrow, Boll bears the distinction of being “Fundamentalist” in part by his inclusiveness in contrast to the sectarianism of the Churches of Christ. The rejection of Boll, however, indicates that the attitude of the Churches of Christ toward Fundamentalism was not wholly favorable, whatever sympathies they may have had toward some aspects of the Fundamentalist movement.  

**Fundamentalism and the Restorationist Churches**  

In light of the Disciples controversy and the sometimes rigorous conservatism of the Independent Christian Churches and the Churches of Christ, one might express surprise that these groups are not generally counted among the stalwarts of Fundamentalism. The fact remains that today few of the Restorationists move in the circles of “card-carrying Fundamentalism,” that network of schools, churches, associations, mission boards, and publications that consciously identifies itself as “Fundamentalist.” Virtually none of the major public leaders of Fundamentalism are from the Restorationist ranks.  

Unquestionably, some Restorationists moved in conservative interdenominational circles in the 1910s, 1920s, and 1930s. Disciples evangelist Charles Reign Scoville was one of many popular interdenominational evangelists of that era. Like other evangelists, such as Billy Sunday and William Biederwolf, Scoville conducted interdenominational campaigns and preached at Fundamentalist venues, such as the Winona Lake Bible Conference. Some Restorationists even joined overtly Fundamentalist causes. Several conservative Disciples attended the meeting of the World’s Christian Fundamentals Association (the major interdenominational Fundamentalist body of that time) in 1924 and printed the WCFA’s resolutions in the *Christian Standard*. Christian Churches leader James Murch met with Baptist Fundamentalist leader W. B. Riley in 1924 and returned expressing his belief in a sense of common purpose.  

Furthermore, as Kevin Kragenbrink argues, Restorationist conservatives shared not only in
some doctrinal concerns but also in the cultural conservatism that characterized Fundamentalism. Kragenbrink details the attitudes of the Disciples on “Americanism” issues such as Bolshevism, immigration, the Ku Klux Klan, and forms of nativism. He notes that the divide among the Disciples on these issues tended to mirror the divide over doctrinal issues, with conservatives generally leaning to the politically conservative side. He also demonstrates how Disciples conservatives aligned with Fundamentalists on issues such as the teaching of evolution in public schools and prohibition.

James DeForest Murch perhaps best represents the outreach of the Christian Churches to conservative evangelicalism. A leader among the Independent Christian Churches, Murch became involved with the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), editing their magazine United Evangelical Action for fourteen years. Murch even wrote the official history of the NAE, titling it, significantly, Cooperation Without Compromise. Murch consciously defined the Christian Churches as the “Conservative Center,” a middle way between the “Liberal Left Wing” represented by the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) and the sectarian “Legalistic Right Wing” represented by the Churches of Christ.

At the same time, Murch also embodies a divide among conservative Protestants that complicates the matter of identifying “Fundamentalist Disciples.” In the 1940s and 1950s, conservative American evangelicalism split into two groups. One group, taking the name “the New Evangelicalism” and represented by Billy Graham, Christianity Today, Fuller Theological Seminary, and the NAE, took a more inclusive approach toward non-conservatives and disdained the alleged narrowness of the old-line Fundamentalist position. The other group, keeping the name “Fundamentalist,” maintained a strict separation from liberalism and denounced the New Evangelical approach. Kragenbrink notes a similar divide among the Christian Churches. He details how the Christian Restoration Association, organized in 1925, became a center of the rigorously conservative Disciples and likens it to contemporary Fundamentalism, in contrast to the New Evangelical approach represented by conservatives such as Murch. These militant conservatives criticized the moderate conservatives and took a vociferously militant line against compromise with liberalism.

One minister in the Christian Churches who rose to prominence in contemporary Fundamentalism was Billy James Hargis. He grew up in the Christian Church and initially served as a pastor to congregations in that group. However, Hargis rose to prominence in Fundamentalist circles when he left the regular church ministry, saying that God had called him instead to be a crusader against Communism. In the 1950s he worked closely with anti-Communist Fundamentalist Carl McIntire and McIntire’s International Council of Christian Churches. He first gained attention with his “Bible balloons,” efforts to float copies of the Bible behind the Iron Curtain by means of balloons released from Western Europe. Hargis founded and led the Christian Crusade, a militantly anti-Communist organization equally dedicated to conservative Christianity and Americanism. During the 1950s and 1960s he spoke in many Fundamentalist pulpits and counted many fervently anti-Communist Fundamentalists among his friends and readers. His influence went into a major tailspin in the mid-1970s, however, when he resigned as president of American Christian College in Tulsa amid charges he had had sexual relations with students of both sexes.

Yet even Hargis’s story reveals what is, at best, the hesitant acceptance of the Christian Churches by Fundamentalists. During his heyday in interdenominational Fundamentalist circles, Hargis was ambivalent about his connection to the Christian Churches. His official biography (1965) stresses his continuing membership in the Christian Churches. His autobiography (1974), however, claims that he abandoned all denominational affiliation when he launched his anti-Communist crusade in 1950 so that he could rise above denominational limitations. It was apparently his political stance more than his theological credentials that opened doors for Hargis in interdenominational Fundamentalism. When he tried to rebuild his coalition after the scandals of the 1970s, many Fundamentalists criticized him for theological compromise by cooperating with the Charismatic movement and
other movements they saw as theologically questionable.\textsuperscript{65}

As Hargis’s case illustrates, similarities and sympathies do not necessarily lead to identification. Certainly this is true of conservative Restorationists and Fundamentalists. Previous pages have indicated the suspicion with which conservative Restorationists have viewed Fundamentalism, or at least aspects of the movement. Fundamentalist opposition to Restorationist groups and their teachings is no less sharp. Some Fundamentalist critics take aim at the Churches of Christ in particular, since they generally seem to be more sectarian. Fundamentalist charges generally focus on the alleged legalism of the Restorationist groups, their staunch Arminianism (especially the idea of falling from grace), and above all the linking of salvation to baptism by immersion.\textsuperscript{66}

Hugh Pyle represents the opinion of many Fundamentalists when he calls the Churches of Christ “a pernicious religious cult which has deceived countless thousands about God’s way of salvation.”\textsuperscript{67} On the other hand, Leroy Garrett cites Joseph Dampier, a former president of the North American Christian Convention and professor at Emmanuel School of Religion, as contending “that the Independents did not become a part of the Fundamentalist movement as such, for they were restorationists who believed in baptism for the remission of sins. For this reason other Fundamentalists would not accept them.”\textsuperscript{68} The pointed differences on such issues and the attitude of each side to the other makes it difficult to see how there could be any rapprochement between Fundamentalists and conservative Restorationists.

**Conclusion**

The study of the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy among the Disciples of Christ confirms some observations and generalizations about the overall controversy. James North cites Bruce Shelley and Chester Tulga to note parallels between the Baptist controversy and the Disciples controversy, such as Tulga’s observation that an uninformed conservative will follow his convention’s leadership.\textsuperscript{69} Likewise the Christian Churches revealed the same penchant for building separate institutions to replace those lost to liberalism. Joel Carpenter has described this tendency. Borrowing from the title of a popular gospel song, Carpenter says these separate institutions formed as a result of the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy provided “a shelter in a time of storm” to Fundamentalists.\textsuperscript{70} Already cited above was North’s observation of how the conservatives replaced allegedly compromised Disciples institutions (e.g., the UCMS, the International Convention, the schools) with their own (e.g., Cincinnati Bible Seminary, North American Christian Convention). Wolfgang likewise notes the growth of Churches of Christ colleges in parallel to the development of Fundamentalist schools as havens of safety in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.\textsuperscript{71}

The controversy may also shed some light on the vexed question of Fundamentalist origins and the definition of the movement. In the 1960s Ernest Sandeen began a renaissance in Fundamentalist studies by suggesting a theological and ideological source for the movement in premillennialism and belief in the inerrancy of Scripture.\textsuperscript{72} LeRoy Moore, however, thought that Sandeen’s view was not comprehensive enough and failed to explain all facets of the movement. Other have echoed Moore’s charge and pointed out other roots. George Marsden, for example, notes the importance of factors such as the Keswick movement and revivalism.\textsuperscript{73}

Moore’s suggestion, however, is of a slightly different flavor from just suggesting more roots. He differentiates between *doctrinaire Fundamentalism* and *Fundamentalism as a party movement*. In other words, there is a form of Fundamentalism drawing upon a particular theological heritage (premillennialism, dispensationalism, revivalism, etc.). There were also, however, “Fundamentalist parties” in the denominational battles that did not draw from this heritage. Moore uses the example of Baptist A. H. Strong, who was not a Fundamentalist but who became involved in Fundamentalist efforts at the end of his life when he began to warn against and to combat liberalism in Baptist schools and mission boards.\textsuperscript{74}

One need not accept all of Moore’s argument to appreciate his point. He sees the Fundamentalist and Modernist factions in the 1920s more as political coalitions, albeit religiously
based, a point of view that unduly reduces the role of theological causes in the controversy. But Moore does stress that some participated in the Fundamentalist controversy without sharing fully in the theological milieu that generated doctrinaire Fundamentalism. This observation may help explain why contemporary Fundamentalists (the heirs of the theological influences noted by Sandeen and Marsden) look with suspicion on the Independent Christian Churches. The two sides fought alongside one another more from common cause than common ideology.

Historian James North of the Christian Churches tends toward this viewpoint. He in fact cites Sandeen’s arguments about the doctrinal roots of Fundamentalism to demonstrate how the Disciples’ version differed. North stresses the lack of continuity between the Disciples conservatives and other Fundamentalists over issues such as premillennialism and opposition to evolution. He argues, “Fundamentalism could become an issue among the Disciples only as it dealt with peculiarly Disciples precepts. As it turned out Disciples fundamentalism focused on the issue of baptism by immersion.” His concern is for the uniqueness of the Disciples controversy.

One must beware, however, of drawing lines too finely here. Kevin Kragenbrink, another historian of the Christian Churches tradition, stresses the commonality of the Disciples conservatives with other Fundamentalists. As noted earlier, he demonstrates that the Disciples conservatives shared many concerns with the other Fundamentalists not only in doctrine but also in social and political matters. There are unquestionably differences between the Fundamentalists of the Restoration churches and those of other groups involved in the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy, and understanding those differences is essential to understanding correctly the history of the Disciples controversy, its aftermath, and the relationship of Restorationist conservatives and modern Fundamentalism. At the same time, one cannot properly understand that controversy without noting the similarities as well.

Finally, the Disciples controversy reinforces the contention that the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy was over real and substantial issues. Some writers have denied this. Leroy Garrett, for example, charges that issues such as open membership and liberalism were not the real cause of the Disciples division. Instead, he argues, the cause “was the vindictive spirit and unbrotherly attitude of certain papers, preachers, and professors.” But even Fundamentalists who reject certain teachings of the Restorationist churches will admit that a real and serious difference of positions existed. Differing world views clashed in the controversy, as C. C. Morrison wrote in 1924. Kragenbrink notes, “In order to make a peaceful resolution … it would have been necessary for one party or the other to renounce its world view and set aside its own identity. This fight was not simply over differences of opinion; it was a fight over the very basis of Christian identity and over the nature of Christian society.” Those who would fully understand these controversies must reckon on this fact.
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