

2002

Fundamentalist and Evangelical Perspectives in Education

Ken Badley

George Fox University, kbadley1@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/soe_faculty



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Badley, Ken, "Fundamentalist and Evangelical Perspectives in Education" (2002). *Faculty Publications - School of Education*. Paper 38.
http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/soe_faculty/38

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Education at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications - School of Education by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolf@georgefox.edu.

Ken Badley

Fundamentalist and Evangelical Perspectives in Education¹

THIS PAPER LOOKS historically at the beliefs of fundamentalists and evangelicals, noting some similarities and differences. It then examines how they have expressed those beliefs in four specific areas of education: posture toward state education, creation and support of independent schools, production of theory, and production of instructional materials. The study is set in the North American theological and educational contexts.

Keywords: fundamentalist, evangelical, state education, independent schools, home education.

1. Fundamentalists and evangelicals in historical context

1.1 The reaction to modernity thesis

In one of the few books by a fundamentalist about fundamentalism, George W. Dollar offers a useful starting definition:

'Historic fundamentalism is the literal exposition of all the affirmations and attitudes of the Bible and the militant exposure of all non-Biblical affirmations and attitudes.'²

In the decades since 1973 when Dollar offered that definition, two important changes have occurred involving *fundamentalism*. First, the word has expanded in meaning to include many individuals and groups outside the branch of Protestant Christianity in which it originated. It has also shifted in meaning so that people often use it now to refer to anyone fanatically devoted to a set of religious beliefs.

Simultaneously with this semantic expansion and shift, the amount of scholarly examination of fundamentalism has increased, some of it friendly, some uncertain, some hostile. Much of this scholarship views fundamentalism world-

- 1 Along with other articles in this issue, this is adapted from a paper presented at the Stapleford Education Conference at St John's College, Nottingham on 4-6 January, 2002.
- 2 Dollar, George W., *A History of Fundamentalism in America* (Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1973), xv.

wide as a reaction to modernity.³ Thus, we now hear talk, for example, of rising Roman Catholic fundamentalism⁴, of a fundamentalist political party attempting to transform India into a Hindu state, and, of course, of a variety of groups identifying themselves as Islamic fundamentalists.

To ask about fundamentalist and evangelical efforts in education, we must first get back of this less specific current usage to the late 1800s when the term was first used, and then follow the thread of fundamentalism and the two threads of fundamentalism and evangelicalism to the present. We begin our excavation by asking after the utility of the explanation that fundamentalism is a reaction to modernity. The thesis explains a lot, not just with reference to American Protestant fundamentalism but to other, more recent forms as well.⁵

1.2 Fundamentalism goes into exile

What led to the publication of *The Fundamentals* between 1909 and 1915, the books after which the movement is now named? Between 1860-1900, the emphasis in study of religion in most university-level seminaries in the USA swung from pastoral training to critical and comparative studies in religion (using philology, archaeology and history). The purpose of this critical study was to satisfy the requirements of the academy more than to edify the church or the believer. The nineteenth-century liberalism to which *The Fundamentals* were responding was certain about the scientific methods and academic purposes of this Biblical criticism. Some who wished to defend what they saw as historic orthodoxy thought otherwise. So, beginning in 1909, *The Fundamentals* were sent free to almost 400,000 professors, church leaders, clergy and interested lay persons across the US (especially) and Canada. In the preface to a 1958 reprint we find the following:

'The primary characteristic of the religious picture of our day is flux and change. Heartening, indeed, it is to know that in an age of confusion and instability there are certain inalienable and inviolable truths upon which believers can stand. Small men hold big opinions, big men are gripped by convictions. Of the latter class, were the con-

-
- 3 Lawrence, Bruce B., *Defenders of God: The Fundamentalist Revolt Against the Modern Age* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989); Kepel, Gilles, *The Revenge of God: The Resurgence of Islam, Christianity and Judaism in the Modern World*, translated by Alan Braley (University Park, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994); Armstrong, Karen, *The Battle for God* (New York: Knopf, 2000).
 - 4 Gleason, Philip, *Contending with Modernity: Catholic Higher Education in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).
 - 5 See for example, Roberts, Jon H. & Turner, James, *The Sacred and the Secular University, The History of Secularization of American Higher Education in the 1800s*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Marty, Martin E. & Appleby, R. Scott (eds.) *Fundamentalisms and Society: Reclaiming the Sciences, the Family and Education* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1993); and Hunter, James Davison, 'Fundamentalism in its Global Contours' in Cohen, Norman J. (ed.) *The Fundamentalist Phenomenon* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990) pp. 56-72.

tributors to the original series of *The Fundamentals*, which began to appear in the first decade of this century.⁶

The reaction-to-modernity thesis need point no further for evidence that it accounts adequately for the rise of fundamentalism. But the early fundamentalists had far more reasons for concern than simply higher criticism.

They saw the idea of evolution as a threat to biblical accounts of creation, a concern that culminated in the Scopes trial of 1925. Fundamentalists saw a social gospel tied to liberal theology and this ultimately resulted in their own abandoning of the social agenda. They saw around them moral decline, and certainly, on the issue of alcohol at least, they enjoyed wide social backing for their cause. And, as intimated in the comment quoted from Feinberg above, they saw around them change, secularization and urbanization. In the forty years between 1880 and 1920 they lost control of the major denominations in both Canada and the U.S. By the end of the Scopes trial, they were fully in exile and they had been made a laughingstock by intellectuals, journalists and commentators.⁷

1.3 Evangelicalism grows out of fundamentalism

Following World War II, a number of fundamentalists began to distance themselves from what they saw as the anger, the exile and the anti-intellectual excesses of fundamentalism. George Marsden, the leading American specialist in the history of fundamentalism, sees fundamentalism and evangelicalism splitting after the formation in the 1940s of both the National Association of Evangelicals and Carl McIntyre's (fundamentalist) American Council of Christian Churches. A key event in the divorce was the 1957 Billy Graham New York Crusade where the City Council of Churches helped sponsor his meetings. This infuriated some fundamentalists and they then split from the evangelicals. By the end of the 1950s, Moody Bible Institute became the flagship institution of fundamentalism with Billy Graham, Wheaton College and *Christianity Today* emerging as the three identifying pillars of evangelicalism.⁸

One wonders at this point what the pattern of historical development might have been if fundamentalists had been more capable of embracing paradox in

- 6 Feinberg, Charles L., (ed.) *The Fundamentals for Today*, complete in two volumes (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1958).
- 7 Wuthnow, Robert, 'The Future of the Religious Right' in Cromartie, Michael (ed.) *No Longer Exiles: The Religious Right in American Politics* (Washington: Ethics and Public Policy Centre, 1993) pp. 27-46. An entirely unsympathetic account appears in Conway, Flo & Siegelman Jim, *Holy Terror: The Fundamentalist War on America's Freedoms in Religion, Politics and Our Private Lives* (New York: Doubleday, 1982).
- 8 Marsden, George, 'Defining American Fundamentalism' in Cohen, Norman J. (ed.) *The Fundamentalist Phenomenon* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990) pp. 33-34. See also Marsden, George, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).

the way Signe Sandmark describes in the second section of her article. If they were slightly less certain, or less dogmatic, perhaps the split with evangelicals would not have happened. One wonders too whether some attention to the Roman Catholic notion of balance (as Terence McLaughlin describes in his article) might have affected the approach fundamentalists have taken, with reference either to the split with evangelicals referred to here, or to any number of actions they have taken with regard specifically to education.

1.4 Contemporary evangelicals and fundamentalists

Certainly, most people in North America who identify themselves as evangelicals are in basic agreement with the fundamental doctrines articulated at the 1895 Niagara Falls conference and promulgated in *The Fundamentals*.⁹ These were and are as follows:

- the Bible is God's verbally inspired and inerrant word;
- Jesus is virgin-born;
- Jesus is Divine, the Christ, God incarnate;
- in dying, Jesus Christ accomplished a substitutionary atonement for our sins; and
- Jesus Christ rose bodily from the dead and will return to take his church to be with him in glory.

Having said that most contemporary evangelicals are in basic agreement with the fundamentals, it should however be noted that an increasing number view the concern with inerrancy as a red herring because the original autographs cannot be checked and the texts we have seem to contain obvious problems. Why go out on a limb, some are asking, for something so patently untenable? Inerrancy notwithstanding, wide agreement on doctrine remains between contemporary fundamentalists and evangelicals.¹⁰

The telling differences between the two come in other areas. In the US especially, fundamentalists tend to align themselves with the right politically where

9 Marsden, George, 'The Evangelical Denomination' in Neuhaus, Richard John & Cromartie, Michael (eds.) *Plety and Politics: Evangelicals and Fundamentalists Confront the World* (Washington: Ethics and Public Policy Centre, 1987) pp. 57-68.

10 Many outsiders to these two movements write with some imprecision. Provenzo, for example, uses *fundamentalist* to include both evangelicals and fundamentalists and then uses *ultra-fundamentalist* to designate those on the political far right – see Provenzo, Eugene F., *Religious Fundamentalism and American Education: The Battle for the Public Schools* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1990). It should also be noted that the terms 'fundamentalist' and 'evangelical' (and, with them, the term 'reformed') are not used in as sharply distinct ways by Christians in other parts of the world as they are in North America; in some countries, many Christian may be very happy to identify themselves as being both 'evangelical' and 'reformed' while self-identification as 'fundamentalist' may be a comparatively rare occurrence.

evangelicals represent a variety of political stripes.¹¹ Evangelical alignment with the middle and even the left is more the case in Canada. These differences in political alignment may be rooted partly in the fundamentalist reaction to liberal theology, which has often gone hand in hand with more liberal social policy. Likewise, the unquestioned faith in capitalism that often goes with fundamentalist territory in both nations gives way to more variety when one looks at evangelicalism. Fundamentalists have been rather more prone than evangelicals to endorse the preaching of a number of television evangelists preaching that Christian faith leads to economic success (often identified as a 'health and wealth gospel').¹²

Despite commonalities of doctrine, evangelicals have avoided at least one extreme of North American fundamentalism, the tendency to make detailed predictions in their eschatology about the end of human history.¹³ Especially in this area of eschatology, fundamentalist interpretation and preaching often has a certain ring of certainty and superiority. From it, others derive the impression that fundamentalists believe they 'know' exactly what the Bible says: in many cases that they are going to heaven and the rest of us are not.

This superiority also surfaces in the common fundamentalist denial that they have a hermeneutic (other than to read the Bible for its 'literal meaning'). Evangelicals have tended to be more moderate in their claims to knowledge, admitting to both the importance of hermeneutics and their own possession of a hermeneutic. Doubtless evangelicals gain something in their reputation in the wider world as a result of this more moderate stance. But admitting that they read with a hermeneutic damns them in the eyes of fundamentalists. Most fundamentalists would claim to have no need for hermeneutics; the Bible is plain and they read it for what it says; epistemologically, that is, they adopt a naive realist approach to reading the Bible instead of a critical realist approach. (I would personally argue that it is not really the case that the fundamentalist has no hermeneutic; he or she simply has a different hermeneutic. In addition, such a person is actually more at risk of error because of lack of awareness of their own fallibility in interpreting the scriptures.)

2. Fundamentalists and evangelicals in education

Having traced some of the historic commonalities and emerging differences between fundamentalists and evangelicals, we now turn to their concerns about education and the variety of ways they have expressed those concerns.

- 11 See Liebman, Robert C. & Wuthnow, Robert, *The New Christian Right* (New York: Aldine, 1983) and Diamond, Sara, *Spiritual Warfare: The Politics of the Christian Right* (New York: Black Rose, 1990).
- 12 See Marsden, George, 'The Religious Right: An Historical Overview' in Cromartie, Michael (ed.) *No Longer Exiles: The Religious Right in American Politics* (Washington: Ethics and Public Policy Centre, 1993) pp. 1-23.
- 13 Often part of dispensationalism and/or premillennialism. Some conservative denominations have backed away from these interpretations of scripture in recent years.

2.1 Postures toward state education

Niebuhr's 5-part schema from his *Christ and Culture* can be a useful tool for classifying religious attitudes to culture. At first sight, his 'Christ against culture' category would seem to describe the fundamentalist attitude. It seems to give a certain perspective on the exile experienced by fundamentalists from about 1920 to the 1970s. However, it fails to explain either the evangelical engagement with society starting after the Second World War¹⁴ or fundamentalist political involvement from the late 1970s onward. In any case, our present task is more specifically focussed on education, and it may be wiser to approach both evangelicalism and fundamentalism inductively, by examining what they have specifically done and said about this particular aspect of culture.

Indeed, with reference to American and Canadian politics in general, fundamentalists have in recent decades been unclear whether they are in fact insiders or exiles. Decades of exile, self-imposed or not, have left a certain mark on fundamentalism, reflected in mindset and language. Evangelicalism's growth out of fundamentalism in the 1940s and 1950s was partly marked by a return from this exile. The 1970s proved to be a landmark decade. A self-declared born-again president (Carter) was elected in 1976 and served from 1977-1980. But his alignment with several liberal causes angered many Christians. On some accounts, it was his public confession of Christ that galvanized many on the Christian right to work for Republican victories in the 1980 and 1984 elections. During the two Reagan governments and the Bush government that followed, however, the Christian right discovered that they had less real political leverage than some felt they had been promised; instead of using politics, politics may have used them. So it has not been clear lately whether American fundamentalists are in or out of the political loop.

Certainly, fundamentalists had grounds to complain about education. They had repeatedly encountered growing state power in education, especially related to the mistaken equation of a legitimate state interest in ensuring that children receive education with the development of a state-run monopoly in the provision of that education. In the 1920s, the Oregon state government actually tried to close both a military school and a Catholic day school on the grounds that all children were compelled by law to attend state-run schools.¹⁵ In 1925, the US Supreme Court found in these Oregon cases that children may attend a private, religious school as long as that school's educational program meets certain minimum standards, a happy result for later fundamentalists who would educate their own children. But the cases still indicated how far some education officials would go if permitted to do so, leading one observer to comment that 'the right in the United States to educate... children has become a frontier of religious and civil liberties'.¹⁶ So when fundamentalists raised their questions

14 In fact, many evangelicals do not want to be classified in the 'Christ against culture' category.

15 *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 (1925).

16 Bruce Cooper in the Foreword to Vance, Randall E., *Private Schools, Public Power: A Case for Pluralism* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1994) p. ix.

about state intervention in education, they were not alone.

Given this mixed overall experience of society, politics and the politics of education, the fundamentalist and evangelical responses to state schools are somewhat but not entirely predictable. Fundamentalists have offered the fiercer critique of state schools. Several issues stand out: the teaching of evolution, apparent softness on communism, 'family' issues (abortion, homosexuality, sex education, pornography), school prayer¹⁷, school violence, low academic standards, even US foreign policy.¹⁸ Many of these detailed criticisms can be viewed as parts of wider questions: What are the political and social agendas of schools? What vision of society will be taught in schools and will schools be based on: Christian, secular humanist¹⁹, liberal and pluralistic? Some critics of fundamentalist independent schools suggest that the criticisms about low academic standards and school violence may be simply fronts for underlying racism: in effect, white parents place their children in independent schools to keep them near other white children.²⁰

The contents of school textbooks have come under the scrutiny of both fundamentalist and evangelical researchers. Their studies have revealed a consistent pattern of ignoring the role of Christian faith in both history and in contemporary life.²¹ Some school books have come under particular attack from fundamentalists. These have ranged from children's books that are held to portray homosexuality as normative through to *Macbeth*, *Catcher in the Rye* and *Lord of the Flies*.

There is an ongoing struggle to see creation and 'Creation Science' included in state curricula with, in some cases, demand for equal time for creation and evolution. Several states that changed their laws in response to the demand for such policies have had these changes challenged in turn and, by the end of the 1980s, no state had any longer a legal requirement for the equal treatment of 'Creation Science' in their statute books.

- 17 See Fenwick, Lynda Beck, *Should the Children Pray? A Historical, Judicial, and Political Examination of Public School Prayer* (Waco, TX: Markham Press Fund, 1989); Alley, Robert S., *Without a Prayer: Religious Expression in the Public Schools* (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus, 1996); Andreszewski, Tlicia, *School Prayer: A History of the Debate* (Berkeley Heights, NJ: Enslow, 1997).
- 18 See, for example, Lienesch, Michael, *Redeeming America: Piety and Politics in the New Christian Right* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1993), pp. 80-86; and Fraser, James W., *Between Church and State: Religion and Public Education in a Multicultural America* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988). See also Provenzo, Eugene F., *Religious Fundamentalism and American Education: The Battle for the Public Schools* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1990).
- 19 Contra Tim LaHaye, Provenzo argues that secular humanism is not a religion and is, in fact, barely a movement – see Provenzo (1990) pp. xiv – xvi.
- 20 See Bawer, Bruce, *Stealing Jesus: How Fundamentalism Betrays Christianity* (New York: Crown, 1997) p. 143.
- 21 For example, Roques, Mark, *Curriculum Unmasked: Towards a Christian Understanding of Education* (Eastbourne, E. Sussex: Monarch, 1989).

2.2 Independent schools

Fundamentalists, and to a lesser degree evangelicals, have set up their own independent schools. In the US, American Lutheran, Christian Reformed, Roman Catholic and Seventh Day Adventist churches had established their own independent schools.²² The pattern is different in Canada where a few day schools were founded by the same groups but Roman Catholic schools are fully funded by most provinces.²³

However, since the 1970s, churches and groups of parents have started thousands of what are in Britain called 'new Christian schools'. Some of these schools formed because of a single conflict with a state school. Others come out of a more comprehensive philosophy articulated by a group of parents or a local congregation. One comment from Jerry Falwell, the best-known representative of American fundamentalism, warrants inclusion in any discussion of the motives for starting independent schools. He wrote the following in 1979:

'One day, I hope in the next ten years, I can trust that we will have more Christian day schools than there are [state] schools. I hope I can live to see the day when, as in the early days of our country, we won't have any [state] schools. The churches will have taken them over again and Christians will be running them. What a happy day that will be.'²⁴

Falwell's comment can be read in several different ways: as an expression of fundamentalist triumphalism, a vision to see the church re-assuming responsibilities it once carried, or anticipation of everyone in the US converting to Christ. I am not clear how we should read it although triumphalism does fit better with the tone of much of Falwell's rhetoric in the 1970s and 1980s (now much moderated). In these sentences, Falwell clearly does not speak for most American evangelicals or even for all fundamentalists. But his remark does catch some of the spirit that lies behind the creation of fundamentalist independent schools, especially in the US.²⁵ And it reveals two points at which fundamentalists might learn from other traditions. First, they might note Luther's idea that education

-
- 22 Most schools begun by Christian Reformed parents have affiliated with Christian Schools International. Fundamentalist and evangelical schools have tended to associate with Association of Christian Schools International.
 - 23 Funding guaranteed to Catholics in Ontario and Protestants in Quebec by sections 92-93 of the British North American Act (1867). These clauses were renewed in the Constitution Act (1982) but a constitutional amendment ended Protestant education in Quebec in the late 1990s.
 - 24 Falwell, Jerry, *America Can't be Saved* (Murfreesboro, TN: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1979) p. 53.
 - 25 Independent schools have been the subject of much study, some of it sympathetic, some not. See, for example, Rose, Susan D., *Keeping Them Out of the Hands of Satan: Evangelical Schooling in America* (London: Routledge, 1988). Rose's use of *evangelical* differs from that in this paper; she does not distinguish *fundamentalist* from *evangelical*.

is for all, even if it is not Christian education. Second, Lutheran, Reformed and Roman Catholic Christians, by refraining from making the fundamentalists' sacred-secular distinction, embrace a larger slice of human life as a gift from God, yielding immediate differences in their understanding of education and the school curriculum.

One related issue for Americans especially has been that of tuition tax credits. Can the local education taxes paid by homeowners, or, for that matter, the state education grant, follow the student to whatever school he or she attends? Since 1997, several Christian schools in Canada, affiliated with both CSI and ACSI, have become alternative schools within state school systems (an unthinkable scenario in the US). This status gives them full instructional funding (salaries and curriculum materials), varying amounts of capital funding (for buildings), access to board/district resources, membership in teacher unions, etc.

Significant numbers of fundamentalists and smaller numbers of evangelicals have chosen home education, at which point they are somewhat aligned with various libertarians and some members of minority religions. The reasons for this choice vary but, for fundamentalists and evangelicals, often include some objection to what is being taught in state schools and a desire for parents to strengthen their relationships with their children. Besides traditional subject-matter, fundamentalist parents who educate their children at home often want religious doctrine taught to their children along with conservative political and social perspectives. Many also want the child to learn that the family is the most important institution in society.²⁶ Some begin home education for practical and immediate reasons (such as remote locations or special needs for a child) and then continue for theological and ideological reasons once they move into home education more fully, meet other parents and read literature about it.

2.3 The use and production of theory

We turn now to the relationship between fundamentalists and evangelicals and educational theory, in both cases asking about their stance toward existent educational theory and their own production of educational theory.

First, what stance have fundamentalists taken toward educational theory? Several remarks are in order. Fundamentalist educators have tended historically (and to the present day) to set up and rail against 'bogeymen'. Those attacked have included such persons as the perennial John Dewey (and progressive education), Charles Darwin and anyone named Huxley. In the 1970s and 1980s, cries of alarm were often heard about 'humanism' and 'secular humanism' taking over America's classrooms but these cries have now subsided somewhat. Critics have ridiculed the fundamentalist tendency to focus on such issues. Sometimes that ridicule is warranted if, for example, would-be critics of Dewey have not bothered to read him first. But sometimes the ridicule is not warranted.

26 Van Galen, Jane A., 'Ideologues and Pedagogues: Parents Who Teach their Children at Home' in Van Galen, Jane A. & Pitman, Mary Anne (eds.) *Home Schooling: Political, Historical and Pedagogical Perspectives* (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1991) pp. 63-76.

When fundamentalists identify state heavy-handedness in education for example, they are not alone. In having their antennae up for any social engineers who would hijack school curricula, they perhaps do everyone a favour.

For all the heat generated by fundamentalists who talk about education, little has been so far produced in the way of theory. Many lament this situation, from elementary through higher education. Nathan Hatch, for example, traces antipathy to Christian scholarship and the results that antipathy has had in the effort to establish evangelical higher education in the USA. He lists as obstacles: the lack of development of 'a Christian mind', problems with faculty development and recruitment to Christian colleges, and the fundamentalist background of many evangelicals which yields little wealth to draw upon intellectually. He calls for 'higher education that is unflinching in its commitment both to Christian values and to serious learning'.²⁷ Fundamentalists (and perhaps some evangelicals) should be sobered when they consider the point of Hatch's lament in juxtaposition to the comprehensive vision of education articulated by Lutherans, Roman Catholics, or, especially, Christian Reformed educators.

I do not wish to leave the impression that nothing has been done. Paul A. Kienel, for many years the head of Association of Christian Schools International, edited a substantial volume entitled *The Philosophy of Christian School Education*.²⁸ In North America, both fundamentalists and evangelicals use his book and teach in ACSI schools. But another, more sobering, example comes from Richard C. Barry and E. Anne Smith's *Reading for Christian Schools*.²⁹ Their method is to work what they call 'Bible Action Truths' into every lesson of study and, too often, this method can result in merely inserting Biblical material into the curriculum at the most surface level.

Despite having significantly less interest than fundamentalists in independent day schools, evangelicals have attempted to develop a thorough-going Christian philosophy of education. The fundamentalist antipathy toward the theory produced by non-Christians contrasts sharply at this point with the evangelical openness to that theory. Evangelicals in North America, like their counterparts in the UK, have been open to the cultural riches contributed by others and have tended to look for truth wherever it could be found, whether in lapsed Christians such as John Dewey and Carl Rogers, clearly antagonistic non-believers such as B. F. Skinner, or believers such as Cornelius Van Til and Maria Montessori. In their embrace of the doctrine of common grace and their effort to take benefit from the intellectual efforts of anyone who has thought carefully about education, evangelicals may even sometimes have been too uncritical of

27 Hatch, Nathan O., 'Evangelical Colleges and the Challenge of Christian Thinking' in Carpenter, Joel A. & Shipps, Kenneth W. (eds.) *Making Higher Education Christian* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans [Christian University Press], 1987) p. 170.

28 Kienel, Paul, *The Philosophy of Christian School Education* (Whittier, California: ACSI, 1980). The title is misleading as it should, perhaps, be seen as a theological rationale for Christian schools rather than a well-structured philosophy of education.

29 Barry, Richard C. & Smith, E. Anne, *Reading for Christian Schools* (Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1984).

the philosophical roots of the ideas they have adopted.

Evangelicals have also leaned heavily on Reformed thinkers in their theorizing. Steven Vryhof's article indicates why they might do so: Reformed Christian educators have toiled faithfully to produce a body of theory for Christian education.

Evangelicals have also focused in their theorizing on Christian higher education more than on day school education. There has been much talk of 'the integration of faith and learning' and of how 'all truth is God's truth'.³⁰

2.4 Instructional materials

Both fundamentalists and evangelicals have produced instructional materials, but the quality varies dramatically. The worst materials reduce the integration of faith and learning to the mere insertion of Bible verses into lessons. Fundamentalists of course face a major difficulty here because they deny to some degree the theological concept of common grace and, as a result, cannot embrace cultural riches from other traditions. Lutheran, Reformed and Roman Catholic perspectives – as witnessed by the other articles in this issue – all reveal a theologically-grounded interest in the whole world and the whole curriculum in some sense God's possession or revelatory of God's presence. Fundamentalists somehow miss this breadth and are left without a clear sense of what to do with much of the curriculum. Furthermore, fundamentalists often limit God's transformative work in this world to the saving of individual souls. This exclusive and limited view of God's work misses his interest in the commonwealth, it misses the poor, and it misses an opportunity to show solidarity with the larger human community.

Perhaps surprisingly, evangelicals have also been short on the production of material, although maybe for a different reason. As noted above, evangelicals have not embraced independent schools to the degree that fundamentalists have done. For evangelical parents placing their children in state schools, materials are almost not an issue. Those connected to independent schools would likewise be more inclined to use and adopt curriculum materials developed by commercial educational publishers rather than develop alternative materials. And, as I noted above, evangelicals have focused more on higher education, not just in their theorizing, but also in their production of learning materials.

3. Conclusions

Despite their common roots, fundamentalists and evangelicals in North America have gone their separate ways, in many cases deliberately so. Fundamentalists have established many independent Christian schools in the last three decades.

30 Almost endless bibliography is available in this area. See, for example, the papers in Carpenter, Joel A. & Shipps, Kenneth W. (eds.) (1987) especially Marsden, George M., 'Why No Major Evangelical University? The Loss and Recovery of Evangelical Advanced Scholarship' (pp. 294-304); also Noll, Mark, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994) and Holmes, Arthur, *The Idea of a Christian College* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975, 1987).

Evangelicals have not embraced those schools to the same degree. Fundamentalists have also embraced home education in greater numbers than evangelicals. These different approaches can be seen to follow from different overall answers to the question of how Christians should properly relate to culture. Such an analysis may land near the mark, but will miss some of the particularities of Christian history in the US and Canada. A detailed analysis beginning around 1880 that asks how the modernist controversy unfolded in most denominations could yield better fruit.

Fundamentalists and evangelicals have expressed their interests in education quite differently. Fundamentalists continue to remind evangelicals of the need for great awareness of some of the threats inherent in contemporary culture. Many evangelicals in Canada, for example, have never thought about independent, religious schools for their children.

Likewise, evangelicals continue to remind fundamentalists of several problems with their approach. First, their way of drawing the line between sacred and secular leaves them bereft of many of the gifts God has given humans, albeit often through non-believers. Second, North American fundamentalists have leaned heavily toward market economics, as if economic freedom were the highest Christian value. Third, fundamentalists have tended to approach scripture inconsistently, declaring inerrancy a watershed issue and claiming to hold a 'high view of scripture' while, at the same time, being slow to take the scripture seriously regarding care for the poor or the limited importance of economic freedom. Finally, while fundamentalism may have begun as a protest against modernity, that protest is nonetheless shaped by modern concerns and categories.³¹

Much work remains for both evangelicals and fundamentalists. Evangelicals must give greater attention to theorizing and producing materials related to elementary and secondary education. In some cases, they may need to reflect more critically on their faith in state education. Fundamentalists need new categories of thought so that they can affirm culture with less fear and with the kind of openness they seem to reserve exclusively for right-wing political thought. And they need to produce educational theory of their own rather than simply criticize what they call the educational establishment.

Finally, both need to develop the dispositions that would allow them to learn from others who have heard God's call to educate their children in other than state schools.

Bibliography

- Alley, Robert S., *Without a Prayer: Religious Expression in the Public Schools* (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus, 1996).
- Andreszewski, Thcia, *School Prayer: A History of the Debate* (Berkeley Heights, NJ: Enslow, 1997).
- Armstrong, Karen, *The Battle for God* (New York: Knopf, 2000).
-

31 Fundamentalists tend to place great and unquestioned faith in modern media for example.

- Barry, Richard C. and Smith, E. Anne (eds.) *Reading for Christian Schools* (Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1984).
- Bawer, Bruce, *Stealing Jesus: How Fundamentalism Betrays Christianity* (New York: Crown, 1997).
- Carpenter, Joel A. & Shippo, Kenneth W. (eds.) *Making Higher Education Christian* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans [Christian University Press], 1987).
- Chadwick, R., *Teaching and Learning: An Integrated Approach to Christian Education* (Old Tappan: Fleming Revell, 1982).
- Conway, Flo and Siegelman, Jim, *Holy Terror: The Fundamentalist War on America's Freedoms in Religion, Politics and Our Private Lives* (New York: Doubleday, 1982).
- Cooke, Robert L., *Philosophy, Education, and Certainty* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1940).
- Diamond, Sara, *Spiritual Warfare: The Politics of the Christian Right* (New York: Black Rose, 1990).
- Dollar, George W., *A History of Fundamentalism in America* (Greenville, South Carolina: Bob Jones University Press, 1973).
- Falwell, Jerry, *America Can be Saved* (Murfreesboro, TN: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1979).
- Feinberg, Charles L., (ed.) *The Fundamentals for Today*, complete in two volumes (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1958).
- Fenwick, Lynda Beck, *Should the Children Pray? A Historical, Judicial, and Political Examination of Public School Prayer* (Waco, TX: Markham Press Fund, 1989).
- Fraser, James W., *Between Church and State: Religion and Public Education in a Multicultural America* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988).
- Gleason, Philip, *Contending with Modernity: Catholic Higher Education in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- Hatch, Nathan O. 'Evangelical Colleges and the Challenge of Christian Thinking' in Carpenter, Joel A., and Shippo, Kenneth W. (eds.) *Making Higher Education Christian* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans [Christian University Press], 1987).
- Holmes, Arthur, *All Truth is God's Truth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977).
- Holmes, Arthur, *Faith Seeks Understanding* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971).
- Holmes, Arthur, *Shaping Character: Moral Education in the Christian College* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991).
- Holmes, Arthur, *The Idea of a Christian College* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975, 1987).
- Holmes, Arthur, *The Making of a Christian Mind* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity, 1985).
- Hunter, James Davison, 'Fundamentalism in its Global Contours' in Cohen, Norman J. (ed.) *The Fundamentalist Phenomenon* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990).
- Kepel, Gilles, *The Revenge of God: The Resurgence of Islam, Christianity and Judaism in the Modern World* translated by Alan Braley (University Park, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994).
- Klenel, Paul, *The Philosophy of Christian School Education* (Whittier, California: ACSI, 1980).
- Lawrence, Bruce B., *Defenders of God: The Fundamentalist Revolt Against the Modern Age* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989).
- Liebman, Robert C. & Wuthnow, Robert, *The New Christian Right* (New York: Aldine, 1983).
- Lienesch, Michael, *Redeeming America: Piety and Politics in the New Christian Right* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).
- Lockerbie, D. Bruce, *The Way They Should Go* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972).
- Marsden, George, 'Defining American Fundamentalism' in Cohen, Norman J. (ed.) *The Fundamentalist Phenomenon* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990).
- Marsden, George, 'The Evangelical Denomination' in Neuhaus, Richard John &

- Cromartie, Michael (eds.) *Piety and Politics: Evangelicals and Fundamentalists Confront the World* (Washington: Ethics and Public Policy Centre, 1987).
- Maraden, George, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).
- Marsden, George, 'The Religious Right: An Historical Overview' in Cromartie, Michael (ed.) *No Longer Exiles: The Religious Right in American Politics* (Washington: Ethics and Public Policy Centre, 1993).
- Marsden, George M., 'Why No Major Evangelical University? The Loss and Recovery of Evangelical Advanced Scholarship' in Carpenter, Joel A., and Shipps, Kenneth W. (eds.) *Making Higher Education Christian* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans [Christian University Press], 1987).
- Marty, Martin E. & Appleby, R. Scott (eds.) *Fundamentalisms and Society: Reclaiming the Sciences, the Family and Education* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1993).
- Noll, Mark, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994).
- Provenzo, Eugene F., *Religious Fundamentalism and American Education: The Battle for the Public Schools* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1990).
- Roberts, Jon H. & Turner, James, *The Sacred and the Secular University: The History of Secularization of American Higher Education in the 1800s* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).
- Rose, Susan D., *Keeping Them Out of the Hands of Satan: Evangelical Schooling in America* (London: Routledge, 1988).
- Roques, Mark, *Curriculum Unmasked: Towards a Christian Understanding of Education* (Eastbourne, E. Sussex: Monarch, 1989).
- Shepard, Robert S., *People in the Ivory Tower: Religion in the Early American University* Preface by Martin Marty (Brooklyn: Carlson, 1991).
- Torrey, R.A., Dixon, A. C. et al., eds. *The Fundamentals* (in 12 volumes) (Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company, 1909 – 1915).
- Van Galen, Jane A., 'Ideologues and Pedagogues: Parents Who Teach their Children at Home' in Van Galen, Jane A & Pitman, Mary Anne (eds.) *Home Schooling: Political, Historical and Pedagogical Perspectives* (Norwood, New Jersey, Ablex, 1991).
- Vance, Randall E., *Private Schools, Public Power: A Case for Pluralism* Foreword by Bruce Cooper (New York: Teachers College Press, 1994).
- Wuthnow, Robert, 'The Future of the Religious Right' in Cromartie, Michael (ed.) *No Longer Exiles: The Religious Right in American Politics* (Washington: Ethics and Public Policy Centre, 1993).