

# ***Fundamentalism and the Orthodox Presbyterian Church***

***A Fundamentalism File Research Report  
by Mark Sidwell***

This report is intended to be a resource to help Fundamentalist Christians in studying and evaluating religious leaders and movements. It draws primarily upon materials housed in the Fundamentalism File in the J. S. Mack Library on the campus of Bob Jones University.

Although every effort has been made to provide an impartial study of the topic, this work will naturally reflect the interpretations and viewpoint of its author. ***This report should not be taken as representing an official statement of the position of Bob Jones University.*** The University's theological position is well expressed by its creed.

The staff of the Fundamentalism File would welcome any questions or comments concerning the content of this report.

# ***Fundamentalism and the Orthodox Presbyterian Church***

Observers use the term *Fundamentalist* in an astonishing variety of ways. Some apply the label to any extremist or neo-traditionalist religious group, as in “Islamic fundamentalists.” Others, treating the term a little more fairly in its historical context, use *Fundamentalist* for any sort of doctrinally conservative Christianity—though often a form of Christianity opposed or disliked by the one using the label. The common use of *Fundamentalist* as an epithet for conservatives in the Southern Baptist Convention is a case in point.

There remains a more focused use of the term, namely, a label for those Protestant conservatives who actively identify themselves as “Fundamentalists.” These “card-carrying Fundamentalists” proudly use the label and interact within a whole network of Fundamentalist churches and other institutions. Although such a use of the term is narrower than the others, it is a use that is easiest to define and to defend. It is in this sense of “Fundamentalist” that this study examines the relationship of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC) to Fundamentalism.

One might naturally identify the OPC with Fundamentalism. The denomination arose in the 1930s out of the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy within the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Its leader, J. Gresham Machen, is commonly identified as one of the leading Fundamentalists of his time. But the OPC has historically distanced itself from the Fundamentalist movement, and the arguments it offers for doing so are worth considering.<sup>1</sup>

## **Background of the OPC**

The Orthodox Presbyterian Church emerged from the aftermath of the Fundamentalist controversy, a complex and involved struggle. The increasing influence of European higher criticism and the growth of a more liberal, naturalistic “New Theology” in America caused many orthodox Christians to begin drawing lines of belief which, they said, marked boundaries of Christian truth that could not safely be crossed. The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. marked these

boundaries in 1910 by the adoption of five key doctrines that the PCUSA required all candidates for the ministry to affirm: the inerrancy of the Bible; the virgin birth, vicarious atonement, and bodily resurrection of Christ; and the reality of miracles. The denomination reaffirmed this stance in 1916 and 1923.<sup>2</sup>

The PCUSA conducted a series of highly visible investigations of the allegedly heretical views of Charles Augustus Briggs, Henry Preserved Smith, and A. C. McGiffert in the late nineteenth century, but the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy within the church may be said to have “officially” begun in 1922. Harry Emerson Fosdick, a leading Baptist Modernist who was teaching at Union Theological Seminary and filling the pulpit of First Presbyterian Church in New York, addressed his church on May 22 with the message “Shall the Fundamentalists Win?” Fosdick insisted that the denomination declare itself tolerant of liberal views and not insist on conformity to a doctrinal standard.

In response to Fosdick, Clarence Macartney of the Arch Street Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia preached to his congregation “Shall Unbelief Win?” Moreover, Macartney lodged a protest through his presbytery over Fosdick’s position in the church. After a process of investigation, Fosdick was forced out and he became pastor of Park Avenue Baptist Church in New York. Meanwhile, in 1924, Macartney was elected moderator of the PCUSA.<sup>3</sup>

These apparent victories of the conservative party, however, masked a movement toward the toleration that Fosdick espoused. In 1923, 149 Presbyterian clergy issued the “Auburn Affirmation,” a document calling on the PCUSA to abandon the five-point doctrinal test for ministers. After some skirmishing, the PCUSA adopted the Affirmation viewpoint in 1927 and virtually eliminated doctrinal tests for ministers.

In the center of these battles was J. Gresham Machen (1881-1937), assistant professor of New Testament literature and exegesis at Princeton Theological Seminary. Despite temptations from

liberalism during his graduate study in Marburg and Göttingen in 1905-6, Machen had become a firm upholder of the conservative tradition of the Princeton theology. He established a solid scholarly reputation through *The Origin of Paul's Religion* (1921) and later *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (1930), and he penned one of the most cogent popular defenses of the conservative position, *Christianity and Liberalism* (1923).<sup>4</sup>

Princeton, long one of the bastions of orthodoxy in the PCUSA, was the next center of controversy within the denomination as that school became the focus of an effort to reorganize the board. This the denomination did in 1929, installing a board committed to a more theologically inclusive course. In protest, Machen left to found Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. Joining him were several faculty and students from Princeton, including Robert Dick Wilson, Cornelius Van Til, O. T. Allis, Francis Schaeffer, and Carl McIntire.<sup>5</sup>

Machen continued the battle against liberalism, moving the scene of the action to the problem of liberalism on the mission field. As one tactic in this battle, he formed the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions to send orthodox missionaries to the field. The PCUSA, although declaring itself unable to enforce doctrinal uniformity among its ministers, found Machen in violation of church discipline in forming an independent board to compete with that of the denomination. The church defrocked Machen and six other ministers over the issue.

In 1936 Machen was part of a group of 34 ministers, 17 ruling elders, and 79 laymen who formed a new church body. The group originally called itself the Presbyterian Church of America, but in 1939 a lawsuit brought by the PCUSA forced the denomination to rename itself the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. It was a small but thoroughly conservative body, mandating subscription to the Presbyterian Westminster Confession of Faith.<sup>6</sup>

The OPC took a definite stand at its founding, a stand that perhaps helps explain its occasional identification as a Fundamentalist body. Mark Noll notes that the group embraced the "conviction ... that personal opposition to liberalism was not enough."<sup>7</sup> Many conservatives who did not join the OPC, such as Clarence Macartney, per-

sonally opposed liberalism, but the new denomination insisted on a corporate opposition, a position which naturally resulted in separation. "From the first, therefore, the self-identity of the OPC involved opposition not only to liberalism, but also to denominational pluralism."<sup>8</sup>

### **Machen and Fundamentalism**

Historians and other observers have generally not hesitated to call J. Gresham Machen a Fundamentalist, but some have raised legitimate questions about such a designation.<sup>9</sup> In favor of "Machen as Fundamentalist," one may note how he fits the overall pattern of a Fundamentalist. He sided with—indeed, helped lead—the orthodox side in a major theater of the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy. He wrote one of the defining polemics of the controversy, *Christianity and Liberalism*. Machen resisted the introduction of liberal influence at the school at which he taught and, failing that, founded a new seminary. He protested against liberalism on the denominational mission board and founded his own board in protest. Dismissed from his church, he founded his own group and led others to separate from a mainline denomination.

Others dissent from this view. Fundamentalist George Dollar denies Machen the title "Fundamentalist," calling him one of Fundamentalism's "Orthodox Allies," because of his Reformed views and antipathy to dispensationalist premillennialism.<sup>10</sup> Perhaps the leading historian to question the absolute identification of Machen with Fundamentalism is D. G. Hart of Westminster Theological Seminary. Hart argues, negatively, that Machen's opposition to dispensationalism—viewed as a defining hallmark of the Fundamentalist movement—precludes any easy identification of Machen with Fundamentalism. Positively, Hart says that Machen's Reformed confessionalism did not simply make him antipathetic to dispensationalism but actively shaped his belief and practice in a manner distinct from that typical of American Fundamentalism.<sup>11</sup>

Machen himself displayed more than ambivalence about the term. He once wrote, "The term Fundamentalism is distasteful to the present writer and to many persons who hold views similar to his. It seems to suggest that we are adherents of some strange new sect, whereas in

point of fact we are conscious simply of maintaining the historic Christian faith and of moving in the great central current of Christian life.”<sup>12</sup>

In 1926 Machen said, “Do you suppose, gentlemen, that I do not detect faults in many popular defenders of supernatural Christianity? Do you suppose that I do not regret my being called, by a term that I greatly dislike, a ‘Fundamentalist’? Most certainly I do. But in the presence of a great common foe, I have little time to be attacking my brethren who stand with me in defense of the Word of God. I must continue to support an unpopular cause.”<sup>13</sup>

In 1927, on being offered the presidency of the newly founded Bryan Memorial University, Machen replied that “thoroughly consistent Christianity, to my mind, is found only in the Reformed or Calvinistic Faith; and consistent Christianity, I think, is the Christianity easiest to defend. Hence I never call myself a ‘Fundamentalist.’ There is, indeed, no inherent objection to the term; and if the disjunction is between ‘Fundamentalism’ and ‘Modernism,’ then I am willing to call myself a Fundamentalist of the most pronounced type. But after all, what I prefer to call myself is not a ‘Fundamentalist’ but a ‘Calvinist’—that is, an adherent of the Reformed Faith.”<sup>14</sup>

### **The Bible Presbyterian Split**

Machen’s reservations concerning Fundamentalism are reflected in the later history of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. The distinctions between Machen’s Reformed confessionalism and ideas popular in the stream of American Fundamentalism appeared forcefully within a year of Machen’s death. While still an infant church, Machen’s group divided into what eventually became known as the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and the Bible Presbyterian Church.

This split resulted from two issues of importance to the Fundamentalist movement: alcohol and premillennialism. Generally, the Reformed confessionalists took a position rooted in the idea of “Christian liberty.” Since the Bible did not clearly condemn alcohol, then the believer could follow his own conscience on the matter. Machen himself was not opposed to wine, and he in fact opposed prohibition. Other issues also figured in discussions about the limits of Christian liberty,

such as the use of tobacco, but alcohol was the central, most controversial point.

Opposing this tendency within the new church was a group led by Carl McIntire, a pastor in Collingswood, New Jersey, and J. Oliver Buswell, president of Wheaton College. They came out strongly for total abstinence from alcohol and tobacco. They protested vigorously because Westminster Seminary did not ban these substances and charged that even the faculty were partaking.

The other issue, premillennialism, was not as clear-cut. The confessionalist side claimed that the problem was not premillennialism but rather dispensationalism, which the confessionalists thought incompatible with historic Reformed theology. The McIntire-Buswell faction claimed that the problem was not dispensationalism but rather any form of premillennialism, which they claimed the confessionalists would not tolerate.

The clash climaxed at the denomination’s General Assembly of 1937. The majority voted down three overtures favoring total abstinence. The McIntire-Buswell minority then left to form the Bible Presbyterian Church. Beneath the public issues in this dispute was an argument over Reformed identity. The Bible Presbyterians were open to cooperation with non-Presbyterians while the majority jealously guarded their Reformed distinctiveness. Disagreements over this matter had led to conflict within the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions even before the schism. Afterwards, the IBPFM aligned itself with the Bible Presbyterians. Thus the organization whose formation led to Machen’s expulsion from the PCUSA did not follow the strictly Presbyterian position of its founder but a more denominationally open stance.<sup>15</sup>

### **Later Controversies in the OPC**

The Bible Presbyterian schism represented the major fight over the Fundamentalist/Reformed identity of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, but it was not the only one. From 1943 to 1948 the denomination went through lengthy discussions about whether to ordain philosophy professor Gordon Clark. The center of that dispute involved an issue unrelated to Fundamentalism, Clark’s concept of the incomprehensibility of God and how his views clashed with those of the faculty of

Westminster Seminary. But a significant portion of Clark's support came from OPC members who desired a more open stance toward non-Calvinists so that the OPC could fight alongside them against liberalism and participate in political reform. The decision not to ordain Clark was, in a sense, a vote against a Fundamentalist position in favor of an overtly Reformed one.<sup>16</sup>

The Clark controversy paradoxically not only reveals how the OPC refused to view itself as Fundamentalist but also highlights a position taken by the OPC that outwardly places it in the same orbit as more contemporary (post-1950s) Fundamentalism. The 1940s saw the rise of the New Evangelicalism, a movement dedicated to "reforming" Fundamentalism by repudiating Fundamentalist separatism and participating more openly in contemporary scholarship and theological discussion.<sup>17</sup> One of the major vehicles of the New Evangelicalism was the National Association of Evangelicals, founded in 1942 as an alliance of denominations and individuals generally adhering to the New Evangelical agenda.

The OPC refused to join the NAE in 1943. Hart and Muether give the denomination's rationale: "How could a body that was opposed to liberalism allow its president, [Harold] Ockenga, to retain his membership in a modernist denomination, the United Congregational Churches of Christ? By not opposing modernism in a consistent way, the NAE's voice would always be compromised. Even more objectionable was the constituency of the new organization, which was composed of different Protestant theological traditions from Pentecostals to Presbyterians." They also cite the NAE's plan to conduct evangelism and mission work through parachurch agencies not under the oversight of church officers.<sup>18</sup> This position toward the NAE reflected the denomination's overall attitude toward the whole New Evangelical movement.

At first glance, this argument sounds very much like those of contemporary Fundamentalists against the NAE, particularly the charge of a "compromised" testimony.<sup>19</sup> However, at the same time the OPC also refused offers to join the militantly Fundamentalist, separatist American Council of Christian Churches, founded by Carl McIntire. The visible stance of the OPC was similar to that of Fundamentalist opponents of the

New Evangelicalism, but the rationale was somewhat different. As Hart puts it, "From the OPC's perspective, neither the NAE nor the ACCC was sufficiently Calvinistic, and neither organization exhibited a proper (i.e., Presbyterian) understanding of the church."<sup>20</sup> The matter came down again to a distinction between American Fundamentalism (at least as it was commonly viewed) and Reformed confessionalism.

### **An Orthodox Presbyterian Critique of Fundamentalism**

What are the alleged differences between Fundamentalism and Reformed confessionalism? Hart and Muether explain the distinction from the OPC point of view. They say that Fundamentalism "stands for certain theological emphases, among which are dispensationalist theology, revivalistic techniques of soul-winning, stern prohibitions against worldly entertainments, and a low view of the institutional church."<sup>21</sup> This brief description offers the major tenets of the Reformed confessionalist critique of Fundamentalism.

Many Reformed writers and theologians strongly criticize elements of dispensationalist theology, such as the pointed distinction between Israel and the church and the insistence that the law has no binding authority on the Christian.<sup>22</sup> This question of dispensationalism figured heavily in the Bible Presbyterian split of 1937. One could argue that identifying Fundamentalism absolutely with dispensationalism is an unfair generalization, for certainly not all Fundamentalists have been or are dispensationalists. Rolland McCune, himself a staunch dispensationalist, argues that dispensationalism, although dominant in Fundamentalism's history, is not a defining doctrine for the movement.<sup>23</sup> The strong OPC opposition to dispensationalist teaching, however, precludes the denomination from allowing belief in that system to be a matter even of individual conscience. Unquestionably, the OPC will not accept dispensationalism within its ranks. The question is whether the OPC considers that system a matter of such serious theological error that holding to dispensationalist teaching affects Christian fellowship.

In relation to "worldly entertainments," the question of individual conscience is reversed. As seen in the Bible Presbyterian split of 1937, the

majority of the OPC preferred an open position on matters such as consuming alcohol or using tobacco. This attitude also characterizes their general approach to activities such as attending motion pictures or the theater. The argument is not that these activities are necessarily good but that they are matters of Christian liberty which the individual believer may decide for himself.

The charges by Hart and Muether against the Fundamentalist views of revival and the institutional church are more subtle. An article written by Hart alone helps explain this position.<sup>24</sup> Although one should beware of taking the views of one member of the OPC as a statement of the group's overall stand, Hart's arguments reflect the tenor of the OPC position. Hart prefers the word *reformed* to *revived* when studying the church. Like many Calvinists, Hart rejects the Arminianism implicit (and often explicit) in revivalism. But he also disagrees with writers such as Iain Murray who think revival is commendable as long as it is wedded to Calvinistic theology.

If revival is actually taking place, Hart says, then it is an invisible work of a sovereign God and humans are not competent to comment upon it. All that believers can observe is reform, how well a church or individual conforms to the standards of the Word of God. God works in the church through the Word and the sacraments, not as a result of the personal dynamism or character of the minister. Revival generally downplays the institutional church, Hart claims, in favor of pragmatic methodologies that "get results." The rub for Hart is that many Evangelicals then come to view the inward reality as key and the outward forms as optional.

Revivalism, then, holds a twofold danger to Hart. The concept itself is suspect since revival—if it even occurs—is not observable to believers. Furthermore, a fascination with the concept allegedly causes Christians to denigrate the "ordinary" work of the Holy Spirit, that is, the Spirit's ordained method of working through the church, particularly, through the regular preaching of the Word and administering of the sacraments.

### **Contemporary Stance of the OPC**

Despite these differences, few Fundamentalists would question the overall doctrinal solidity of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, with its

rigorous adherence to the Westminster standards. There is no trace of liberalism within that body and little that can be called an accommodation to liberalism. It is "a doctrinally rigorous, procedurally precise body."<sup>25</sup>

Furthermore, the OPC has taken a firm stand on many social issues of concern to Fundamentalists. In the late 1970s the First Orthodox Presbyterian Church of San Francisco went through a successful fight to dismiss a church organist who was a homosexual, a significant victory for the practice of religious freedom.<sup>26</sup> Likewise, the OPC led a protest against a sexual-orientation law in New Jersey in 1992, a protest that led the governor and attorney general of that state to agree that "any ... church that does not condone homosexuality can preach against homosexuality, protest gay rights laws, and refuse to hire homosexuals."<sup>27</sup> In 1996 the OPC suspended relations with the Christian Reformed Church, another confessional Reformed body. Among the issues disputed were the CRC's willingness to ordain a candidate of questionable orthodoxy, its alleged tolerance of theistic evolution, and especially its support of the ordination of women to the ministry.<sup>28</sup>

The heart of Fundamentalist disagreements with the OPC would probably lie in (1) the personal liberty it allows its members concerning alcohol, tobacco, and "worldly entertainments," and (2) its stance of viewing Reformed confessionalism as the basis of church fellowship. In regard to the first point, the OPC's refusal to enforce standards of what Fundamentalists view as personal separation undoubtedly creates uncertainty among Fundamentalists toward the OPC.

The second point, the impact of the Reformed identity of the OPC, is harder to gauge. Some Fundamentalists probably suspect the OPC because of its Reformed character as expressed in practices and beliefs such as infant baptism and covenant theology. But the OPC itself, as has been seen, tends to distance itself from non-Reformed groups. Noll observes, "While some contact continued with generally evangelical and antiliberal groups, the OPC has experienced closest fellowship with small, self-consciously Reformed bodies."<sup>29</sup> The OPC has displayed this tendency in both its associations and in its decisions not to associate. The denomination pursued

Reformed fellowship in its membership in the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council and (until 1988) in the Reformed Ecumenical Synod and in its extended but ultimately unsuccessful discussions of merging with the Presbyterian Church in America.<sup>30</sup> On the other side of the ledger is the OPC's distance from interdenominational groups such as the NAE.

One might offer two observations concerning this matter of Reformed identity as it relates to a group's identification with Fundamentalism. First, there is always a danger of skewed priorities when a person or group holds strongly to a certain basis of Christian fellowship. It is easy in such cases to overlook problems with another person or group if they are "sound" on the point being stressed. Thus far, the OPC seems to have avoided this danger. If anything, the OPC has a reputation for "theological nit-picking" among its Reformed peers.<sup>31</sup>

The second observation is that the OPC's critique of Fundamentalism seems to assume a precise ideology in that movement which may not really exist.<sup>32</sup> The OPC's tendency to make dispensationalism an essential tenet of Fundamentalism is an example. Likewise, Hart distinguishes Machen from Fundamentalists in rooting his view of separation in his concept of the nature of the church and its "separateness" from culture.<sup>33</sup> Hart's argument presumes a definite Fundamentalist theology of separation that differs from Machen's. But one could just as easily argue that Fundamentalism embraces various rationales for separation, and that Machen provides a model useful for Reformed Fundamentalists.

The Orthodox Presbyterian Church probably would not appreciate being called Fundamentalist, and insofar as self-identification is a criterion, the OPC would not be Fundamentalist. Perhaps George Dollar was partly right, at least as his definition applies to the OPC. The group is really an "orthodox ally" of Fundamentalism in many ways. It is consistently orthodox on essential doctrines of the faith and firmly opposes false teaching. But if it is an ally, the alliance is an uneasy one. The OPC tends to be suspicious of those who do not hold to Reformed teaching, and unquestionably some Fundamentalists are equally suspicious of the OPC for holding such teaching.

Reformed confessionalism does not necessarily exclude a person or group from holding to a Fundamentalist position.<sup>34</sup> But a determination to see Reformed doctrine as the basis of fellowship would establish different grounds of fellowship than those which Fundamentalists have historically laid down. In short, the Orthodox Presbyterian Church is a conservative, orthodox group but one that would not want to embrace Fundamentalism and also one which many Fundamentalists would not want to embrace.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>Useful sources on the history of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church include the following: D. G. Hart and John Muether, *Fighting the Good Fight: A Brief History of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church* (Philadelphia: The Committee on Christian Education and The Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1995), a first-rate denominational history; Charles G. Dennison and Richard C. Gamble, *Pressing Toward the Mark: Essays Commemorating Fifty Years of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church* (Philadelphia: The Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1986), a superior collection of essays on the OPC; Edwin H. Rian, *The Presbyterian Conflict* (1940; reprint, Philadelphia: The Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1986); Robert King Churchill, *Lest We Forget: A Personal Reflection on the Formation of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church* (Philadelphia: The Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, n.d.); Charles Dennison, ed., *The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1936-1986* (Philadelphia: The Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1986); Mark Noll, "The Pea Beneath the Mattress—Orthodox Presbyterians in America," *The Reformed Journal*, October 1986, pp. 11-16; D. G. Hart, "The Legacy of J. Gresham and the Identity of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church," *Westminster Theological Journal* 53 (1991): 209-25.

<sup>2</sup>On the history of the Fundamentalist-Modernist Controversy in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., see Bradley J. Longfield, *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Lefferts Loetscher, *The Broadening Church: A Study of Theological Issues in the Presbyterian Church Since 1869* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954); David O. Beale, *In Pursuit of Purity: American Fundamentalism Since 1850* (Greenville, S.C.: Unusual Publications, 1986), pp. 113-70; William Weston, "The Presbyterian Controversy: The Triumph

of the Loyalist Center,” in *Re-Forming the Center: American Protestantism, 1900 to the Present*, ed. Douglas Jacobsen and William Vance Trollinger Jr. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 109-28.

<sup>3</sup>See Mark Sidwell, “Did the Fundamentalists Win? The Clash of Fosdick and Macartney,” *Biblical Viewpoint* 32, no. 2 (1998): 87-95.

<sup>4</sup>J. Gresham Machen, *The Origin of Paul’s Religion* (New York: Macmillan, 1921); *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930); *Christianity and Liberalism* (New York: Macmillan, 1923).

<sup>5</sup>See Beale, pp. 165-70; and Ronald T. Clutter, “The Reorganization of Princeton Theological Seminary Reconsidered,” *Grace Theological Journal* 7 (1986): 179-201. Clutter rightly points out that the battle within Princeton was not between conservatives and liberals but between conservatives with differing views of how inclusive the church should be. He also notes the important role played by personality conflicts in the clash. Clutter overstates his case, however, in concluding that this difference was not serious and that the two sides should have come to some accommodation over this inclusivism. The later direction of Princeton and Westminster seminaries indicates that the two parties had differing views of the limits of doctrinal latitude, regardless of their personal doctrinal views. D. G. Hart views the Princeton clash as an ideological matter of some significance, but one involving differing understandings of proper Presbyterian doctrine and church order. See D. G. Hart, “J. Gresham Machen, Confessional Presbyterianism, and the History of Twentieth-Century Protestantism,” in *Re-Forming the Center: American Protestantism, 1900 to the Present*, pp. 138-39.

<sup>6</sup>The importance of Machen’s view of the church as a factor in his actions is discussed by Dallas M. Roark, “J. Gresham Machen and His Desire to Maintain a Doctrinally True Presbyterian Church” (Ph.D. diss., Iowa State University, 1963). Against those who criticize Machen’s allegedly inadequate conception of the church, he argues that Machen’s central thought was to create a true Presbyterian church through adherence to the Westminster Confession.

<sup>7</sup>Noll, p. 13.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>For a fuller discussion of this issue, see Mark Sidwell, “Was J. Gresham Machen a Fundamentalist?” *Biblical Viewpoint* 31, no. 2 (1997): 71-80.

<sup>10</sup>George W. Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America* (Greenville, S.C.: Bob Jones University Press, 1973), pp. 173-83.

<sup>11</sup>Hart’s arguments may be seen in the following works: *Defending the Faith: J. Gresham Machen and the Crisis of Conservative Protestantism in Modern America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1994); “The Legacy of J. Gresham and the Identity of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church” (cited in note 1); “Presbyterians and Fundamentalism,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 55 (1993): 331-4; “A Reconsideration of Biblical Inerrancy and the Princeton Theology’s Alliance with Fundamentalism,” *Christian Scholar’s Review* 20 (1991): 362-75; “J. Gresham Machen, Confessional Presbyterianism, and the History of Twentieth-Century Protestantism,” in *Re-Forming the Center: American Protestantism, 1900 to the Present*, pp. 129-49. The last essay is a particularly good summary of Hart’s arguments against identifying Machen as a Fundamentalist.

<sup>12</sup>Quoted in Ned Stonehouse, *J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), p. 336.

<sup>13</sup>Quoted in Stonehouse, pp. 336-37.

<sup>14</sup>Quoted in Stonehouse, p. 428.

<sup>15</sup>On this division, see George M. Marsden, “Perspective on the Division of 1937,” in *Pressing Toward the Mark*, pp. 295-328; Hart and Muether, pp. 41-54; Rian, pp. 163-69; Beale, pp. 315-50; Carl McIntire, *Death of a Church* (Collingswood, N.J.: Christian Beacon Press, 1967), pp. 143-62.

<sup>16</sup>On the controversy over the Clark ordination and its ramifications, see Michael A. Hakkenberg, “The Battle over the Ordination of Gordon H. Clark, 1943-1948,” in *Pressing Toward the Mark*, pp. 329-50; Hart and Muether, pp. 105-15.

<sup>17</sup>On the New Evangelicalism’s history and ideology, see George Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) and Marsden’s *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), pp. 62-82. For a defense of the New Evangelicalism, see Ronald Nash, *The New Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1963). For Fundamentalist critiques of the movement, see Ernest Pickering, *The Tragedy of Compromise: The Origin and Impact of the New Evangelicalism* (Greenville, S.C.: Bob Jones University Press, 1994); and Mark Sidwell, *The Dividing Line: Understanding and Applying Biblical Separation* (Greenville, S.C.: Bob Jones University Press, 1998), pp. 113-27.

<sup>18</sup>Hart and Muether, p. 116. See their overall discussion of the NAE, pp. 115-19.

<sup>19</sup>Cf., e.g., Pickering, pp. 36-38; and M. H. Reynolds Jr., “The National Association of Evan-

gelicals: 43 Years of Evangelical Compromise,” *Sword of the Lord*, 9 August 1985, pp. 1, 22-23.

<sup>20</sup>Hart, “J. Gresham Machen, Confessional Presbyterianism, and the History of Twentieth-Century Protestantism,” p. 131. Sean Michael Lucas writes, “While they appreciated the scholarly tendencies of the moderate fundamentalists and the separatist tendencies of the militant fundamentalists, Westminster and the OPC were not content to align with either.” “Fundamentalisms Revived and Still Standing: A Review Essay,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 60 (1998): 336-37.

<sup>21</sup>Hart and Muether, pp. 42-43.

<sup>22</sup>See, e.g., O. T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1945); John H. Gerstner, *Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth: A Critique of Dispensationalism* (Brentwood, Tenn.: Wolgemuth and Hyatt, 1991); Vern S. Polythress, *Understanding Dispensationalists*, 2nd ed. (Philipsburg, N.J.: P and R Publishers, 1994).

<sup>23</sup>Rolland D. McCune, “Doctrinal Non-Issues in Historic Fundamentalism,” *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 1 (1996): 179-80.

<sup>24</sup>D. G. Hart, “‘Reformed’ or ‘Revived’? Why Words Matter,” *Modern Reformation*, July-August 1998, pp. 38-41.

<sup>25</sup>Noll, p. 16.

<sup>26</sup>See “Church Waits Out Far-Reaching Legal Threat,” *Moody Monthly*, June 1980, pp. 88-89; “Gay Organist Suffers Setback in Dispute with Coast Church,” *Christian News*, 19 May 1980, p. 13; “Judge Rejects Paying the Piper to Maintain Belief,” *Christianity Today*, 23 May 1980, p. 49. Interestingly, the church’s attorney, John Whitehead, is alleged to have described the church as “fundamentalist, one that holds the Bible to be literal when it describes homosexuals as sinners.” (“Church Waits Out Far-Reaching Legal Threat,” p. 88.)

<sup>27</sup>*National and International Religion Report*, 29 June 1992, p. 7.

<sup>28</sup>See Darrell Todd Maurina, “Orthodox Presbyterian Church to Consider Breaking Christian Reformed Ties,” *Christian Observer*, 26 June 1992, p. 8; “Orthodox Presbyterians Suspend Ties with Christian Reformed Church,” *Christian Observer*, 5 July 1996, p. 5. OPC delegate Jeff Taylor said of the break, “It would be naive for us to think the issue is women in office. The issue is also the authority of Scripture, homosexuality, and Creation and evolution.” “Presbyterian Groups Sever CRC Ties,” *Christianity Today*, 11 August 1997, p. 55.

<sup>29</sup>Noll, p. 13.

<sup>30</sup>See Hart and Muether, pp. 135-38; “Reversing Field, OPC Says Yes to PCA,” *The Presbyterian Journal*, 17 June 1981, pp. 4-6; “PCA Presbyteries Split on RPCES and OPC,” *The Presbyterian Journal*, 23 September 1981, p. 5; “OPC Fails to Get Two-Thirds Vote for Joining PCA,” *The Presbyterian Journal*, 9 July 1986, pp. 9-10. The OPC withdrew from the Reformed Ecumenical Synod in protest over the policies of member churches in tolerating homosexuality and questioning the early chapters of Genesis (Hart and Muether, pp. 144-45). It also supported the expulsion of the Christian Reformed Church from the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council in the 1990s over similar concerns. See “North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council Completes Suspension of Christian Reformed Church,” *Christian News*, 7 December 1998, p. 3.

<sup>31</sup>“Shepherd Controversy Remains a Cloud,” *Presbyterian Journal*, 17 June 1981, p. 8. Leveling the charge of “nit-picking” here were elements of the PCA opposed to any merger with the OPC. The article notes the irony of this charge, because, in this case, members of the PCA were accusing the OPC of tolerating doctrinal aberration in the form of an allegedly erroneous view of justification by faith being espoused by Norman Shepherd, associate professor of systematic theology at Westminster Seminary.

<sup>32</sup>This flaw is evident, e.g., in Lucas, “Fundamentalisms Revived and Still Standing,” pp. 327-37, where he overdraws the position of Fundamentalism in order to distinguish it from Reformed confessionalism.

<sup>33</sup>D. G. Hart, “J. Gresham Machen, the Reformed Tradition, and the Transformation of Culture,” *Evangelical Quarterly* 68 (1996): 312-16. Hart elsewhere differentiates the separatism of the OPC from Carl McIntire’s ACCC by saying “the basis for its [the OPC’s] opposition was not dispensationalism or conservative politics. Rather it was Presbyterian theology and polity” (“The Legacy of J. Gresham,” p. 220). His point about the OPC’s stance is valid, but one may question whether his description of the Fundamentalist rationale for separation is entirely accurate.

<sup>34</sup>See an interesting discussion of this matter in Blakely Baynes Hurst, “Confessionalism and Revivalism in the Singapore Bible Presbyterian Movement,” *The Burning Bush* 3 (1997): 69-82.