

LEFT BEHIND: THE EVANGELICAL LEFT AND THE LIMITS OF EVANGELICAL
POLITICS, 1965-1988

VOLUME I

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate School
of the University of Notre Dame
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

David R. Swartz

George Marsden, Director

Graduate Program in History

Notre Dame, Indiana

July 2008

© Copyright by

David R. Swartz

2008

All rights reserved

LEFT BEHIND: THE EVANGELICAL LEFT AND THE LIMITS OF EVANGELICAL
POLITICS, 1965-1988

Abstract

by

David R. Swartz

This dissertation examines the evangelical left movement in the United States during the postwar period. Non-conservative sectors of evangelicalism, vibrant in the nineteenth century but in eclipse following the fundamentalist-modernist controversies of the early twentieth century, again emerged in the 1960s and 1970s. Politically moderate to leftist and theologically conservative, this evangelical left encompassed diverse groups such as the Post-American/Sojourners intentional community, InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, Evangelicals for Social Action, and the Association for Public Justice.

This small but vibrant movement points to a broader, more differentiated evangelicalism obscured by the prominence of the religious right. Evangelical boundaries for instance proved to be surprisingly permeable in failing to shield many young evangelicals from “the world.” Powerful cultural and political forces shaped the evangelical left, which traveled a parallel journey with its secular counterpart through the civil rights movement, antiwar protests, New Left politics, and identity politics. As the evangelical left peaked in the mid-1970s, it became clear that “the sixties” had produced

a similarly wrenching, if a bit lagged, effect on evangelicalism as it had on non-religious cultural institutions. Though the movement languished under the weight of identity politics and the dilemmas of abortion, it persisted into the 1980s as a key component of the postwar politicization of evangelicalism. Its contentious tactics, absolutist rhetoric, and public engagement of structural politics with spiritual commitments in fact anticipated the political style of the religious right.

In seeking to broaden the traditionally narrow scope of evangelicalism, this dissertation additionally explores the struggle for identity among diverse evangelicals. Despite attempts by architects of the new evangelicalism to create the illusion of a single evangelical identity in the 1950s and 1960s, the movement remained politically, theologically, and culturally diverse. Evangelicalism's decentralized ecclesiastical structures; recurrent strains of apoliticism; ill-fit to the American two-party system; and racial, gender, theological, and political diversities belie its reputation as a unified political bloc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE The Quietist and Rightist Roots of the Evangelical Left	23
CHAPTER TWO Campus Politics: The Student Search for an Authentic Evangelicalism	58
CHAPTER THREE Global Reflex: The Third World Speaks to American Evangelicalism	106
CHAPTER FOUR Civil Rights and the Creation of an Evangelical Left	154
CHAPTER FIVE Vietnam and Evangelical Animus against Civil Religion	190
CHAPTER SIX The New Left and Evangelical Radicalism	229
CHAPTER SEVEN The Third Way: The Politics of Spiritual Community	295

VOLUME II

CHAPTER EIGHT The Chicago Declaration and the Promise of a United Progressive Evangelical Front	357
CHAPTER NINE Identity Politics: The Fragmentation of the Progressive Coalition	415
CHAPTER TEN From Carter to Reagan: Left Behind by the Right.....	488
CHAPTER ELEVEN The Limits of Evangelical Politics: The Evangelical Left in the 1980s.....	547
APPENDIX A	622
BIBLIOGRAPHY	624

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to a host of colleagues, friends, and family for their support of this project. For their incisive critiques and model scholarship, I wish to thank my committee: George Marsden, John McGreevy, Fr. Thomas Blantz, and Scott Appleby. I am especially indebted to my adviser George Marsden for his constructive and kind readings of chapter drafts.

I wish to thank many others at the University of Notre Dame: the Graduate School for a Zahm Travel Grant that funded visits to archives in Pasadena, Berkeley, Palo Alto, Chicago, and Philadelphia; the Hesburgh Library inter-library loan staff; the history department for generous years of funding; and Tim Gloege, Raully Donahue, and members of the Colloquium on Religion and American History for formative conversations as this dissertation germinated.

I wish to thank Kevin Miller, Tim Erdel, Donald Dayton, and Perry Bush for very helpful suggestions as I began research on the project.

I wish to thank Ron Sider and Naomi Miller for providing access to dozens of musty boxes of Evangelicals for Social Action files in the basement of Palmer Seminary; Bob Schuster and Wayne Weber at the Billy Graham Center Archives; David Malone and David Osielski at Wheaton College Special Collections; Nancy Gower at Fuller Theological Seminary; and Lucinda Glenn at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley.

I wish to thank many who provided lodging and companionship during my travels: Galen and Hollie Smith, Joshua and Sarah Crosley, Joe and Kathy Swartz, Paul Snezek, Walt and Virginia Hearn, and Jim and Mary VanderKam.

I wish to thank several friends and family for their help in caring for our children during particularly crucial stages of this dissertation: the saintly Rosa Bortrager most of all, but also David Banga, Calvin Bortrager, Gaby Brenneman, Jody Machiela, Phyllis Swartz, Steve Swartz, and Sharon Weaver.

I wish to thank my parents, Steve and Phyllis Swartz, for encouraging intellectual curiosity and for reading every word of this dissertation as I drafted each chapter. I wish to thank my three sons, Andrew, Jonathan, and Benjamin, each born in the three years during which this dissertation was researched and written. Their first smiles, steps, and words—and thousands of diaper changes—happily punctuated many dreary days of writing.

Finally, I wish to thank my wife Lisa, lovely in form and spirit, for her unfailing encouragement and nurture. I dedicate this dissertation to her.

INTRODUCTION

The *Washington Post* reported that the gathering of evangelical leaders might “launch a religious movement that could shake both political and religious life in America.”¹ The newspaper referred not to presidential candidate Ronald Reagan’s speeches to the National Religious Broadcasters convention at the swanky Washington Hilton, nor to his address in Dallas in 1980 at which he famously told 10,000 conservative evangelicals, “I know you can’t endorse me, but I want you to know that I endorse you.” Rather, the *Post* reporter was describing one of the first meetings of an “evangelical left” held nearly a decade earlier. These evangelical leaders, meeting at the YMCA Hotel on Chicago’s South Wabash Street on Thanksgiving weekend in 1973, had just denounced militarism, racism, sexism, economic injustice, and “Nixon’s lust for and abuse of power.”

The YMCA, a fitting site to proclaim evangelicalism’s return to social justice, featured many accoutrements of the new evangelical progressivism. Its dingy interior testified to simple living, its urban location to a rejection of suburban living and an embrace of social concern. As Paul Henry, a Calvin College professor and candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives, stood inside the YMCA declaring that evangelicals “dare no longer remain silent in the face of glaring social evil,” the echoes of stray gunfire from outside rang through the hall.

¹ Marjorie Hyer, “Social and Political Activism Is Aim of Evangelical Group,” *Washington Post*, November 30, 1973, p. D17.

After several days of intense discussion, reported the *Post*, the group emerged with “The Chicago Declaration,” the manifesto of an emerging evangelical left. Its authors called not for revolution in the mold of the New Left, as Jim Wallis, a former Students for a Democratic Society leader at Michigan State, preferred, nor for a vague commitment to social action, as evangelical icon Carl F. H. Henry, father of Paul Henry, hoped. Still, the signing of the Declaration was a heartening moment for both Wallis and the elder Henry. Wallis, previously disinclined to compromise with the evangelical establishment, began to harbor renewed hope for the future of the tradition as he watched Henry re-sign the Declaration just minutes after removing his signature in a pang of inner anguish over how his conservative constituents might respond. The two men embraced, signaling a convergence of leaders disenchanted with both the political apathy and conservatism of contemporary evangelical politics.² The Chicago Declaration—and the broader evangelical left movement in the 1970s and 1980s—underscores the persistence and vitality of a non-rightist political impulse in an evangelical tradition often portrayed as uniformly traditionalist and politically rightist.

I.

The 1973 Chicago Declaration, however, appears anomalous amidst historiographical literatures in which religion and the political left rarely intersect. The first wave of research on the 1960s for instance both eschewed the role of religion on leftist activism and depicted the 1970s as a decade of declension from a

² Marjorie Hyer, “Evangelical Protestants Turn Political,” *Washington Post*, December 28, 1973, p. C13; Ron Sider, “An Historic Moment,” in *The Chicago Declaration*, ed. Ron Sider (Carol Stream, Ill.: Creation House, 1974), 25, 29.

purist politics unencumbered by gender, racial, or religious identity.³ A second wave, seeking to rebut characterizations of the era as “unlike any other,” treats these decades as idiosyncratic blips in a larger narrative of conservative ascendancy. Many scholars now point to the 1980s as the culmination of a long rise of coherent conservative thought that began with the Republican insurgency of 1938.⁴ None of these formulations leaves much space for left-liberal religious movements that persisted beyond the 1960s.

A burgeoning historiography on evangelicalism, like that of postwar American politics, also concentrates on the ascendancy of political conservatism. Lisa McGirr charts the formation of a coalition of anti-statist libertarians and social conservatives in southern California. These moral traditionalists perceived a decline in religiosity, morality, individual responsibility, and family authority as they observed racial rioting in Watts, student protests at Berkeley, and the rise of the Black

³ Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam, 1989); Maurice Isserman, *If I Had a Hammer: The Death of the Old Left and the Birth of the New Left* (New York: Basic Books, 1987); James Miller, *Democracy Is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987); Kirkpatrick Sale, *SDS* (New York: Random House, 1973). For repudiations of this first wave, see Wini Breines, “Whose New Left?” *Journal of American History* 75, No. 2 (1988), 528-545; Alice Echols, *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967-1975* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989); Kenneth J. Heineman, *Campus Wars: The Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era* (New York: New York University Press, 1993). For helpful historiographical surveys of 1960s and 1970s historiography, see Leo Ribuffo, “1974-1988,” 102-122, in Stephen J. Whitfield, ed., *A Companion to 20th-Century America* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004); Van Gosse, “A Movement of Movements: The Definition and Periodization of the New Left,” 277-302, in Jean-Christophe Agnew and Roy Rosenzweig, eds., *A Companion to Post-1945 America* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002).

⁴ Bruce Schulman, *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics* (New York: Free Press, 2001); Schulman and Julian E. Zelizer, eds., *Rightward Bound: Making America Conservative in the 1970s* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008). James Patterson conversely shows how conservatives layered on new ideas and structures onto a liberal, New Deal American template. See Patterson, *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945-1974* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

Panthers in Oakland.⁵ Darren Dochuk extends McGirr's argument, contending that evangelical churches in Orange County were an important, fertile setting for the emergence of the religious right.⁶ William Martin's *With God on Our Side* outlines the rise of religious right organizations such as the Moral Majority and the Christian Coalition.⁷ James Ault's *Spirit and Flesh* describes the ecclesiology, daily life, and politics of a fundamentalist Baptist church in 1980s Massachusetts.⁸ John Turner's 2008 analysis of Campus Crusade explores evangelicalism's growing prosperity, negotiations over gender roles, and connections with political conservatism.⁹ Susan Harding's examination of fundamentalist language and politics contends that Jerry Falwell represents the morphing of a politically and socially disenfranchised movement into a more involved "fundamentalist evangelicalism."¹⁰

While literature on the political and religious right has proliferated in recent years, scholars have only begun to explore the intersection of faith and politics on the non-right. Susan Curtis's *A Consuming Faith* ties the rise of the Protestant liberalism in turn-of-the-century America to modern consumer culture and the Social Gospel

⁵ Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton University Press, 2001).

⁶ Darren Dochuk, "From Bible Belt to Sunbelt: Plain Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Southernization of Southern California, 1935-1969" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2005).

⁷ William Martin, *With God on Our Side: The Rise of the Religious Right in America* (New York: Broadway Books, 1996).

⁸ James M. Ault, Jr., *Spirit and Flesh: Life in a Fundamentalist Baptist Church* (New York: Knopf, 2004).

⁹ John G. Turner, Bill Bright and Campus Crusade for Christ: *The Renewal of Evangelicalism in Postwar America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008).

¹⁰ Susan Friend Harding, *The Book of Jerry Falwell: Fundamentalist Language and Politics* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000). Also see Michael Lienesch, *Redeeming America: Piety and Politics in the New Christian Right* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 118-24.

movement.¹¹ Richard Wightman Fox explores the relationship between the Social Gospel and progressivism in “The Culture of Liberal Protestant Progressivism, 1875-1925.”¹² Doug Rossinow’s incisive work on Students for a Democratic Society at the University of Texas investigates the liberal Protestant roots of the New Left in Austin.¹³ His unveiling of “Christian existentialists” whose intellectual and religious influences included Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Reinhold Niebuhr, and the YMCA adds a new tributary in the genealogy of the New Left. A more developed historiography on the civil rights movement suggests that a potent combination of religion and politics helped overthrow Jim Crow in the South.¹⁴

These studies, however, remain the exception. In the understandable rush to explain the rise of the Moral Majority of the 1980s, the Christian Coalition of the 1990s, and the evangelical language of George W. Bush in the 2000s, scholars have neglected moderate and progressive sectors of evangelicalism. Beyond

¹¹ Susan Curtis: *A Consuming Faith: The Social Gospel and Modern American Culture* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1991). For other examples of helpful treatments of religious and the progressive era, see Norris Magnuson, *Salvation in the Slums: Evangelical Social Work, 1865-1920* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1977); Anthony Dunbar, *Against the Grain: Southern Radicals and Prophets, 1929-1959* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1981); Harry G. Lefever, “The Involvement of the Men and Women and Religion Forward Movement in the Cause of Labor Justice, Atlanta, Georgia, 1912-1916,” *Labor History* 14 (Fall 1973), 521-35; Jacquelyn Dowd Hall, *Revolt Against Chivalry: Jessie Daniel Ames and the Women’s Campaign Against Lynching* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979); John Patrick McDowell, *The Social Gospel in the South: The Woman’s Home Mission Movement in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South 1886-1939* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982).

¹² Richard Wightman Fox, “The Culture of Liberal Protestant Progressivism, 1875-1925,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 23 (Winter 1993), 639-43.

¹³ Doug Rossinow, *The Politics of Authenticity: Liberalism, Christianity, and the New Left in America* (Columbia University Press, 1998).

¹⁴ David J. Garrow, *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Christian Leadership Conference* (New York: W. Morrow, 1986); Charles M. Payne, *I’ve Got the Light of Freedom: The Organizing Tradition and the Mississippi Freedom Struggle* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Charles Marsh, *God’s Long Summer: Stories of Faith and Civil Rights* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997); David Chappell, *A Stone of Hope: Prophetic Religion and the Death of Jim Crow* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

contemporaneous accounts of progressive and New Left evangelicals in the 1960s and 1970s, few scholars have attended to the substantial connections between progressive politics and evangelicalism—and the fraying of these intriguing ties in the 1980s.¹⁵ The caricature of evangelicalism as a monolithic political bloc gripped by only a few moral and political issues is inaccurate.¹⁶ Had observers been attentive to the long tradition of evangelical progressivism and social radicalism in American history, they would not have been bewildered by the emergence of the evangelical left in the 1970s and again in the 2000s.¹⁷

II.

This dissertation extends the historiography of twentieth-century religion and politics, thus far dominated by research on religious right and progressive mainline

¹⁵ For journalistic accounts of the evangelical left, see Richard Quebedeaux, *The Young Evangelicals: Revolution in Orthodoxy* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974); *The Worldly Evangelicals* (New York: Harper and Row, 1978); Carol Flake, *Redemptorama: Culture, Politics, and the New Evangelicalism* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press, 1984). These efforts were helpful and suggestive, but accomplished the rather bland task of cataloguing its parts. Scholarly works include James Davison Hunter, “The New Class and the Young Evangelicals,” *Review of Religious Research* 22, No. 2 (December 1980), 155-169; Robert Booth Fowler, *A New Engagement: Evangelical Political Thought, 1966-1976* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); Boyd T. Reese, Jr., “Resistance and Hope: The Interplay of Theological Synthesis, Biblical Interpretation, Political Analysis, and Praxis in the Christian Radicalism of ‘Sojourners’ Magazine” (Ph.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1991); Kyle Cleveland, “The Politics of Jubilee: Ideological Drift and Organizational Schism in a Religious Sect” (Ph.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1990).

¹⁶ Even in 1980 in the midst of the Reagan Revolution, 30-40% of evangelicals voted Democratic—a significant minority, even considering southern white Democrats and black evangelical Democrats. Albert J. Menendez, *Evangelicals at the Ballot Box* (Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1996). For perspective, note that 22% of white evangelicals voted for John Kerry in the 2004 presidential election, and one-third of white evangelicals voted for Bill Clinton in 1996.

¹⁷ See, for example, Thomas S. Kidd, *The Great Awakening: The Roots of Evangelical Christianity in Colonial America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007); Christine Heyrman, *Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); Timothy L. Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957); Magnuson, *Salvation in the Slums*; Michael Kazin, *A Godly Hero: The Life of William Jennings Bryan* (New York: Knopf, 2006); Joseph Creech, *Righteous Indignation: Religion and the Populist Revolution* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006).

activism, with the story of the evangelical left from 1965 to 1988. Chapter one outlines the rightist roots of the evangelical left. By the postwar era, after a period of relative quietism in the wake of the Scopes Trial, many evangelicals had grown in wealth and education and were enjoying the white, middle-class benefits of Eisenhower prosperity. While many of these evangelicals voted Republican, their faith did not tightly intertwine with their politics. Neither did they self-consciously mobilize as evangelicals on behalf of political candidates. Their rising wealth and education, however, left them poised to engage changing American political configurations.

Chapter two details the objection of evangelical children to the “embourgeoisement” of their tradition. Evangelical students in the 1960s struggled against the *in loco parentis* posture of college deans, the Vietnam War, racial segregation, environmental degradation, and the rising suburban prosperity of their parents, who they saw as merely perpetuating oppressive social and economic structures. A group of students and professors associated with evangelical colleges, InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, the Post-Americans, the Christian World Liberation Front, the Institute for Christian Studies, and The Other Side community emerged to challenge the dominant conservative ethos of mid-century evangelicalism.

Chapter three describes how encounters with third-world evangelicals in the postwar era helped turn young evangelicals toward moderate and left-leaning political postures. In many cases, these non-Western critiques of American imperialism and capitalism pushed young evangelicals toward Vietnam protests, civil rights, and a tempered nationalism—views sacralized by their origins on the mission field. By the

1970s, these progressive elements—and a more resolute global concern generally—had become important markers of the young evangelical movement.

Chapter four explores how the embrace of the civil rights movement by some evangelicals, although late and politically inconsequential, contributed to the formation of the evangelical left in several important ways. First, civil rights mobilized evangelicals disenchanted with conservative politics. Second, the movement encouraged them to consider social problems in a structural sense. An emphasis on individual actions to help disenfranchised southern blacks spawned a holistic effort to raise the psychological, economic, and political health of a race—and then to even broader concerns about capitalism, gender, simple living, and participatory democracy. Chapter five contends that agitation against the Vietnam War added to the emerging structural element of the young evangelical critique, provoking heightened ambivalence toward the nation and a campaign against American “civil religion.”

The most disillusioned evangelicals resonated with New Left critiques of the American “technocracy.” Simultaneously critical of political conservatism and liberalism, these evangelical New Leftists denounced the collusion of big business, government, the military, and technology. Chapter six describes how some young evangelicals, in their practice of activist tactics and a moral absolutism, helped bridge elements of the New Left and the religious right. In the early 1970s, however, radical evangelicals retreated from identification with the New Left as the movement fragmented and turned toward violence. Young evangelicals increasingly spoke of a “third way” in which a spiritual community of love would offer a theologically and

socially legitimate repudiation of the dehumanizing forces of the technocracy.

Chapter seven describes the spirituality of this segment of the evangelical left in its expressions of egalitarianism, local politics, and simple living in small, tight-knit communities.

Despite the small-is-beautiful sensibility, many in the evangelical left still hoped for large-scale change. A coalition in the mid-1970s began to seek a consensus around reforming, rather than revolutionizing or withdrawing from, society. Chapter eight discusses Evangelicals for McGovern, the first evangelical partisan political organization of the twentieth century formed to elect a president, as well as the “Chicago Declaration,” the document that launched a united progressive evangelical front. Progressive segments of the evangelical left profited from disillusionment surrounding the Watergate scandal and the strong advocacy of Mark Hatfield, the maverick Republican senator from Oregon who vigorously opposed the Vietnam War. For several heady years, members of the emerging evangelical left—and their new organization Evangelicals for Social Action—were the darlings of the secular media and had the ear of the evangelical media and the vast evangelical middle.

The bid to build a united progressive evangelical front, however, collapsed in a few short years. The evangelical left, once dedicated to the critique of broad social structures, began to fragment along gender, racial, age, and theological lines. The Evangelical Women’s Caucus, for example, reduced its once-substantial involvement in the evangelical left to focus on urging women’s ordination and passage of the Equal Rights Amendment. Chapter nine describes how the rise of identity politics, related to the disappearance of the Vietnam War as a unifying issue in the late 1970s,

became a primary factor in the decline of the evangelical left, as it was for the New Left.

The presidency of Jimmy Carter illuminated the incoherence of evangelical politics. While many evangelicals on the right voted for Carter in 1976, many on the left opposed his election. Anabaptist evangelicals, for example, charged that his progressivism insufficiently challenged conventional politics. In the vacuum of the fragmented evangelical left, below-the-belt issues such as abortion and the Equal Rights Amendment became the new evangelical rallying points. Chapter ten describes how the religious right used the issue of abortion and appropriated the rhetoric and methods of the evangelical left. The evangelical right, disillusioned by Jimmy Carter and the secular political left, formed a powerful political coalition with other moral traditionalists and civil libertarians in the Republican Party. Chapter eleven describes the continuing fracture of the evangelical left, despite an attempt to rally around a consistent pro-life theme. The evangelical left struggled to retain a coherent identity over Reformed-Anabaptist disputes about social change and over debates about ecumenical involvement. By the 1980s evangelicals who were trying to be socially responsible in progressive terms but also stay closer to the evangelical mainstream on issues like abortion were left without a political party.

III.

The intra-evangelical battles between political progressives, radicals, and conservatives outlined in this narrative highlight the definitional difficulties encountered by scholars of a movement afflicted by the instability of shifting

alliances, changing theologies, and celebrity fiefdoms.¹⁸ Even the term “evangelical” itself has fallen in and out of favor among evangelicals. Pollsters, who did not typically distinguish evangelicals from other Protestants before the 1980s, variously classify evangelicals by self-identification with the term, by denomination, or by having had a “born again” experience. Meanwhile, journalists and politicians often crudely shorthand evangelicals as conservative Protestants who vote Republican.

More sophisticated definitions employ cultural, theological, and historical approaches. David Bebbington, for example, highlights four theological impulses and beliefs of evangelicals: conversionism, activism, biblicism, and crucicentrism.¹⁹ Protestants adhering to these characteristics include such culturally diverse groups such as Dutch Reformed, Mennonite, Southern Baptist, certain African-American denominations, and even individuals and movements within Catholicism and mainline Protestantism. They included Princeton’s urbane J. Gresham Machen; adherents of William Jennings Bryan’s agrarian populist fundamentalism²⁰; adherents of the Holiness movement, which emerged out of Wesleyan Methodism and stressed the power of the Holy Spirit in overcoming personal sin as well as social concerns such as caring for the poor; and Pentecostalism. Observers of this daughter

¹⁸ Douglas A. Sweeney, “The Essential Evangelicalism Dialectic: The Historiography of the Early Neo-Evangelical Movement and the Observer-Participant Dilemma,” *Church History* 60, No. 1 (March 1991), 70-84; Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston, eds., *The Variety of American Evangelicalism* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1991); David Dockery, ed., *Are Southern Baptists Evangelicals?* (Nashville: Broadman, 1993); James Davison Hunter, “Operationalizing Evangelicalism,” *Sociological Analysis* 42 (1981), 363-372; Robert Booth Fowler, *A New Engagement: Evangelical Political Thought, 1966-1976* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 2.

¹⁹ David Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: From the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989), 1-19.

²⁰ Michael Kazin, *A Godly Hero: The Life of William Jennings Bryan* (New York: Knopf, 2006); Joseph Creech, *Righteous Indignation: Religion and the Populist Revolution* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006).

movement, which emphasized faith healing and speaking in tongues, often described Pentecostalism as “fundamentalism with a difference.”

Other scholars stress historical dimensions, contending that twentieth-century Protestants are evangelical if they can be organically linked to the Great Awakenings of the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries and the early twentieth-century attempt to conserve supernaturalism and reject modernist innovations. Even so, early twentieth-century manifestations of evangelicalism were socially, economically, politically, and ethnically diverse. The striking diversity of evangelicalism has led many observers of American religion to resort to metaphor and complex taxonomies in describing the movement. Cullen Murphy spoke of the “vast tent of evangelical faith” that holds a “twelve-ring circus” of peace churches, black Pentecostals, fundamentalists, among others.²¹ Robert Webber divided the movement into fourteen subgroups.²² Catholic missiologist Thomas Stransky referred to evangelicalism as “a confusing conglomeration.”²³ Historian Timothy Smith, one of the first to recognize the many varieties, depicted evangelicalism as a kaleidoscope or mosaic.²⁴ More recently, Jon Stone has suggested the term “coalition.”²⁵

²¹ Cullen Murphy, “Protestantism and the Evangelicals,” *Wilson Quarterly* 5 (August 1981), 105-116.

²² Robert Webber, *Common Roots* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 32.

²³ Thomas Stransky, “A Look at Evangelical Protestantism,” *Theology, News and Notes* 35 (March 1988), 24.

²⁴ Timothy L. Smith, “The Evangelical Kaleidoscope and the Call to Unity,” *Christian Scholar’s Review* 15 (1986), 125-140. Whatever the metaphor, scholars assume that such a thing as evangelicalism exists and is at least somewhat coherent. The exception to this is Donald Dayton. See “Some Doubts about the Usefulness of the Category ‘Evangelical,’” *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*, eds. Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1991), 245-251. Who should count as an evangelical—and which groups are most essentially evangelical—have been questions at the heart of a vigorous historiographical discussion. Roughly pitting Reformed model versus a Holiness model, the debate seems to have arrived at somewhat of a synthesis in descriptions of the movement as a coalition, kaleidoscope, or mosaic. See Sweeney, “The

Stone and others limit the term “evangelical” to describe a loose coalition of reforming fundamentalists during the middle half of the twentieth century. This emergent subset of evangelicals, northern fundamentalists who by the 1940s and 1950s came to be known as “new” or “card-carrying” evangelicals, sought to revive evangelicals’ social and political prospects from the morass of the Scopes Trial and denominational defeats.²⁶ The most important institutional sign of the new movement came in the 1942 founding of the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE). The cultural mandate cultivated by NAE was clear from the beginning. At its first conference in St. Louis entitled “The National Conference for United Action among Evangelicals,” Harold Ockenga, the young pastor of Park Street Church in Boston, challenged the many future luminaries of the “new evangelical” movement in attendance to take back America. The “disintegration of Christianity” endangered America. Evangelicals enjoyed impressive numbers, Ockenga noted, but they needed to organize. Ockenga proposed an intellectual-theological program combined with mass revivalism that would launch “a new era of evangelical Christianity.”²⁷

Elected to the NAE’s presidency the following year after a second address entitled “Christ for America,” Ockenga presided over the rapid growth of the new evangelicalism. He became an important booster of Billy Graham, sponsoring the

Essential Evangelicalism Dialectic.” For an extended debate, see the September 1993 issue of *Christian Scholar’s Review*.

²⁵ Jon R. Stone, *On the Boundaries of American Evangelicalism: The Postwar Evangelical Coalition* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997).

²⁶ On the denominational wars, see George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 191-195. On the remarkable internal vitality of fundamentalists in the 1930s and 1940s that provided for its rapid recovery and new engagement in the 1950s and beyond, see Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

²⁷ Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, 147-150. On Ockenga, see the forthcoming biography by Garth Rosell.

evangelist for an extended crusade in Boston in 1950. Within five years with Ockenga at the helm, the NAE had over 750,000 members in its ranks and inspired collaborative ventures such as the National Religious Broadcasters, the Evangelical Theological Society, the Evangelical Press Association, and the Evangelical Foreign Missions Association. The NAE, which according to historian Joel Carpenter served as a “convener, catalyst, and confidence-builder,” also worked to buttress the fortunes of already existing institutions—among them Youth for Christ, *Christianity Today*, Wheaton College, Fuller Theological Seminary, the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, and InterVarsity Christian Fellowship.²⁸ These extra-denominational bodies became surrogate denominations to which some conservative Protestants donated much money and time.²⁹

In an influential 1984 essay—still considered the standard work on defining evangelicalism—George Marsden acknowledged both the coherence of the “new evangelicalism” and broader theological and historical approaches to defining evangelicalism. First, he wrote, evangelicals share conceptual unity in common theological beliefs. Second, the movement is organic with a common history and set of experiences. Third, evangelicalism can be understood as a coherent transdenominational community in which conservative Protestants work together toward common missionary and cultural goals and share common evangelistic and worship practices. Given the shared behaviors, history, and doctrines of its adherents, Marsden suggested, evangelicalism could be viewed as a “most informal”

²⁸ Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, 150. On Fuller Seminary, see George Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987).

²⁹ Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith since World War II*, *Studies on Church and State* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988).

denomination.³⁰ His ambivalence, however, was clear. Even as he made the case for evangelical identity, Marsden noted the porous boundaries of and shifting coalitions in the movement. The evangelical left—with direct roots in the “new” evangelicalism but close ties to a diverse range of conservative Protestants—clearly affirms the complexity of Marsden’s three-fold definition.

The conceptual and terminological difficulties of the evangelical left nearly rival that of broader evangelicalism. Non-rightist evangelicals contemporaneously used four terms to describe themselves: “young evangelicals,” a designation introduced by Richard Quebedeaux³¹; “radical evangelicals,” “progressive evangelicals”; and “evangelical left.” In this dissertation, I use all three more or less synonymously with several qualifications. First, given the largely moderate-to-conservative tenor of late-twentieth-century evangelical politics, I employ “evangelical left” in a relative sense and sometimes for figures who are leftist only by virtue of not being on the political right. Second, I sometimes use “progressive evangelicals” in contrast with “radical evangelicals” to distinguish between Democratic-voting, typically Reformed evangelicals interested in constructive politics on one hand, and on the other, sectarian, typically Anabaptist evangelicals who sought solutions in alternative communities. Third, I sometimes use “young evangelicals” without quotations to refer to those in the evangelical left who are not young in age.

³⁰ George Marsden, “The Evangelical Denomination,” in *Evangelicalism and Modern America*, ed. George Marsden (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), x.

³¹ Richard Quebedeaux, *The Young Evangelicals: Revolution in Orthodoxy* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974).

IV.

The story of the evangelical left illuminates several important themes related to the need for a more textured depiction of evangelicalism and its place in American politics. It suggests for example that boundaries established by scholars of the New Left require expansion beyond Students for a Democratic Society and elite college campuses. One of the more striking ironies of recent scholarship is that the historiography of a movement dedicated to ground-level participatory democracy has been dominated by the study of white, male, elite university students. That even some decidedly non-elite evangelicals also questioned “the unholy alliance” of capitalism, democracy, technology, and government bureaucracy points to inordinately narrow boundaries of New Left historiography.

The vitality of the evangelical left also suggests that evangelical boundaries should be seen as permeable. Despite the construction of a vibrant subculture at mid-century, separate educational institutions and cultural restrictions failed to effectively shield the movement from “the world.”³² Many in the evangelical left

³² Scholars of evangelicalism have discussed at length the ambivalence of evangelicals toward modern American culture. Smith calls evangelicals “embattled and thriving.” Kathryn Long says that evangelicals are “simultaneously embracing and rejecting” modernity. Carpenter says they wrestled “as to whether they were alienated outsiders or quintessential Americans.” I simply contend that they were profoundly shaped by it, even as they denied its influence. See Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of American Evangelicalism, 1870-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 228; Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, xii; Kathryn T. Long, “In the Modern World, but Not of It,” 223-236, in Daniel H. Bays and Grant Wacker, eds., *The Foreign Missionary Enterprise at Home* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2003). On descriptions of the evangelical subculture and its boundaries as relatively impermeable, see James M. Ault, *Spirit and Flesh: Life in a Fundamentalist Baptist Church* (New York: Knopf, 2004); Dean M. Kelley, *Why Conservative Churches Are Growing: A Study in Sociology of Religion* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972); David Harrington Watt, “Ethnographic Approaches to the Study of American Evangelicalism,” Paper presented at the 1991-92 Meetings of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Pittsburgh, 1991; Bryan Wilson, *Religion in Sociological Perspective* (London: Oxford University Press, 1982); Randall Balmer, *Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory: A Journey into the Evangelical Subculture in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); Donald W. Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 2-3. Dayton wrote, “There was, however, in the 1960s at least one relatively safe bastion of escape from this turmoil—the subculture that despite its diversity is

emerged from conservative, tight-knit religious communities as the more radical impulses of the 1960s made their way into evangelical redoubts. Shaped by powerful cultural and political forces, young evangelicals traveled an astonishingly parallel journey with their secular counterparts through the civil rights movement, antiwar protests, New Left politics, and identity politics. As the evangelical left peaked in the mid-1970s, it became clear that “the sixties” were exerting a profound, if lagged, effect on evangelicalism. The political affiliations of evangelicals on a broader scale reflected these permeable boundaries. Democratic identification rose from 34.9% in the 1960s to 38.7% in the 1970, then fell to 21.7% in the 1980s.³³ In the 1980s the administration of Ozark Bible College pulled copies of the progressive *The Other Side* magazine placed there in the 1960s and early 1970s.³⁴ Mid-century evangelicalism, despite its efforts to construct levies between itself and the counterculture, moved in remarkable rhythm with cultural and political tides.

encompassed by the label ‘Evangelical.’ The basic transmitters of this tradition are a series of ‘Christian colleges’ (some independent and some denominationally anchored). These schools, usually situated in rural, small-town, or suburban locations, are scattered across the country but tend to cluster in the Midwest. They are not widely known, but their names (Wheaton, Houghton, Malone, Greenville, Seattle Pacific, etc.) are revered within Evangelicalism as fortresses against the modern world, in which Evangelical youth can be educated and mate without threat from the pagan ideologies and lifestyles of the secular world. ... It is difficult to recreate the atmosphere of such a college in the 1960s. No doubt the incidents that loom so large in memory were not the whole of campus life. But the contrast between the pettiness of the issues that troubled us and the magnitude of the issues that were being dealt with in society is frightening. Campus life was circumscribed by cultural patterns and ethical mores called ‘prudentials’ at my college. These included the traditional Evangelical prohibitions against drinking, smoking, dancing, card-playing, and theater-going. Our lives were largely bound up in testing the limits of these prohibitions.”

³³ Lyman A. Kellstedt and Mark A. Noll, “Religion, Voting for President, and Party Identification, 1948-1984,” 374, in Noll, ed., *Religion and American Politics: From the Colonial Period to the 1980s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). These numbers partly reflect the movement of southern whites from the Democratic Party to the Republican Party in the 1970s.

³⁴ Kyle Cleveland, “The Politics of Jubilee: Ideological Drift and Organizational Schism in a Religious Sect” (Ph.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1990), 196.

If evangelicalism felt the pull of culture, it in turn increasingly asserted its political will in the postwar era. Preceding the more celebrated religious right by nearly a decade, the evangelical left pioneered evangelicals' re-engagement of public issues with one's spiritual commitments. Pacesetters of the evangelical left such as Evangelicals for Social Action, Association for Public Justice, and Sojourners moved to Washington, D.C., in the 1970s in gestures of both a symbolic and pragmatic engagement of politics. Moreover, in its application of both Manichean and apocalyptic biblical rhetoric and in its contentious activism to American politics in the early 1970s, the evangelical left opened the door to a remarkable surge of right-wing evangelicalism that helped lift Reagan to the presidency in 1980.³⁵ The story of the evangelical left thus points to the new ways that broader evangelicalism, defying expectations of secularization theorists, began to tie its faith to politics in the last half of the twentieth century.³⁶ In their pews evangelicals sang the popular chorus "This World Is Not My Home" less often and "Shine, Jesus, Shine" more often.³⁷ The evangelical left, though burdened by identity politics, persisted into the 1980s as a key component of the politicization of evangelicalism.

³⁵ Gary North wrote, "I told him that Sider was preparing the way for evangelicals to get involved in social action and politics, but that my economic opinions, not Sider's, were representative of the broad mass of evangelical opinion." See Gary North, "Ron Sider Has Moved in the Right Direction," *Biblical Economics Today* 19, No. 6 (1997).

³⁶ On secularization theory, see José Casanova, *Public Religions in the Modern World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby, eds., *Fundamentalisms Observed* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); Mark D. Regnerus and Christian Smith, "Selective Privatization among American Religious Traditions: The Reversal of the Great Reversal," *Social Forces* 76, No. 4 (June 1998), 1347-1372.

³⁷ The lyrics to "This World Is Not My Home" suggest the apolitical approach of the 1950s and 1960s: "This world is not my home, I'm just passing through/ My treasures are laid up somewhere beyond the blue/ The angels beckon me from Heaven's open door/ And I can't feel at home in this world anymore." The lyrics to "Shine, Jesus, Shine" suggest the more activist nature of evangelicalism in the 1970s and 1980s: "Shine, Jesus, Shine/ Fill this land with the father's glory/ Blaze, spirit, blaze/ Set our hearts on fire/ Flow, river, flow/ Flood the nations with grace and mercy/ Send forth your word/ Lord, and let there be light."

If growing politicization was the overarching narrative of evangelical left and of evangelicalism more broadly, the vitality of the evangelical left and the consequent battle over evangelical identity in the 1970s suggest the incoherence and limits of evangelical politics. One observer in the early 1970s described evangelicalism as a “gathering army of recruits without strong leadership or clearly understood marching orders.”³⁸ As the reputation and political strength of evangelicalism increased in the 1970s, the movement failed to cohere. Evangelicalism in fact grew even more politically and culturally differentiated. A surprisingly strong faction of non-right evangelicals—45% called themselves moderates and 19% liberals in a 2000 Princeton University survey—pervaded the movement, refusing to conform to the caricature of a liberal mainline social gospelism-conservative fundamentalism dichotomy painted by many scholars.³⁹ Some mainliners remained essentially evangelical with a conservative theology and warm piety even if their denominational leadership did not. A handful of evangelical leaders urged the formation of a welfare state, involvement in civil rights, and a harsh critique of the United States, even though their constituents did not. The case of senator from Oregon Mark Hatfield, a libertarian Republican with strong stances in favor of civil rights legislation and against the Vietnam War, points to the idiosyncratic position of evangelicalism in post war politics. That Hatfield emerged as evangelicals’ most admired politician demonstrates that

³⁸ Gordon Spykman, “The Tower of Babel Revisited: The Calvin Conference on Christianity and Politics,” *Vanguard* (July-August 1975), 24.

³⁹ The Religion and Politics 2000 survey, Princeton University, Robert Wuthnow, principal investigator. Cited in Corwin E. Smidt, “Evangelical and Mainline Protestants at the Turn of the Millennium: Taking Stock and Looking Forward,” paper presented at Southern Methodist University, 2002. In this argument, I concur with Douglas Jacobsen and William Vance Trollinger, Jr., eds., *Re-Forming the Center: American Protestantism, 1900 to the Present* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

conservative theology did not inevitably lead to rightist politics. Nor did evangelical activism on the right emerge with the force often attributed to it by the press.⁴⁰

The evangelical left itself reflected several of the most salient characteristics of broader evangelical incoherence: a latent apoliticism and internal fragmentation. Evangelical voices regularly urged political activists to remember their primary religious tasks. Ron Sider reminded politicized evangelicals on the left and the right that “Politics is not nearly as important as many people think. It’s not the way to bring salvation. It’s not the only way to change the world.”⁴¹ *Sojourners*, along with *Christianity Today*, consistently emphasized the importance of worship and community and questioned whether principled faith could mix with the compromising of conventional politics.⁴² This apolitical impulse showed itself in broader evangelicalism as well. Periodically, important evangelical leaders and disenchanted activists decried the seduction of political power.⁴³ Meanwhile, evangelicals spent less than one percent of evangelical donations in the 1990s on politics.⁴⁴ Just over

⁴⁰ Soon after the 1980 election, political scientists began to point out that evangelical political influence in was being exaggerated. See for example Stephen D. Johnson and Joseph B. Tamney, “The Christian Right and the 1980 Presidential Election,” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 21, No. 2 (June 1982); James K. Guth, “New Christian Right,” in Liebman and Wuthnow, eds. *New Christian Right*, 37; and Robert Booth Fowler, “The Failure of the Religious Right,” 57-74. In Michael Cromartie, ed., *No Longer Exiles: The Religious New Right in American Politics* (Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1993).

⁴¹ Ronald J. Sider, “A Plea for More Radical Conservatives and More Conserving Radicals,” *Transformation* 4, No. 1 (January 1987), 11-16.

⁴² See for instance, “Carter’s Credibility,” *Christianity Today* 20, No. 14 (April 9, 1976), 31.

⁴³ Charles W. Colson, *Born Again* (Old Tappan, N.J.: Chosen Books, 1976); Cal Thomas and Ed Dobson, *Blinded by Might: Why the Religious Right Can’t Save America* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1999); J. David Kuo, *Tempting Faith: An Inside Story of Political Seduction* (New York: Free Press, 2006).

⁴⁴ Michael Hamilton, “The Financing of American Evangelicalism since 1945,” 130, in *More Money, More Ministry: Money and Evangelicals in Recent North American History* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).

half of evangelicals even voted.⁴⁵ Evangelicals, despite their heightened political sense, remained more interested in running churches than in electing public officials.

The evangelical left also reflects the malleable nature of evangelicalism. Rooted in the sixteenth-century Reformation and “democratized” in the nineteenth century, evangelicalism still nurtures an anti-authoritarian impulse. Lacking a coherent hierarchy and willing to assume innovative cultural shapes, evangelicalism adapts itself to fill many fissures in American society.⁴⁶ While this feature has contributed to its considerable growth, it also disrupts political coherence. American evangelicalism consists of hundreds of denominations and thousands of para-church organizations with constituents from disparate geographies, socio-economic statuses, and ethnicities.⁴⁷ Few evangelical leaders speak for large numbers of constituents. Given its ecclesial diversity, faith in intuition, and literal scriptural hermeneutic, evangelicals have had difficulty constructing political theory, especially compared to American Catholics.⁴⁸ Evangelicals’ engagement of diverse politics—including New Left, progressive New Deal, and right-wing politics, all since the early 1970s—suggest the volatility of evangelical politics and its susceptibility to co-optation, sudden shifts, and identity politics. The twenty-year-old alliance of many evangelicals

⁴⁵ K. B. Kraakevik, “The Political Mobilization of White Evangelical Populists in the early 1970s and Early 1980s” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago Divinity School, 2004), 80.

⁴⁶ Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

⁴⁷ Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith since World War II* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988).

⁴⁸ For evangelical recognition of the more developed state of Catholic political thought, see Kristin E. Heyer, “Insights from Catholic Social Ethics and Political Participation,” 101-114, in Ronald J. Sider and Diane Knippers, eds., *Toward an Evangelical Public Policy* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2005).

with the Republican Party should be considered provisional.⁴⁹ Evangelicalism's decentralized structures, recurrent apoliticism, and diversities belie its political reputation. Its politics thus have been startlingly less than the sum of its parts.

Evangelicals noted the diversity and limits of evangelical politics even before the rest of the nation awoke to exaggerate its potential. Carl F. H. Henry, who had "romanced the possibility that a vast evangelical alliance might arise in the United States to coordinate effectively a national impact in evangelism, education, publication and sociological action," concluded that his mission had failed. "There is a lack of a sense of body in the evangelical community. It is fragmented," bemoaned Henry in his 1976 jeremiad *Evangelicals in Search of Identity*.⁵⁰ This elegy, written after two decades of a frenetic and ultimately unsuccessful attempt by Henry to impose the label "evangelical" on a diverse group of Christians and to coordinate their energies, points to the essential reality that twentieth-century evangelicalism was never as coherent as secular critics and evangelical triumphalists seemed to think. The evangelical left, sounding its minority political voice with surprising resonance, proved Henry's point.

⁴⁹ D. G. Hart, "Last Dance? The Future of the Religious Right and American Conservatism," paper presented at the Philadelphia Society, April 28, 2007; Mark A. Noll, "Evangelicals and Politics," paper presented at Colloquium on American History and Religion, February 14, 2007.

⁵⁰ Carl F. H. Henry, *Evangelicals in Search of Identity* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1976), 13; "Interview: Carl Henry on Evangelical Identity," *Sojourners* 5, No. 4 (April 1976), 27. (27-32); Henry, "Signs of Evangelical Disunity," *Christianity Today* 20, No. 14 (April 9, 1976), 33-34; Henry, "American Evangelicals in a Turning Time," *Christian Century* 97 (November 5, 1980), 1060.

CHAPTER ONE

THE QUIETIST AND RIGHTIST ROOTS OF THE EVANGELICAL LEFT

“We tended to be apolitical, but when political instincts did surface, they were conservative.” —former Houghton College student

Evangelicalism re-emerged in the mainstream political consciousness in the year of the nation’s bicentennial, intent, many observers thought, on recapturing long-lost American Christian transcendence. Over 50 million Americans claimed to be born again. Major news magazines ran cover stories on the recent surge in evangelical political and cultural power. *Newsweek* even dubbed 1976 the “year of the evangelical.” Self-professing evangelical Jimmy Carter was elected president. Future presidential candidate John B. Anderson told leaders of the National Association of Evangelicals that “evangelicals had replaced theological liberals as the ‘in’ group among Washington leaders.” Citing examples of conservative evangelicals in positions of political power, Anderson intoned, “The new evangelical majority in American religion bears a heavy responsibility for the nation’s future.”¹ Secular critics in turn worried that this rising religious bloc might impose a theocracy upon the nation. Within years, the Moral Majority emerged, and many observers credited evangelicals with sweeping Ronald Reagan into the presidency.

¹ James C. Hefley and Edward E. Plowman, *Washington: Christians in the Corridors of Power* (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House Publishers, 1975), 195.

Secular observers soon learned that a cadre of so-called “young evangelicals” was voicing its dismay over this emerging conservative activism.² Evangelicalism was too wealthy, said Charles Barfoot, who grew up Pentecostal. “I remember growing up with black children because we were all oppressed since we’re lower middle-class, but then we ‘arrived’ later on. What started out as a tent can become a million-dollar facility.” This upward mobility had led to “a brand of evangelicalism ... particularly accommodated to America’s middle-class Republican ideals,” continued David Gill, who had grown up fundamentalist in the Plymouth Brethren tradition.³ A more biting critique had already come from seminarian Jim Wallis several years earlier in 1971. Evangelicals, he asserted, were passive in the face of mounting injustices; their only political action served to maintain the status quo. His church, he complained, worshiped a god who was “American, white, capitalist, and violent; whose silent religion and imagined neutrality goes hand in hand with ‘nigger’ and ‘napalm.’”⁴ Whether irenic or caustic in their critiques, young evangelicals of all stripes were certainly correct to identify an overarching quietism and conservatism in their parents’ evangelical heritage.

This chapter, in charting the rise of evangelicals’ social status and theological changes, positions the emergence of dissenting young evangelicals such as Barfoot,

² On the rise of evangelical conservative politics in the 1960s and 1970s, see John Turner, “Sharing God with Modern America: A History of Campus Crusade for Christ” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2005); Darren Dochuk, “From Bible Belt to Sunbelt: Plain Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Southernization of Southern California, 1939-1969” (University of Notre Dame, 2005). On the evangelical left’s concern about the rise of conservative politics, see Jim Wallis and Wes Michaelson, “The Plan to Save America: A Disclosure of an Alarming Political Initiative by the Evangelical Far Right,” *Sojourners* 5, No. 4 (April 1976), 4-12.

³ “An Ecumenical/Evangelical Dialogue with Harvey Cox,” *Right On* 6, No. 10 (June 1975), 1, 4, 6, 8, 11.

⁴ Jim Wallis, “The Movemental Church,” *Post-American* 1, No. 2 (Winter 1972), 2-3.

Gill, and Wallis within a northern, white “new evangelicalism.” Rising from the ashes of the Scopes Trial and the defeat of fundamentalists in mainline denominations in the 1920s, these “new evangelicals” enjoyed the white, middle-class benefits of Levittowns, the GI Bill, and Eisenhower prosperity. They built a “new evangelical” empire of colleges, publishing houses, and churches who supported Billy Graham—a still-young evangelist who would become emblematic of modern conservative evangelicalism. Rejecting the otherworldly dispensationalism of early twentieth-century fundamentalism and its disavowal of “social service Christianity,” the new evangelicals increasingly sought to “go public” with the social implications of their faith.⁵ By the late 1960s, though most still harbored suspicions of political activism, many evangelicals were poised to strike a blow to the liberal political consensus.

I.

The political stature of evangelicalism in 1980 stood in stark contrast to its public perception half a century earlier. Not even the most optimistic of the beleaguered fundamentalist evangelicals in the 1920s, historian George Marsden wrote, would have predicted that the movement would “long persist as a major factor in American life.”⁶ Indeed, for many decades after the disastrous 1920s, fundamentalist evangelicals largely retreated to a quietist stance. In keeping with their lack of cultural and political ambition in this period, fundamentalist evangelicals

⁵ W. B. Riley speaking at the opening of the new Christian World Fundamentalist Association, quoted in Robert D. Linder, “The Resurgence of Evangelical Social Concern (1925-1975),” 198, in *The Evangelicals*, eds. David F. Wells and John D. Woodbridge (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975).

⁶ George Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, rev. ed., (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006) 231.

nurtured a soft apoliticism. *The Fundamentals*, a twelve-volume set of articles published in 1917 that repudiated the Protestant modernist movement, warned against getting too caught up in politics, and fundamentalists limited their haphazard political interests to votes for prohibition and non-activist sentiments against evolution and communism.⁷ Concern for theological orthodoxy and piety subordinated politics, which would emerge only in the 1970s as a salient characteristic of the movement.⁸ Fundamentalist evangelicals devoted much more time to congregational life, holy living, and missionary work than to party politics. In the 1930s, as fundamentalists struggled to build their own ecclesiastical structures, political activism, according to historian Mark Noll, “went into eclipse.”⁹ With the exception of a minority of conspiratorialist and militant fundamentalists such as Fred Schwartz, Carl McIntire, and Billy James Hargis, fundamentalist evangelicals did not mobilize on behalf of political candidates nor tie their faith closely to their politics.¹⁰

Rising prosperity at mid-century and adjustments to premillennial eschatology, however, sparked a new willingness on the part of quietistic evangelicals to engage the political realm. The theological and sociological contours of mid-

⁷ Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 120; Marsden, “Fundamentalism Yesterday and Today,” 232. Most voted for the Republican ticket, though in the South, evangelicals generally voted Democratic.

⁸ The overwhelming majority of articles in InterVarsity’s *HIS* magazine, for example, were devoted to topics such as sex, evangelism, hard work and discipline, devotional and inspirational literature, holiness, prayer, Bible-reading, and “unequal yoking” in dating and marriage.

⁹ Mark A. Noll, “The Scandal of Evangelical Political Reflection,” 81, in *Being Christian Today: An American Conversation*, eds. Richard John Neuhaus and George Weigel (Washington: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1992).

¹⁰ Dean Curry writes, “It is not, I believe, an oversimplification to say that early twentieth-century fundamentalism occupied itself with saving souls, period. There was a plethora of cultural quirks—such as anti-Catholicism and support for prohibition—that embellished fundamentalism, but the core of its theology was about saving souls that otherwise were doomed to eternal damnation.” See Dean C. Curry, “Biblical Politics and Foreign Policy,” in *Evangelicals and Foreign Policy: Four Perspectives*, ed. Michael Cromartie (Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Foreign Policy Center, 1989), 44.

century Wheaton College, which stood “at the center of one of the most influential networks of organized evangelical leadership,” according to Marsden, illuminate this trajectory.¹¹ Unable to rely on the “old money” of wealthier mainline denominations, Wheaton’s administrators and its lower middle-class students scraped their way through the Great Depression. By the mid-1940s, however, the college went on a building binge and enjoyed a rapid arc in applications as thousands of students and World War II veterans streamed to the outskirts of Chicago.¹²

Veterans’ use of the G.I. Bill points to the critical—and ironic, given their conservative animus against big government—role that government largesse played in the upward social and economic mobility of fundamentalist evangelicals. Wheaton students participated in the Federal Relief Administration work-study program, part of the New Deal legislation of the 1930s. In the 1940s and beyond the G.I. Bill funds paid for tuition, fees, textbooks, and supplies for students to attend evangelical colleges. Married veterans even received \$90 per month in living expenses; those with children got \$120 per month.¹³ Not only did some lower-middle class Wheaton students (many of whom were the first in their families to attend college) fund their entire collegiate education at Wheaton through the G.I. Bill or ROTC, others received low-interest loans through the National Defense Education Act in the 1950s.¹⁴ By the

¹¹ George M. Marsden, *Evangelicalism and Modern America* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1984), xv.

¹² Paul M. Bechtel, *Wheaton College: A Heritage Remembered, 1860-1984* (Wheaton, Ill.: H. Shaw Publishers, 1984), 122, 177-183, 214. Other evangelical schools enjoyed a similar boom. Seattle Pacific University’s spiked from 397 students in 1945 to 660 just one year later as veterans returned from Europe and Asia to live in a hastily built complex called “G.I. Housing.” See Donald McNichols, *Seattle Pacific University: A Growing Vision* (Seattle: Seattle Pacific University, 1989), 91, 131.

¹³ Thacker, *Vision and Miracle*, 184.

¹⁴ Hamilton, “The Fundamentalist Harvard,” 123, 252-255. Even faculty enjoyed government aid from Fulbright Act, which faculty used to study and research abroad.

late 1960s various forms of student financial aid from federal sources made up over 20% of the income of private colleges.¹⁵

Federal aid extended beyond student tuition assistance to the infrastructures of evangelical colleges.¹⁶ Wheaton enjoyed grants from the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Science Foundation, which helped fund the growth of the science departments in the 1950s. Asbury College received grants from the National Science Foundation to train students in nuclear radiation theory.¹⁷ In 1966 Seattle Pacific received a \$330,000 grant to build a 65,000 square foot administration-classroom building from the Washington State Higher Education Facilities Commission under the authority of the Federal Government's Education Facilities Act of 1965.¹⁸ Even more importantly, a favorable tax climate in the United States, especially when compared to Canada, contributed to the growth of evangelical colleges. Estate taxes could nearly be eliminated by large donations to nonprofit organizations. Moreover, the federal government exempted private colleges from nearly all taxes, offered lower

¹⁵ Chester E. Finn, Jr., *Scholars, Dollars, and Bureaucrats* (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1978), 14. On the postwar American educational boom generally, see pages 20-23. Ringenberg notes that not all evangelicals cooperated with government funding. Grove City College in Pennsylvania declined government largesse, and many Southern Baptists feared that accepting money might ultimately cede control to the federal government. Overall, Ringenberg acknowledges, federal money was a boon to evangelical higher education. See William Ringenberg, *The Christian College: A History of Protestant Higher Education in America* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2006), 206-207). On government aid to Catholic schools, see Elizabeth A. Edmondson, "Without Comment or Controversy: The G.I. Bill and Catholic Colleges," *Church History* 71, No. 4 (December 2002), 820-847. Edmondson notes that in 1947, the federal government "paid for the tuition under the G.I. Bill of about 100,000 veterans enrolled in Catholic schools of higher learning." Also see Philip Gleason, *Contending with Modernity: Catholic Higher Education in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

¹⁶ On government aid to evangelical denominations and relief agencies, see Axel R. Schaffer, "The Cold War State and the Resurgence of Evangelicalism: A Study of the Public Funding of Religion since 1945," *Radical History Review* 99 (Fall 2007), 29-37.

¹⁷ Thacker, *Vision and Miracle*, 196.

¹⁸ McNichols, *A Growing Vision*, 131.

postal rates, and granted a relatively lax regulatory environment.¹⁹ By the 1990s a higher proportion of the budgets of conservative Protestant colleges came from public sources than did the budgets of public schools.²⁰

The boon of government aid encouraged evangelical colleges to pursue more ambitious academic programs, a trajectory already underway at schools such as Wheaton. In the 1940s, Wheaton pursued national accreditation and improved faculty credentials. Since so few newly hired professors held PhDs (only 20% in the late 1940s), the administration developed an informal method of producing its own faculty. The existing faculty identified the most promising students in their classes, sent them to respected Midwestern graduate schools to receive their MA, and recruited them back to Wheaton to teach while giving them time to finish their dissertations. By 1965, alumni comprised 56% of Wheaton's faculty.²¹ Some of them had been groomed by Gordon H. Clark, an influential philosophy professor, who stirred many of his students to contemplate the vision of a Reformed Christian tradition much broader than the sectarian faith of their parents.²² Before long,

¹⁹ Burkinshaw, "The Funding of Evangelical Higher Education in the United States and Canada in the Postwar Period," 290; Michael Hamilton, "More Money, More Ministry: The Financing of American Evangelicalism since 1945," in *More Money, More Ministry: Money and Evangelicals in Recent North American History*, ed. Larry Eskridge and Mark A. Noll (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000), 134. On the other hand, evangelicals pay for their children's education twice: first, with educational taxes funneled to public schools and second, with tuition payments to private schools. Also see Finn, *Scholars, Dollars*, 15.

²⁰ Stephen Monsma, *When Sacred and Secular Mix: Religious Nonprofit Organizations and Public Money* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1996), 69-76.

²¹ Hamilton, "The Fundamentalist Harvard," 33-37, 135-136. Between 1943 and 1963 the number of students' fathers who had attended college had risen from 11% to 50%. See David Parker Lansdale, "Citadel under Siege: The Contested Mission of an Evangelical Christian Liberal Arts College" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1991), 206.

²² By Reformed, I mean a Calvinist theology and sensibility rising out of the Reformation that urged the remaking of the world. Clark sought to "save and rebuild the West" by transforming culture. See Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, 192-192.

Wheaton was funneling students into Harvard Divinity School, which was looking for top-notch evangelical students. Historian Joel Carpenter notes that in the latter years of the 1940s, more than a dozen evangelicals earned doctorates from Harvard. Many of them became the leaders of the new evangelicalism.²³

Returning to Wheaton and other evangelical schools armed with the most prestigious degrees ever held by fundamentalist evangelicals, these rising scholars began to introduce more rigorous academic standards. Seattle Pacific College grew more selective in its admissions standards in the mid-1960s, irritating some of its alumni who had trouble getting some of their children admitted.²⁴ Despite impressive growth in enrollment, Wheaton by the mid-1950s was rejecting half of all students who applied. Those admitted went on to earn PhDs at a rate comparable to the most elite liberal arts schools in the nation.²⁵ The style and content of Wheaton's curriculum showed that the college during mid-century had become "a legitimate heir of American ideas about higher education."²⁶ Other evangelical colleges in fact followed Wheaton's lead, beginning to add to or replace strictly Bible and theological

²³ Harold Lindsell, for example, went on from Wheaton to study at UC-Berkeley and Harvard. Carl F. H. Henry, after earning an M.A. at Wheaton, undertook doctoral studies at Boston University, just two years before Martin Luther King, Jr. See Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, 191-192. Many of these evangelicals—for example, Burton L. Goddard (University of California, Westminster Sminary, Harvard University), Earl B. Robinson (Amherst, Westminster, Harvard), Edward John Carnell (Wheaton, Westminster, Harvard), Paul King Jewett (Wheaton, Westminster, Harvard), Charles G. Chaeffele (Wheaton, Westminster, Harvard), and Carl F.H. Henry (Wheaton, Boston)—taught at Gordon, another emerging new evangelical school, while graduate students at Harvard or Boston University. See G. Lloyd Carr, "Development of the Humanities Division," in Ann Ferguson, ed., *Shaping a Heritage: Celebrating the Centennial* (Wenham, Mass.: Gordon College, 1989), 89.

²⁴ McNichols, *A Growing Vision*, 112, 119.

²⁵ Bechtel, *Heritage Remembered*, 133, 235.

²⁶ Hamilton, "Fundamentalist Harvard," 125, 129.

training programs with a liberal arts curriculum.²⁷ By the 1970s, a dozen of these colleges were engaging in discussions about creating a “great evangelical university” and urging cooperation beyond the evangelistic level to the “equally critical educational frontier.”²⁸ The great evangelical university never happened, but by the 1980s, nearly 100 evangelical colleges were members of the Christian College Consortium.²⁹

By the 1950s, then, the new evangelicalism’s growing intellectual rigor was carrying over to a measure of cultural engagement. Wheaton students actively participated in the National Student Association and the Model United Nations. Sports teams competed in intercollegiate athletics with state schools. Articles and editorials about the political and cultural winds swirling about them accompanied features on sports, homecoming, and literary clubs in the student newspaper. If Wheaton was warming up to popular culture, American society was eyeing an entirely new image of evangelicalism. Newspaper baron William Randolph Hearst’s 1949

²⁷ For a case of growing intellectual respectability and liberal arts curriculum of Gordon Bible College, see Brereton, “Fundamentalist Bible Schools,” 288-328. On several exceptions to growing intellectual respectability at Wheaton in the 1930s and 1940s, see Hamilton, “The Fundamentalist Harvard,” 134. The administration feared two disciplines in particular: philosophy and the social sciences. In the early 1940s the two philosophers on campus were fired; their classes were given to the Bible and theology department. The social sciences, which offered only elementary courses in sociology and political science, were taught by history faculty. More broadly, however, academics at Wheaton and other evangelical schools dramatically improved during this era.

²⁸ David Kucharsky, “Evangelical Colleges Plan Consortium,” *Christianity Today* 15, No.14 (April 9, 1971), 44-45.

²⁹ Three of the most prominent—Wheaton, Westmont, and Gordon—were not denominationally affiliated and tended to attract large numbers of “card-carrying” evangelicals. But the Coalition included many denominational schools which were growing more integrated in the new evangelical fold. It included three Dutch Reformed, five Mennonite, half a dozen with Methodist roots, eight Nazarene, eight Baptist, several Presbyterian, and many with holiness roots. See Timothy Smith, “Introduction: Christian Colleges and American Culture,” in *Making Higher Education Christian*, eds. Joel A. Carpenter and Kenneth W. Shipps (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1987), 1-3. For a list of Christian College Coalition member schools, see chapter entitled “The Reconstruction of Christian Higher Education” in William C. Ringenberg, *The Christian College: A History of Protestant Higher Education in America* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 183-207.

directive to “puff Graham” in syndicated newspapers across the nation gave instant credibility to Wheaton graduate and evangelist Billy Graham, who since 1948 has made “The Most Admired Man in the World” list more than any other person. The young dynamic preacher, the nation soon saw, was not a wild-eyed preacher of dogmatism; he wore a stylish suit and hand-painted tie and could speak the language of youth culture. Five other Wheaton graduates, all missionaries to the Auca natives of South America, joined Graham in the national spotlight after being martyred in Ecuador in 1957. Photographs of the young men distributed by the Associated Press showed athletic, fashionable young men, observes historian Kathryn Long, “who were a far cry from the starch and formality of the Victorian missionary. They looked like ‘all-American boys.’” McCully, a former football player, “was pictured in an open-collared shirt, rather than a suit and tie; Saint exuded the confidence of a young pilot with a grin on his face and a billed cap shoved back on his head.” Photographs of their families mirrored millions of other postwar couples doing their best to produce the “baby boom” generation.³⁰ These glimpses into the subculture of postwar evangelicalism showed the growing reintegration of fundamentalist evangelicals into American culture and out of the ghetto to which they had retreated during the Scopes era. Increasingly, these new evangelicals (though as well-educated, upwardly mobile northerners associated with Billy Graham they were only a minority sub-species of evangelicalism) aspired to represent the popular image of evangelicalism over against quietist holiness adherents, big-tent Pentecostals such as Oral Roberts, and strident fundamentalists.

³⁰ Kathryn Long, “In the Modern World, but Not of It: The ‘Auca Martyrs,’ Evangelicalism, and Postwar American Culture,” in *Foreign Missionary Enterprise at Home*, ed. Daniel Bays and Grant Wacker (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2003), 229.

Transformations in new evangelical theology mirrored (and helped shape) this rise in social class and cultural engagement. Specifically, many new evangelicals began to reject the dispensational premillennial eschatology of their heritage. The eschatological theory of dispensationalism, a nineteenth-century innovation of British evangelist John Darby, divided history into discrete dispensations and argued that Christians would be “raptured,” that is, removed from the earth prior to Jesus Christ’s return and millennial reign. Fundamentalistic evangelicals considered the rapture to be imminent. Such a framework placed supreme consequence upon getting the world ready for the rapture, for fear that many might be “left behind.”

While at no time did all fundamentalists hold to dispensationalism, the implications for social and political action were profound nonetheless. The all-encompassing concern of saving souls subsumed nineteenth-century evangelical social concerns such as abolition, women’s suffrage, and party politics. Dwight Moody’s metaphor for evangelism—“I look upon this world as a wrecked vessel. God has given me a lifeboat and said to me, ‘Moody, save all you can’—symbolized much about the new approach. Despite the emergence of William Jennings Bryan as a prominent evangelical celebrity and social thinker and fundamentalists’ support of prohibition, anti-evolution legislation, and anti-communism, Moody better symbolized the new social pessimism of most fundamentalist evangelicals.³¹ Not opposed out of principle to reform, dispensationalists nonetheless remained preoccupied by conversionism and the imminence of the end times. Their eschatology inhibited social action.

³¹ It is important to note that there is always a degree of political involvement by fundamentalist evangelicals, though the larger story from the 1920s to the 1940s is the clear ascendancy of social pessimism. See Marsden, “Fundamentalism Yesterday and Today,” 232.

By the 1940s, however, many proto-new evangelicals were quietly putting aside premillennial dispensationalism.³² Though it remained strong at Dallas Theological Seminary and Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, dispensationalism fell out of favor at Fuller Theological Seminary and in other quarters of the new evangelicalism. A visiting delegation to Fuller in 1949 noted that “there is nothing of either the Arminian or Dispensationalist about its teaching.” Carl Henry, while premillennialist, showed considerable coolness to dispensationalism, always attaching the word “broadly” when speaking of his premillennial eschatology.³³ By the 1950s, one of the staples of the new evangelicalism was the repudiation of premillennial dispensationalism. The pages of Fuller’s scholarly journal *Theology News & Notes* were full of anti-dispensationalist arguments in the 1950s.³⁴ By the mid-1960s, antipathy toward dispensationalism had nearly become a litmus test for new evangelical orthodoxy. Prospective Fuller faculty had to defend against any sympathies *for* dispensationalism.³⁵ Other leading evangelical institutions followed Fuller’s lead. At Wheaton, professor Charles Horne articulated the emerging objections to dispensationalism: “Tragically, in large segments of the evangelical church today justifiable theological concepts are used in deplorably unjustified ways.

³² See for example the case of George Ladd of Gordon College, then Fuller Seminary. Though Ladd, a biblical scholar, did not dabble in social ethics, many of his peers did, seeing more room for social action as dispensationalism was refuted. Ladd offered the most comprehensive scholarly attack on dispensationalism. See John A. D’Elia, “A Place at the Table: George Eldon Ladd and the Rehabilitation of Evangelical Scholarship in America” (unpublished manuscript).

³³ David Harrington Watt, “The Private Hopes of American Fundamentalists and Evangelicals, 1925-1975,” *Religion and American Culture*, 1, No. 2. (Summer 1991), 162.

³⁴ See, for example, William LaSor who, in a book review of *Our Blessed Hope*, speaks of the “exegetical distortions of the Dispensational school of interpretation.” See *Theology News & Notes* 3, No. 4 (July 1956), 2.

³⁵ See Daniel P. Fuller, “Report on visit of President Hubbard and Dean Fuller with Dr. Edward Hayes,” June 12, 1967, Fuller Theological Seminary Archives.

... our anticipation of millennial glory must not blind us to the needs of our present world.”³⁶ The eschatological theory was mocked by a group of student candidates—appearing as the “Plenary, Inerrant, Verbal Inspirationist, Ussher Chronology, Fiat Creationist, Dispensationalist, Premillennial Fundamentalist” delegation—during a boisterous primary campaign for student government.³⁷ Though the rejection of dispensationalism may not have been as unambiguous in other evangelical quarters (in part for fear of offending conservative constituents) as it was at Fuller, by the 1950s there seemed to be a clear correlation between eschatological change and new evangelicals with designs on social engagement.

Whether the repudiation of dispensationalism sparked the new engagement toward the world or whether it merely justified an impulse toward social action is unclear.³⁸ What is clear is that this eschatological transformation was inextricably linked to social action. Rejecting the “kingdom later” view of the dispensationalists, some new evangelicals felt a mandate to offer whatever measure of temporal justice and mercy they could in a hurting world, typically through strident anti-communism rather than support of the New Deal or the War on Poverty. Evangelicals were refashioning their image as fundamentalist refugees in a crumbling Babylon to

³⁶ Charles Horne, “Premillennialism, Depravity, and Social Action” *The Other Side* (January-February 1969).

³⁷ Leroy Kimmons, “Unconventional Delegations Choose Primary Candidates,” *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 28 (April 29, 1965): 1.

³⁸ For more on new evangelical repudiation of dispensationalism, see Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston, *The Variety of American Evangelicalism* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1991).

custodial heirs of a Reformation legacy dedicated to ushering in a new Jerusalem in America.³⁹

By the late 1940s “fundamentalism” had become a bad word for many new evangelicals. Carl F. H. Henry, a founding faculty member at Fuller, wrote that “fundamentalism is considered a summary term for theological pugnaciousness, ecumenic disruptiveness, cultural unprogressiveness, scientific obliviousness, and/or anti-intellectual inexcusableness ... extreme dispensationalism, pulpit sensationalism, excessive emotionalism, social withdrawal and bawdy church music.”⁴⁰ Wheaton students, who recognized this trajectory of a broader movement of evangelicals away from fundamentalism, were glad to retreat from the cultural idiosyncrasies of their tradition. In an editorial entitled “Farewell to Fundamentalism,” student Calvin Veltman wrote, “I hereby resign them to their slow, convulsive death in both peace and isolation.”⁴¹ By the 1950s a coterie of new evangelical leaders, most of them associated in some way with Wheaton or Fuller, had risen to lead the way from

³⁹ Late twentieth-century fundamentalists appeared to be living in an inherent tension. They retained their pessimistic dispensationalism, but they sought to re-engage American society, to recover America’s Christian past. Some observers have characterized their politics as “operational postmillennialism.”

⁴⁰ Carl F. H. Henry, “Is Evangelical Theology Changing?” *Christian Life* 17 (March 1956), 16-19; Henry, “Dare We Renew the Controversy?” *Christianity Today* 1 (June 24, 1957), 23-26; Henry, “What Is Fundamentalism?” *United Evangelical Action* (July 16, 1966), 303.

⁴¹ Calvin Veltman, “Farewell to Fundamentalism,” *Wheaton Record* 85, No. 16 (January 10, 1963). The Dean of the Faculty at Westmont College sounded the same theme. At a meeting of the Western College Association, Frank L. Hieronymus said, “As an institution the organization must be identified in those early days with the fundamentalist cause. ... this is the one heritage which the College has with some deliberation tried to outgrow. ... Westmont believes in the Christian fundamentals but it does not believe in what is generally associated with fundamentalism. By that I mean an anti-intellectualism, a certain dogmatism, a belief that there is only one way of doing things, that there are no greys but only black and white. Fundamentalism was born and nurtured in suspicion—not of the world, but of fellow Christians. This, Westmont has tried to overcome completely.” See Frank L. Hieronymus, “College Objectives and College Organization,” 8, in *The Christian Liberal Arts College: Proceedings of a Case Study at Westmont College* (Oakland, Cal.: Western College Association, 1968). (7-11).

cultural separatism to social engagement. Carl F. H. Henry, Richard Halverson, Ken Taylor, Billy Graham, and Harold Ockenga, as the primary architects of the new evangelicalism, articulated a more comprehensive evangelical agenda for the twentieth century that proposed increased political, scholarly, and social engagement. Henry became the preeminent prophet and theologian of the emerging new evangelical movement with his 1947 manifesto *Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*, which carved out space between the social gospelism of mainline Protestant liberalism and the separatist and socially pessimistic tendencies of fundamentalism.

The 88-page broadside, a sharp indictment of the “evaporation of fundamentalist humanitarianism,” was radical for its context. Its call for social involvement, historian Robert Linder writes, “exploded in the field of evangelical thought ... like a bombshell.”⁴² Modernity, Henry began, was replete with social evils, among them “aggressive warfare, racial hatred and intolerance, liquor traffic, and exploitation of labor or management, whichever it may be.” But fundamentalism, motivated by an animus against religious modernism, had separated from worthy humanitarian efforts. This lack of social passion—like the “modern priest and Levite by-passing suffering humanity”—was a damnable offense, according to Henry. Instead of acknowledging the world-changing potential of the gospel, fundamentalists had narrowed it to a world-resisting message. Fundamentalist theology had been reduced to just a few doctrinal and ascetic concerns such as “intoxicating beverages, movies, dancing, card-playing, and smoking.” The student newspaper at one of the

⁴² Linder, “The Resurgence of Evangelical Social Concern (1925-1975),” 221.

large Christian colleges, Henry reported with disgust, had devoted a large amount of space “to the all-important problem of whether it is right to play ‘rook,’ while the nations of the world are playing with fire.” The redemptive message of Christ, Henry was arguing, had implications for all of life, not just the personal.⁴³

The problem of fundamentalism, then, was that it failed to apply the message. Henry sought “an application of, not a revolt against, fundamentals of the faith.” Repudiating the fundamentals of the faith, in fact, was where the liberal solution to social ills lost its way. The liberal social gospel had tried to build “higher civilizations” as its aim to the exclusion of personal salvation. The Social Gospel approach served as an important foil for the middle course Henry and the new evangelicals were trying to chart—a doctrinally pure, socially engaged faith between social gospel advocate Walter Rauschenbusch and fundamentalist Carl McIntire. The new course would confront important social issues such as racism, labor disputes, and military aggression by foreign communistic and totalitarian regimes, all the while retaining conservative theology and evangelical piety. “There is no room here,” wrote Henry, invoking the teachings of John the Baptist, Jesus, and Paul, “for a gospel that is indifferent to the needs of the total man nor of the global man.” *Uneasy Conscience* was a commanding call to a new social mission.⁴⁴

It was a call, however, without a well-defined program. Despite his contention that “one of the fallacies of modern thought ... is that the mere ‘passing of a resolution’ or the ‘writing of a book’ ... automatically constitutes a long step on the

⁴³ Carl F. H. Henry, *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947), 17, 20, 68.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 11, 35, 65.

road to deliverance,” Henry offered up a paucity of suggestions for action himself.⁴⁵ There were intriguing clues of a conservative political orientation, such as his suspicion of the efficacy of increasing labor wages and reducing work hours. Yet other passages suggested a more progressive stance, such as his proposal that the United States should work closely with the then-emerging United Nations.⁴⁶ As a whole, though, the text of *Uneasy Conscience* and Henry’s subsequent writings were startlingly free of any coherent plan for what evangelical social engagement might look like. As late as 1966, Louis Smedes wrote of Henry that “One wishes he would land on some specific points and call his shots. . . . Is he against the War on Poverty? Is he against social security and medicare? Is he for government legislation on civil rights? . . . Dr. Henry is not specific . . . The net impression of Dr. Henry’s essay is that evangelicals do not yet have a social ethic.”⁴⁷ Unspecific to a fault, a multitude of politically diverse evangelicals would later claim the vague *Uneasy Conscience* as their inspiration.

Henry’s clearest suggestion for social change ironically had less to do with party politics than with personal transformation. Authentic social transformation could only be sparked by spiritual transformation, he declared. Referring to the universal imperatives of the Ten Commandments, Henry wrote that “no culture can hope to fulfill such high prerequisites, minus a relationship with that God, holy and redemptive, who is the precondition for their very disclosure to man.” Thus,

⁴⁵ Ibid., 88.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 85-86. Henry’s most definite statement was an off-handed dismissal of communism and “state Socialism,” a sentiment that even social gospellers of the turn of the century would have endorsed. See Ibid., 73.

⁴⁷ Louis Smedes, “The Evangelicals and the Social Question” *Reformed Journal* (February 1966), 9-13.

converted believers were needed to fill the ranks of the social and political ranks. “To the extent that any society is leavened with Christian conviction,” wrote Henry, “it becomes a more hospitable environment for Christian expansion.” It was important not to sacrifice “world statesmanship to men of godless convictions.” Even a redeemed communism or totalitarianism was better than an unredeemed democracy. Henry’s conception of social engagement consisted largely of the placement of redeemed individuals into positions of social importance more than the systematic integration of Christian values into the social infrastructure.⁴⁸

In retrospect, *Uneasy Conscience* seems both less and more revolutionary than it actually was. Read backward, amidst the full-throated rise of the religious right in the 1980s, *Uneasy Conscience* reads as far less than a harbinger of evangelical engagement—at strongest only a tentative step. Understood in context—amidst the separatist impulses of 1930s fundamentalism—Henry’s tract was quite radical.⁴⁹ One Westmont student, restive under the constraints of fundamentalism, was so inspired by *Uneasy Conscience*’s rebuke of cultural isolationism that he kept a copy under his pillow at night during his entire junior year.⁵⁰ Henry’s call to engagement would turn out to be an important catalyst in the politicization of evangelicalism.

⁴⁸ Smedes, “Evangelicals and the Social Question,” 32, 71, 73.

⁴⁹ Fundamentalists themselves published virulent polemics that rejected the social call found in *Uneasy Conscience*. See especially chapter 12, “An Enemy Within: New Evangelicalism,” in George W. Dollard, *A History of Fundamentalism in America* (Greenville, S.C.: Bob Jones University, 1973), 203-211; Robert Lightner, *Neo-Evangelicalism* (Findlay, Ohio: Dunham Publishing Company, 1961), 115-144; Charles Woodbridge, *The New Evangelicalism* (Greenville, S.C.: Bob Jones University Press, 1969); William E. Ashbrook, *The New Neutralism* (Columbus, Ohio, self-published, 1966).

⁵⁰ David Allan Hubbard, “An Ecumenical Experiment,” lecture delivered at Drew University, October 23, 1979, p. 15.

II.

In 1956, nine years after the publishing of *Uneasy Conscience*, leading new evangelicals named Henry the editor of *Christianity Today*, designed to be the premier evangelical periodical.⁵¹ Headquartered in the heart of Washington, D.C., *Christianity Today*'s location symbolized "the place of the evangelical witness in the life of a republic." Henry and other staffers could look down Pennsylvania Avenue for a glimpse of the White House and other symbols of national power.⁵² The new evangelical journal granted generous space to writers attentive to the social implications of the gospel, a move in sharp contrast to the sole soul-winning and theological gate-keeping emphases of the old fundamentalism. Jerusalem was inching ever closer to Washington.

Social engagement, however, did not immediately feed into political activism. New evangelicals, in keeping with the traditional suspicion of politics by their fundamentalist antecedents, were careful not to make explicit their political leanings. The first editorial of their flagship magazine *Christianity Today*, while announcing the movement's intent to "apply the biblical revelation to the contemporary social crisis, by presenting the implications of the total Gospel message for every area of life," was ambiguous about policy prescriptions. Into the 1970s evangelical leaders only rarely endorsed political candidates. Nor did constituents conspicuously mobilize on behalf of candidates. This is not to say that the new evangelicals did not vote or nurture political inclinations. After all, conservative politics fit well with most

⁵¹ For an autobiographical account by Henry of *Christianity Today*'s early years, see Carl F. H. Henry, *Confessions of a Theologian* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1986).

⁵² "Why Christianity Today?" *Christianity Today* 1, No. 1 (October 15, 1956), 20-21.

evangelicals' sense of individualistic spirituality. As Henry suggested, Jesus first of all transformed individuals, who would then transform the world. "The Church as a corporate body has no divine mandate to become officially involved" in politics or social transformation, echoed Vernon Grounds.⁵³ This fit nicely with conservatives' inclination toward states rights over federal intrusion, with their tendency to resist government's tinkering with social structures. Conservative evangelicals wanted a government that governed less, a political judgment that nicely fit their apolitical sensibilities. A former student from Houghton College in upstate New York put it well: "We tended to be apolitical, but when political instincts did surface, they were conservative."⁵⁴ So though evangelical leaders did not endorse political candidates nor politically mobilize their constituents, new evangelicals nonetheless voted in large numbers for Dwight Eisenhower, Barry Goldwater, and Richard Nixon.⁵⁵ Editors in the first issue of *Christianity Today*, for example, though refusing to endorse Dwight Eisenhower, signaled their preference by noting that Democratic candidate Adlai Stevenson took some time out from campaigning to attend Unitarian All Souls Church in Washington, D.C., an action that would be sure to irritate, even

⁵³ "The Church and Political Pronouncements," *Christianity Today* (August 28, 1964), 29-30.

⁵⁴ Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage*, 2.

⁵⁵ Resonance with the Republican Party was especially pronounced in 1960 as evangelicals were confronted with a Catholic candidate. At Houghton College, rumors circulated that a professor was fired for supporting Kennedy's campaign in 1960. At Wheaton, Nixon beat Kennedy 924 to 34. The closest presidential mock election before the 1960s election took place in 1944, when Dewey beat FDR 410 to 71. This was the only time a Democrat captured more than 10% of the vote. At Calvin College, a Christian Reformed college, 90% of students voted for Nixon over Kennedy in 1960, and Republican candidates regularly appeared to drum up support for their campaigns. See Interview with Richard Mouw, Pasadena, Cal., July 12, 2006; Donald W. Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 2; Loren Wilkinson, "Predicted Close Mock Ballot Will Be Novelty at Wheaton," *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 6 (October 30, 1964), 2; "Front Porch Minority Outlines Campaign Issues Here Tuesday," *Chimes* 61, No. 7 (October 28, 1966), 1.

offend evangelical readers.⁵⁶ Such tepid gestures, rather than active mobilization, characterized the non-activist conservatism of evangelicals.

Anti-communism dominated the politics of the new evangelicalism in the early years of the 1950s. Though moderate compared with fundamentalists such as Carl McIntire, the stridency with which new evangelicals opposed communism distinguished it from the anti-communism of the broader liberal consensus. Many for instance felt that a strong commitment to unfettered free enterprise, certainly not the wishy-washy socialism of FDR's New Deal, was necessary to protect freedom and faith. Communism, fundamentalists and new evangelicals continually pointed out, was a menace to Christianity; specifically, the Soviet Union persecuted Christians and elevated Marxist materialism over faith.⁵⁷ In this regard, communism was a religion itself that was competing with evangelical faith. It was this preoccupation with thwarting a global takeover by godless communism that truly animated evangelical resonance with free enterprise and opposition to socialized government. Billy Graham, whose preoccupation was evangelism, cultivated this political passion early in his evangelistic career, going so far as to call communism an ideology of Satan. Like Graham, the marginal political commitments of Bill Bright's evangelistic university organization Campus Crusade in the 1950s were almost exclusively centered on global communism's apparent antipathy toward religion and missionary

⁵⁶ "Digest," *Christianity Today* 1, No. 1 (October 15, 1956), 28.

⁵⁷ See, for example, an article in the first issue of *Christianity Today* that comments on the threat of communist totalitarianism and the necessity of basing freedom in the West on individual rights. See Carl F. H. Henry, "The Fragility of Freedom in the West," *Christianity Today* 1, No. 1 (October 15, 1956), 8-11.

activity. Anti-communism, in its opposition to Marxist atheism, remained one of the few issues in which evangelicals tied faith to their conservative politics.⁵⁸

Despite Bright's call for "strong Christian leadership in government from the local precinct to the White House" and his vociferous support of Goldwater in Campus Crusade staff meetings, he retained his public stance of apoliticism until the late 1970s. Political mobilization, he reasoned, could only detract from the more important mission of evangelism.⁵⁹ Evangelism, he told J. Nelson Bell in 1961, was still "my major concern," for official endorsements might alienate potential converts.⁶⁰ Likewise, Gordon professor Addison Leitch, while declaring that a "commitment to Christ immediately and by necessity has social implications. . . . men saved by grace cannot escape the necessity of working redemptively upon society," nonetheless asserted that evangelicals' primary task was to "win the lost."⁶¹ While individual evangelicals were often outspoken in their political views, evangelicals often were reticent to endorse candidates in the context of congregation and denomination. Thus while the new evangelicalism's founding documents should be read with anti-communist and anti-big government commitments in mind—what historian George Marsden has called "a Christianized version of Republicanism"—it

⁵⁸ Antipathy toward communism remained through the 1960s and 1970s, though it lacked the stridency of the 1950s. As Billy Graham began holding evangelistic crusades in Eastern Europe, his Manichean language declined. Anti-communism by the 1960s and 1970s, according to sociologist Robert Fowler, "was hardly at the heart of evangelical political thinking." See Robert Booth Fowler, *A New Engagement: Evangelical Political Thought, 1966-1976* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 213-215.

⁵⁹ Turner, "Selling Jesus to Modern America," 181-189.

⁶⁰ Turner, "Selling Jesus to Modern America," 222. Bright later wrote, "In the twenty-five years of this ministry, I've not spent one dollar of Crusade money on supporting a person or a party." See "Door Interview: Bill Bright," *Wittenburg Door*, No. 35 (February-March 1977), 15.

⁶¹ Addison H. Leitch, "The Primary Task of the Church," *Christianity Today* 1, No. 1 (October 15, 1956), 11-13, 18.

is important to acknowledge a substantial apolitical impulse that still remained.⁶²

Billy Graham's near, but undelivered, endorsement of Nixon best exemplifies new evangelical politics in both its quietist and rightist postures.⁶³

Excepting anti-communism, evangelicals' public apoliticism continued into the early 1960s. Carl F. H. Henry, disquieted by the prospect of political activism, regularly warned *Christianity Today's* readers not to drown in a sea of political maneuvering.⁶⁴ The best politics, as he had already made clear in *Uneasy Conscience*, would be accomplished as millions of Americans were swept in a wave of spiritual revival. The cleansed lives would mark their immediate territory and cumulatively transform society itself. "The basic needs of the social order must meet their solution first in the redemption of the individual," concluded Henry.⁶⁵ While participating in governance was good, it was not good to put too much faith in the state to push social reform, nor was it always clear which politics were best. "There is no one direct line from the Bible to the ballot box," Henry declared.⁶⁶ New evangelicals, even as they stressed social engagement, nurtured a theology of political limits.

⁶² George Marsden, "Unity and Diversity in the Evangelical Resurgence," in *Altered Landscapes: Christianity in America, 1935-1985*, ed. Donald W. Shriver David W. Lotz, Jr., and John F. Wilson (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1989), 70.

⁶³ Richard V. Pierard, "Billy Graham and the U.S. Presidency," *Journal of Church and State* 22, No. 1 (Winter 1980), 119-121.

⁶⁴ "Southern Baptists and Society," *Christianity Today* (April 14, 1967), 46-47; Adon Taft, "The Gospel in a Social Context," *Christianity Today* (June 23, 1967), 33-34; "Will American Baptists De-escalate or Advance Evangelism?" *Christianity Today* (April 14, 1967), 30-31; "Christian Social Action," *Christianity Today* (March 14, 1969), 24-25; "Editorial," *Christianity Today* (January 5, 1968), 26-27.

⁶⁵ "Why *Christianity Today*?" 20-21. This was a message echoed by Campus Crusade. In a debate with a former SDS president, Crusade's Josh McDowell answered the question, "Why not change the structure?" with this answer: "You can't change man by changing the structure. Man must have an internal change, and Christ has the power to do it." See "Student Action" newsletter, in Folder "Campus Crusade for Christ, 1971," New Left Collection, Hoover Institution Archives, Palo Alto, Cal.

⁶⁶ Henry, for example, wrote, "I thought President Johnson's civil rights message to Congress was his high hour, and wrote him so—although I thought it was no business of the institutional church to

Even as evangelicals' studied ambivalence toward politics persisted in the decades after Henry's *Uneasy Conscience*, their political prospects grew. First, as they rode the postwar wave of economic prosperity, a rising social status offered the affluent "new evangelical" variety of evangelicals the resources and confidence to more robustly engage the political sphere. High giving rates in the midst of a growing national economy generated a massive program of institution-building in the 1960s and early 1970s.⁶⁷ Many evangelicals, along with millions of other Americans, moved to the suburbs from small towns and large cities, building new churches and schools as they went. Nowhere—except perhaps with burgeoning missionary work—was evangelical wealth more evident than in primary and secondary education. From 1959 to 1997, the number of students in non-Catholic private schools (nearly all founded by fundamentalists and evangelicals) jumped from 250,000 to at least 2.2 million, a remarkable rise given the financial commitment of paying both private school tuition and public school taxes.⁶⁸ At the post-secondary level, the proportion of evangelicals who had been to college tripled between 1960 and 1972. While the level was still below the national average, it was an impressive leap and an indicator of

endorse any specific legislative proposal in the name of the Church, and still have some personal reservations about some aspects of civil rights legislation." See Carl F.H. Henry, "What Social Structures?" *Reformed Journal* (May-June 1966), 6-7.

⁶⁷ In 1945 about one out of every 37 radio stations was broadcast evangelical programming; fifty years later, the 1,328 evangelical radio stations comprised one out of every eight stations in the nation. See Hamilton, "More Money, More Ministry: The Financing of American Evangelicalism since 1945," 110.

On the proportionally high levels of evangelical giving, see Dean R. Hoge and Mark A. Noll, "Levels of Contribution and Attitudes toward Money among Evangelicals and Non-Evangelicals in Canada and the U.S.," in *More Money, More Ministry*, ed. Larry Eskridge and Mark A. Noll (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000).

⁶⁸ Hamilton, "More Money, More Ministry: The Financing of American Evangelicalism since 1945," 120-125. Many of these left public schools in the 1960s because of concerns over southern integration and busing policies

evangelicalism's rising status.⁶⁹ Among the most prominent of the 100 evangelical colleges that would eventually make up the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities were Wheaton, Gordon, Calvin, Seattle Pacific, Asbury, and Westmont. Each of these schools flourished in the 1950s and 1960s.⁷⁰ At Seattle Pacific, for example, enrollment increased 63% to just over 2,000 students from 1960-1968. The number of full-time faculty doubled to 110. Nine major buildings were constructed at a total cost of \$7 million.⁷¹ Enrollment at Asbury College rose from 789 at the end of the war to 1,072 by 1965.⁷² Trinity Evangelical Divinity School grew from 31 to 600 between 1962 and 1972. By 1972, five evangelical seminaries—Trinity, Gordon-Conwell, Fuller, Asbury, and Dallas—had outpaced the premier mainline seminary Union in enrollment.⁷³ Upward mobility accelerated, and with greater resources evangelicals began to monitor educational legislation and work on ways to present a unified front to the public.⁷⁴

⁶⁹ John Stephen Hendricks, "Religious and Political Fundamentalism: The Links between Alienation and Ideology" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1977). On the building binge and rapid faculty hiring at evangelical colleges, see Thacker, *Vision and Miracle*, 185-193, 226. At Asbury, the number of faculty rose from 50 to 96 between 1969 to 1978.

⁷⁰ Wheaton received donations from Standard Oil and U.S. Steel. See Bechtel, *A Heritage Remembered*, 252. In Santa Barbara, California, Westmont College purchased several estates, received large donations from the United States Steel Foundation and other private benefactors, participated in the National Defense Student Loan Fund, earned accreditation, and saw its enrollment boom in the 1950s. See Lyle Charles Hillegas, "A History of Westmont College," (Ph.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1964), 151-160. Sociologist Ronald Enroth noted that many students at Westmont drove sports cars in the 1960s. See Enroth, *Urban Mission*, 110.

⁷¹ McNichols, *A Growing Vision*, 143.

⁷² Thacker, *Vision and Miracle*, 184.

⁷³ John R. W. Stott, "Impressions of American Christianity," 3. Copy of undated manuscript in Folder "Wallis at Trinity, Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

⁷⁴ By the early 1970s, the bright, young new president of Seattle Pacific University became an influential voice in Washington state politics and national educational circles. David McKenna in 1971 joined the Washington State Council on Higher Education, helping to pass Senate Bill #419, which provided a \$100 grant per student who chose to attend a private college or university. Two years later he was appointed as chair of an ad hoc committee on gambling for the state of Washington. The apolitical tradition of evangelicals remained—"Some thought that Seattle Pacific's president should

Second, a series of demographic and ecclesiastical shifts brought other conservative Protestants into the evangelical mainstream. As mainliners, ethnics, and homegrown American sects began to identify with the new evangelicalism, the number of denominations affiliated with the NAE doubled to thirty-two in the 1950s, while the number of members of these denominations tripled to nearly 1.5 million.⁷⁵ Even these numbers do not fully capture the growth of the new evangelicalism. Some evangelical mainliners, holding to an inspired Scripture, the necessity of evangelism, an exuberant worship style, and committed to a life of holiness, remained in their home denominations. They formed rump parties within the United Methodist or Presbyterian Church-USA denominations, listened to evangelist Charles Fuller on the radio, read *Christianity Today*, and attended Fuller Seminary. Mainline denominational leaders, for example, complained to David Howard of InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, an evangelical organization with chapters at hundreds of American universities, about its Urbana missionary convention. “Frankly, I dread another Urbana conference! Every time one of them comes around, we get a great influx of eager missionary candidates, and we don’t know what to do with them.”⁷⁶ Whether these evangelical mainliners left their mainline congregations or stayed, the new evangelicalism benefited.

not be involved in helping to form public policy,” notes the college historian—growing numbers of constituents supported McKenna and prominence he was building for the colleges. McKenna also served nationally on the boards of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the Association of American Colleges, and the council on Postsecondary Accreditation. See McNichols, *A Growing Vision*, 193-194.

⁷⁵ See “History of the NAE,” National Association of Evangelicals website <NAE.net>. Viewed September 11, 2007.

⁷⁶ See David M. Howard, “My Pilgrimage in Mission,” *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 21, No. 3 (July 1997), 119.

In addition, ethnic Protestants began to integrate more fully into American life and consequently into the new evangelicalism. Mennonites, long perceived as the “quiet in the land,” opened a Washington office to monitor government legislation in 1968. Around that time substantial numbers of Mennonites began to identify with Billy Graham.⁷⁷ Dutch Calvinists, long comfortable in the political realm, added numbers to the evangelical bloc in the 1960s and 1970s.⁷⁸ The Home Missions Board of the Christian Reformed Church, for instance, promoted the work of InterVarsity on secular college campuses, and the denomination participated in the 1973 evangelical missions campaign of “Key 73.”⁷⁹ While many of these ethnic Protestants retained native cultural and theological idiosyncrasies, evangelicalism was clearly a palatable destination for denominations in the late stages of acculturation.

The greatest numerical boon, however, came from Pentecostal and holiness traditions. Edith Blumhofer traces the Assemblies of God’s trajectory from New Testament and Azusa Street-style primitivism to its growing predilection for American culture and generic evangelicalism. Growing wealthier, deemphasizing the role of women in church affairs, and drifting from restorationism, the denomination joined the NAE in the 1940s. Other Pentecostal and holiness denominations similarly swelled the ranks of evangelicalism. By the 1950s five Pentecostal denominations—

⁷⁷ See Perry Bush, “Anabaptism Born Again: Mennonites, New Evangelicals, and the Search for a Usable Past, 1950-1980,” *Fides et Historia* 25 (Winter-Spring 1993), 26-47. On the Mennonite Central Committee’s Washington, D.C. office, Keith Graber Miller, *Wise As Serpents, Innocent As Doves: Mennonites Engage Washington* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1996).

⁷⁸ On the growing interaction of Dutch Calvinism with American evangelicalism in the mid-twentieth century, see James Bratt, *Dutch Calvinism in Modern America: A History of a Conservative Subculture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1984), 206.

⁷⁹ See chapter 14, “Beyond Ethnicity to Mainstream Evangelicalism,” in Lawrence K. Spalink, “History of the CRCNA,” Prepared for the Tokyo Theological Institute of the Reformed Church of Japan (May 1977). Also see Carl F.H. Henry, “Looking Back at Key 73,” *Reformed Journal* 24, No. 9 (November 1974).

Assemblies of God, Church of God (Cleveland), International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, Pentecostal Church of God, and the Pentecostal Holiness Church—comprised nearly two-thirds of NAE’s constituency. While Pentecostals would not fully integrate into the “new evangelical” network or contribute children to the evangelical left, the Pentecostal presence in the NAE signaled the rise of an important cross-fertilization that paved the way for later political collaboration with evangelical fundamentalists in the religious right.⁸⁰ Moreover, new evangelicals could include Pentecostal numbers in order to artificially inflate the size and strength of their movement.

That a sizable portion of Pentecostalism was rooted in the Sun Belt suggests the important role of geography in the conservative politicization of evangelicalism. In the 1960s and 1970s, the Sun Belt, already an evangelical hub, emerged as a cultural and economic force.⁸¹ The oil boom in Texas helped fund the political mobilization of the buckle of the Bible Belt. The Research Triangle in North Carolina infused sudden wealth into Baptist and Methodist communities. The migration of evangelical plain folk from the western South to southern California, combined with the booming defense industry, provided a large boost to evangelical prosperity.⁸²

An important political realignment away from the Democratic Party in the South also helped turn evangelicalism to the right. Dominant because it enforced

⁸⁰ Edith Blumhofer, *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993).

⁸¹ Bruce J. Schulman, *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics* (New York: Free Press, 2001), 102-117.

⁸² On southern California, see Darren Dochuk, “From Bible Belt to Sunbelt: Plain Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Southernization of Southern California, 1939-1969” (University of Notre Dame, 2005); Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right, Politics and Society in Twentieth-Century America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

racial lines, the Democratic Party held sway from the end of Reconstruction into the 1950s. But as Democrats on the national level “began to impose rights-based racial politics, threatening the localist tendencies of the South,” argues historian Mark Noll, “the region took a sharp turn to the right.” Evangelicals, which densely populated the South “became Republican because the South became Republican.”⁸³ This political realignment, coupled with the ascendancy of the Sun Belt, was enormously critical to the rise in wealth and concomitant improved political fortunes among northern new evangelicals.⁸⁴ This would not play out entirely on the national level until the 1980s, though there were early signs in the tentative political initiatives of rural Oklahoman Bill Bright and Campus Crusade, which made its most significant inroads in the West and South.⁸⁵

⁸³ Noll points out that race might not have been the most important factor in the realignment of southern evangelical politics. Specifically, evangelicals reacted to the expansion of central governmental power, felt first in the enforcement of desegregation but then in other federal mandates for rights-based change. Noll writes that “great political complaint of modern evangelicals has been directed against what is perceived as a federally sponsored intrusion of alien moral norms into local situations where local mores and local leaders had once dominated. This resentment began in the 1930s, with the New Deal. It was strengthened by the expanded federal power exerted on behalf of civil rights in the 1950s and 1960s. But it did not explode as a realigning political force until the 1970s and 1980s. Since then, evangelicals throughout the nation, but especially in the South, have reacted to morally offensive intrusions of the federal government by swinging to the Republicans as the party that promised to remove or reduce the intrusion. . . . So why did white evangelicals become Republicans? Because the South became Republican, and because evangelicals resented the federal enforcement of alien moral norms.” See Mark A. Noll, “Evangelicals and Politics,” paper presented at Colloquium on Religion and American History, University of Notre Dame, February 14, 2007. Billy Graham’s political identification offers a helpful example of the geographical bias by southerners toward the Democratic Party in the 1960s and 1970s. Graham called himself “a life-long Democrat.” Yet he held to a conservative politics and was a staunch supporter of Nixon and other Republicans. Lyman A. Kellstedt and Mark A. Noll, “Religion, Voting for President, and Party Identification, 1948-1984,” in *Religion and American Politics: From the Colonial Period to the 1980s*, ed. Mark A. Noll (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 372-374.

⁸⁴ It should be noted that a significant minority of self-identified, regular church-attending evangelicals in the North—34.9% in the 1960s—also identified themselves as Democratic. Most of these Democrats were not, however, involved in the “new evangelical” coalition of out which the evangelical left emerged.

⁸⁵ On Crusade’s rapid politicization in the 1970s and 1980s, see Turner, “Selling Jesus to Modern America,” 314-315, 370.

H. Maxey Jarman and J. Howard Pew, like Bright, also benefited from the Sun Belt windfall. A devout Southern Baptist deacon with a thick southern drawl, Jarman was founder and CEO of Genesco, Inc., a shoe company based in Nashville.⁸⁶ Taking over his father's business in 1938, Jarman built Genesco into the second largest shoe company in the United States by 1955, the year the Justice Department leveled an antitrust suit against Genesco. Through the 1950s Jarman extended his shoe manufacturing and retail company into a corporation that sold all kinds of apparel. In 1960, two years after he helped found *Christianity Today*, Genesco had sales of over \$350 million.⁸⁷ Along with J. Howard Pew, owner of Sun Oil Company (Sunoco), Jarman was the primary donor in the founding of *Christianity Today*.⁸⁸ Underwriting the \$225,000 cost of launching the magazine, they also mailed *Christianity Today* gratis to over 140,000 Protestant churchworkers. *Christianity Today* shot ahead of *Christian Century's* 37,500 subscribers and emerged immediately as the preeminent new evangelical journal and the most read religious journal in the nation.⁸⁹ Continued funding from Pew and Jarman, both active in right-wing politics, helped maintain and extend the journal's politically conservative orientation.⁹⁰

⁸⁶ See W. Maxey Jarman, *A Businessman Looks at the Bible* (Westwood, N.J.: Revell, 1965). Jarman was nationally prominent. In 1951 *Time* magazine wrote, "Every well-dressed man should have at least 30 pairs of shoes in his closet," says Nashville's debonair W. Maxey Jarman, 47."

⁸⁷ For more on the history of Genesco, see Bill Carey, *Fortunes, Fiddles, and Fried Chicken: A Nashville Business History* (Franklin, Ten.: Hillsboro Press, 2000).

⁸⁸ For correspondence between Pew and Jarman, see *Christianity Today* Collection, BGCA.

⁸⁹ "Conservatism Today," *Time* (July 13, 1962). In his autobiography Henry recounts the hundreds of television, radio, and print outlets that regularly quoted the magazine in its early years. See Henry, *Confessions*, 179-181.

⁹⁰ Jarman ran as a Republican for governor of Tennessee in 1970. Pew was even more conservative. The J. Howard Pew Freedom Trust, founded in 1957, was founded with the intent to expose Americans to the "evils of bureaucracy" and "the values of a free market" and "to inform our

Carl F. H. Henry, a reliable barometer of the evangelical posture toward politics in the 1950s and 1960s, fell victim to the more pronounced politics.⁹¹ In 1967 *Christianity Today* board members Pew, Harold Ockenga, and Nelson Bell, wanting an editor willing to more actively attack the liberal social emphases of mainline denominations and to take their own conservative politics public, ousted Henry in a confusing series of administrative moves.⁹² The faction then hired Harold Lindsell, a former Fuller faculty member whose avowal of biblical inerrancy as normative evangelicalism left him exposed and disgruntled at Fuller. With Lindsell as editor, *Christianity Today* edged closer to endorsing candidates and broad party platforms. Playing into the ecclesiastical controversies within Protestantism during the 1968 election, *Christianity Today* noted that Billy Graham and L. Nelson Bell, in contrast to Graham's more hesitant support of Nixon in 1960, supported Nixon, while leaders of the National Council of Churches were supporting the Democratic candidate

people of the struggle, persecution, hardship, sacrifice and death by which freedom of the individual was won." On Henry's intermittent battles with donors over editorial content, see Henry, *Confessions*, 160-163.

⁹¹ Henry would later complain that both left- and right-leaning evangelicals in the 1970s and 1980s were counting on "political salvation." See Fowler, *New Engagement*, 83.

⁹² The conflict originated over coverage of the National Council of Churches. Pew wanted to print harsh critiques of the NCC in *Christianity Today* for its engagement of social issues, for its efforts "to make the state a servant of the church for purposes of promoting an alien ideology"; Henry rebuffed him at considerable peril, given that Pew was bankrolling large portions of the magazine's budget. While Henry pushed for "social justice" along with "justification" in his remarks at the 1966 World Congress on Evangelism in Berlin, Pew wrote articles pushing a more explicitly politically conservative message that eschewed such language. His article entitled "Should the Church 'Meddle' in Civil Affairs?" in *Reader's Digest*, despite its apolitical overtones, betrayed Pew's allegiance to states' rights and limited government planks of the Republican Party. Each citation of how "concern for the world" was replacing "concern for the soul"—federal aid to education, civil rights, urban renewal, the admission of "Red China" to the United Nations, disarmament, higher minimum wages, forcible union membership—revealed Pew's anti-liberal politics. See J. Howard Pew, "Should the Church 'Meddle' in Civil Affairs?" *Reader's Digest* 88, No. 529 (May 1966), 49-54; "Social Issues and Politics: Are Churches Going Too Far?" *U.S. News & World Report*, Vol. 48 (April 25, 1960), 35; "The Mission of the Church," *Christianity Today* 13, No. 20 (July 3, 1964), 11-14.

Hubert Humphrey.⁹³ Feeling bombarded by the cultural and social cataclysms of the 1960s—changing sexual mores, a new willingness to challenge authority, and a rise in illegal drug use—editors invoked the Nixon campaign’s call for “law and order.” They stormed, “We *are* sick! For one thing we are sick of unasked, unruly potheads who shoot from the lip at our generation.”⁹⁴ In 1970, editors questioned the patriotism and democratic credentials of labor unions, suggesting that unions and strikers obstructed the liberty of the economy.⁹⁵ In 1972, the magazine warned about the dangers of social security, declaring that “the attempt to create an infallible security on earth easily slips over into a kind of idolatry.”⁹⁶ Lindsell’s coverage of the 1972 election showed a clear bias toward the Republican candidates, painting Nixon as a safe, reliable centrist and McGovern as dishonest and scheming. In an editorial aside Lindsell confided that he and other evangelical luminaries would be voting for Nixon.⁹⁷

Other evangelical organizations began to outspokenly support Republicans. In the heat of the 1972 presidential campaign, Bright read a telegram from Nixon at a Campus Crusade convention in Dallas that called for a “deep and abiding commitment to spiritual principles” to over 70,000 youth, who by a five-to-one margin supported Nixon. That Nixon would send such a telegram highlighted

⁹³ In this section of the politics of *Christianity Today*, I am indebted to the analysis and sources of James Fowler, *A New Engagement*, 23-41.

⁹⁴ “We Are Sick,” *Christianity Today* 11, No. 25 (September 29, 1967), 34.

⁹⁵ Robert L. Cleath, “Rendering unto Caesar,” *Christianity Today* 14, No. 20 (July 3, 1970), 32-33.

⁹⁶ “Editorial,” *Christianity Today* (November 10, 1972), 38-39. This editorial, however, provoked a flood of sharp-edged rebuttals from evangelical readers.

⁹⁷ On the close ties between Billy Graham and Richard Nixon, see Lowell D. Streiker and Gerald S. Strober, *Religion and the New Majority: Billy Graham, Middle America, and the Politics of the 70s* (New York: Association Press, 1972), 70-77.

Crusade's growing size, wealth, and influence. That Bright would read the telegram demonstrated the organization's new openness to political engagement in the 1960s and 1970s.⁹⁸

Despite the new rhetorical stridency, an instinctive apoliticism lingered. Even Lindsell, for all his attraction the Republican Party and his personal endorsement of Nixon, walked a tightrope between conservative politics and distrust of politics. The world was an evil place, Lindsell maintained, and Scripture made no promise of an earthly utopia. Thus, social reform was a tricky prospect. Though "every believer ... ought to be involved in seeking the improvement of society," Lindsell wrote, this was not the primary task of Christians; believers would always "endure tribulation in the world."⁹⁹ There was truth in the argument "that the world is filled with evils about which we can do nothing."¹⁰⁰ The best approach was to transform individuals. These "born again" believers would then live out their faith, stamping their spiritual influence on the social structures of the United States. Faith commitment trumped party affiliation, with which involvement could often be "dirty" and "compromising."¹⁰¹ Thus prominent new evangelicals never explicitly told their constituents to vote Republican. In 1968 the *Christianity Today* editor Harold Lindsell, successor to Henry, made a point to explain that it would not endorse any

⁹⁸ Turner, "Selling Jesus to Modern America," 181-189, 219-228, 281. For more on Bright's growing ties to conservative politics, see Box 241 in the Walter H. Judd Collection, Hoover Institution Archives. Judd, a stridently anti-communist congressman from Palo Alto, was a major contributor and supporter of Crusade and Christian Citizen starting in the early 1960s.

⁹⁹ Harold Lindsell, "Think on These Things," *The Other Side* (March-April 1975), 18 (15-17); Harold Lindsell, *The World, the Flesh, and the Devil* (Washington: Canon Press, 1973), 39.

¹⁰⁰ Lindsell, "Think on These Things," 19.

¹⁰¹ "There is a deep-seated feeling among evangelicals that 'politics is dirty.' Since social action in democratic societies involves political activity, and political activity requires compromise and thus failure to achieve that which is ideal, it has been felt that the church's purity would be threatened by social action programs." See Moberg, *Inasmuch*, 20.

candidate. Again in 1972, there was no official endorsement. While those reading between the lines could very easily discern a conservative bent in the pages of *Christianity Today*, political activism, while increasing, was still only a marginally legitimate activity for the church.¹⁰²

Given the more explicit alliance between evangelicals and the Republican Party that emerged in the 1980s, scholars have not fully appreciated the tenuous roots of this relationship. While a mass of evangelicals sympathized with conservative politics from the 1940s through the 1970s, their mobilization into the political juggernaut of the Religious Right was not at all certain. As late as 1975, Reformed scholar Gordon Spykman could write, “Evangelical Christians look much like a gathering army of recruits without strong leadership or clearly understood marching orders.”¹⁰³ Even as the early call for social engagement surged in the 1940s and 1960s, evangelicals’ fundamental priority and basis for social change remained personal transformation rather than political activism. Evangelicals were more likely to send emissaries who could in a very general sense bring spiritual values to the political realm, not immerse themselves as a religious bloc in the gritty politicking of the American party system. A transformed eschatology and rising social status had

¹⁰² Vernon Grounds articulated this distinction between political activity on the part of individual Christians and political activity pushed by the church as a whole. He wrote, “We can and must declare that the church qua church ought not enter the political arena. Its function is that of instructing and inspiring its members either individually or unitedly to undertake whatever political activity neighbor-love may demand. . . . Nobody and no organization is authorized to speak for the church qua church.” (30) See pamphlet entitled “Evangelicalism and Social Responsibility” in InterVarsity Collection, Billy Graham Archives. For more evidence of evangelicalism’s conservative, but apolitical stance, see Wesley Pippert, *Memo for 1976: Some Political Options* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1976), 10-11, 19.

¹⁰³ Gordon Spykman, “The Tower of Babel Revisited,” *Vanguard* (July-August 1975), 24.

brought evangelicals to the brink of political activism, but they did not yet inextricably tie their ballots to their faith.

The immediate path to a more politicized evangelicalism, however, surprised many. Remarkably, the more celebrated politicization of evangelicalism on the right in the 1980s was preceded by evangelical political activism on the left. The evangelical left, sparked by the civil rights movement and the Vietnam War, would draw the attention of the media and expose as caricature the image of evangelicals as uniformly conservative and Republican. Yet for young evangelicals, the caricature felt all too real. As one young evangelical put it in 1970, “Here we are, most of us well-off off-spring of middle-class parents. Not a whole lot for many of us to worry over, suffer for. Looking at us here, who would guess what victims we are? We are victims of our past. Our Evangelical history with its immersion in the American Way of Death seems almost to drown us.”¹⁰⁴ The next generation did not necessarily inherit the reflexive social conservatism of many mid-century evangelicals.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ Richard Forbes, “Is Urbana Really Lost,” *Vanguard* (December 31, 1970). Copy in Box 68, Folder 7, “Urbana 1961-1974,” InterVarsity Collection, Billy Graham Archives.

¹⁰⁵ Of the 518 Lyndon Johnson supporters on Wheaton’s campus in 1964, only 188 said that their parents would cast the same ballot. See “Mock Ballot Contradicts National Vote,” *Wheaton Record* 98, No. 7 (November 5, 1964): 1.

CHAPTER TWO
CAMPUS POLITICS: THE STUDENT SEARCH FOR AN AUTHENTIC
EVANGELICALISM

The visiting evangelist jabbed his finger at the youngster perched on a front-row pew and declared, “If Jesus came back tonight, your mommy and daddy would be taken to heaven, and you would be left all by yourself.” Frightened, the child went home with his parents to an FHA-financed, three-bedroom home in the suburbs of Detroit, where his mother told him that God loved him and “wanted him to be His child.” Nodding his head, six-year-old Jim Wallis, future war protestor and founder of the leftist tabloid *The Post-American*, was “saved.” Wallis’ childhood progressed in idyllic fashion amidst a loving family that offered “an abundance of warm affirmations, constant kudos, and great expectations for success”—and fully ensconced in his evangelical Plymouth Brethren congregation that opposed movie-watching, maintained a staunch theological conservatism, and warmly embraced its small circle of members.

Wallis, however, rebelled in his teenage years against this world of suburban evangelical piety. Coming of age in the 1960s, Wallis did not want to be “just another white kid from everything that was ‘middle’ about America.” “We were from Michigan,” he later explained. “We were middle-class. We were Christians. We lived

in a nice suburban Detroit neighborhood and my brother and sisters and I all went to good schools. The world looked fine to us. My parents believed that we lived in the best city in the best state in the best country in the world.” Wallis found his parents’ judgment incomprehensible, especially as he sensed the anger in the writings of Malcolm X, took self-directed field trips into inner-city Detroit, and began college at Michigan State University. Soon estranged from his faith and his bewildered church, Wallis joined MSU’s chapter of Students for a Democratic Society, quickly becoming one of East Lansing’s most proficient protest organizers. By the end of college Wallis had returned to his childhood faith, but not to the suburban pieties of his childhood. He emerged instead as the founder of the Post-American community in Chicago, perhaps the most prominent voice of the evangelical left.¹

Such narratives of existential quests fill the historiography of modern industrial America. T. J. Jackson Lears’ *No Place of Grace*, for example, documents the existential crises of turn-of-the-century American intellectuals. Douglas Rossinow’s *The Politics of Authenticity* explores the alienation and existentialism of mainline Protestant students in Austin, Texas.² Scholars, however, have not examined the tens of thousands of young evangelicals who displayed much of the same kind of social and spiritual angst found in both Austin and the New Left’s *Port Huron Statement*. Passionate articles in evangelical student newspapers, lauding authenticity

¹ See Jim Wallis, *Faith Works* (New York: Random House, 2000), 3-4; Krista Tippett interview of Jim Wallis, “The New Evangelical Leaders, Part I: Jim Wallis,” American Public Media radio, November 29, 2007.

² T. J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981); Douglas C. Rossinow, *The Politics of Authenticity: Liberalism, Christianity, and the New Left in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998); Marjorie Hope, *Youth against the World* (Boston: Little Brown, 1970); Christopher Lasch, *The New Radicalism in America, 1889-1963: The Intellectual as a Social Type* (New York: Knopf, 1965).

and community, urged students to be “real.”³ Others complained of parents who, despite teaching them to sing “red and yellow, black and white,” still opposed civil rights legislation.⁴ Angst-ridden young evangelicals in the late 1960s and early 1970s called their religious tradition back to a more consistent, authentic faith.

If a quest for authenticity gave them motivation, a growing push in their heritage toward political engagement gave the young evangelicals a method. At evangelical colleges across America, students heard dozens of politicians speak each year. Professors urged students to tackle social issues by entering new professional vocations. Political science professor Richey Kamm urged his Wheaton students for instance to enter “a new mission field—public service and law.”⁵ All this reflected the growing wealth and rapprochement with American culture that characterized the mid-twentieth century. Evangelicals sought to be, and increasingly became, players in American politics.

Yet the new evangelical plenty that made such politicization possible was rejected by the very the recipients of this wealth. The advantages of the suburbs—good schools, social networking, and money to attend college—offered evangelical youth tools to savagely attack their parents’ strivings and commitments, claiming the label of “radicals” and sometimes speaking against “Amerika.” In a classic example of generational cleavage and in an ironic extension of the new evangelical social

³ A population bubble between 1946 and 1964 produced 76 million children, a higher birthrate than in any era before or since. Young Americans not only represented a larger portion of the general population than at any time in American history, but also perhaps formed a more unified, self-conscious entity.

⁴ See Richard Mouw interview, July 12, 2006.

⁵ See Charles Redfield interview in which he talks about the influence of a young history professor at Wheaton that steered him toward politics. See oral interview of Charles Redfield, Tape 8725, Wheaton College Archives.

conscience, thousands of evangelical youth turned against the social and political institutions that nurtured them, using their growing resources to fight the Republican Party, question capitalism, protest the Vietnam War, clash with college administrators over rules, and scoff at the middle class.⁶

Some evangelical institutions, which now share a reputation as the training grounds of the religious right, did not supply Jerry Falwell's shock troops. Rather, for a time in the 1970s, evangelical colleges and student structures formed the core of a vibrant network of moderate, sometimes radical, evangelical culture and politics. This web of evangelical institutions ranged from elite schools such as Wheaton, Gordon, and Westmont; certain chapters of InterVarsity Christian Fellowship; the leftist Christian World Liberation Front in Berkeley, California; intentional communities of disillusioned seminarians such as the Post-American and The Other Side; and evangelical ethnics such as Mennonites and radical Calvinists at the Institute for Christian Studies in Toronto. Key students, faculty, and benefactors of these institutions, driven by a rising social consciousness, showed a rather astonishing resonance with progressive and radical politics that would culminate in a 1973 bid in Chicago to capture large chunks of evangelicalism.

⁶ The young evangelical antipathy toward the middle class produced many defenses by evangelical leaders. A helpful example of these 1970s attempts to rehabilitate the reputation of the middle class is Charles Merrill Smith, *The Case of a Middle-Class Christian* (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1973).

I.

Wheaton College, one of the most substantial sources of the evangelical left, provides a helpful case study of this trajectory.⁷ Located in one of the most Republican vicinities—DuPage County, Illinois—in the United States, the college mirrored the area’s politics and growing prosperity. Historian Michael Hamilton has argued that Wheaton during the 1950s and 1960s epitomized the new evangelicalism’s growing social and intellectual optimism. He points out that Wheaton increasingly attracted the children of the evangelical elite to the point that the college became known in the 1960s as “the evangelical Harvard.”⁸ More typical of other nearly 100 evangelical colleges that would eventually form the Coalition of Christian Colleges and Universities was that Wheaton’s administration and constituency also turned more decisively Republican in the 1950s and 1960s. The Young Republicans flourished, and the many presidential candidates, U.S. Senators, and state representatives who visited campus were usually affiliated with the GOP. Hudson Armerding, president of Wheaton during these decades and former Navy admiral, kept a tight leash on any students and faculty who harbored non-patriotic sentiments.

Cracks in the conservative foundation, however, began to show by the mid-1960s. The student newspaper *The Wheaton Record* printed regular editorials and articles extolling the virtues of dissent, criticism, “real community,” and

⁷ George M. Marsden, *Evangelicalism and Modern America* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1984), xv.

⁸ Michael Hamilton, “The Fundamentalist Harvard: Wheaton College and the Continuing Vitality of American Evangelicalism, 1919-1965” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1994).

“authenticity.”⁹ Long hair and informal styles of clothing began to appear in the mid-1960s.¹⁰ Folk music replaced hymns in student-led worship services. Students began to resist some of the fundamentalist pieties of their parents and college, particularly bans on card-playing and movie-watching. For many fundamentalist youth, attending Wheaton in this era felt liberating. Thomas Howard’s *Christ the Tiger*, a best-selling account of the liberation of a fundamentalist youth at Wheaton, chronicles one student’s encounter with classmates who nurtured very different notions of piety. Howard dabbled in the diverse theologies and sensibilities of Anabaptism, Pentecostalism, and “victorious life” evangelicalism. His professors also injected critical thinking into his education, both frightening and intriguing him with critiques of six-day, 24-hour flood geology and praise of modern art and music.¹¹ As innocuous an environment as Wheaton might have seemed from the outside, the path of many Wheaton students through the thickets of non-denominationalism and the liberal arts led them to question their own traditions.

An energetic minority of students—most of them associated with campus student publications—more quickly outpaced Howard’s mild dissent. Wes Craven, a provocateur at Wheaton long before his notorious career in the horror film genre,

⁹ For particularly clear statements see “Campus Leaders Scrutinize College Authority, Responsibility,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 2 (September 30, 1965), 3; “Authenticity Versus ‘Adjustment,’” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 25 (March 31, 1966), 2; Robin Maxson, “Open, Honest Dialogue ‘In’ on Campus,” *Wheaton Record* 90, No. 13 (January 12, 1968), 2. *The Record* also printed dozens of sympathetic wire reports about student rights, protests, and dissent on other campuses.

¹⁰ See Anne Hanchett, “Growing Beards: Social Protest or Convenience?” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 21 (March 3, 1966), 3; Kippy Reynolds, “New Dress Philosophy Boosts Casual Campus Atmosphere,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 22 (March 10, 1966), 5.

¹¹ Thomas Howard, *Christ the Tiger: A Postscript to Dogma* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1990). From Wheaton, Howard served a stint in the army, traveled with InterVarsity, and went to graduate school, where he turned into a bohemian who read *The New Republic*. Howard became a professor of literature and mentor of young evangelicals at the evangelical Gordon College. In the mid-1980s he converted to Catholicism.

battled the administration as editor of the arts magazine *Kodon* in the 1960s. Insisting that students be permitted to watch Hollywood films and sharply critiquing his fundamentalist heritage, Craven wrote, “It is the conviction in this office, that, in the arts the Fundamentalist Christian world, and more specifically Wheaton, is sadly short of its potential, and far behind its contemporaries. Therefore the copy of this magazine will remain (as long as the present staff remains), free and limited only by the criteria and the boundaries of artistry.”¹² This, coupled with a string of edgy articles with a melancholic, existentialist tone, provoked the administration to suspend publication of *Kodon*.¹³ Another underground tabloid—*Brave Son*—criticized the campus’s neo-classical architecture, evangelical fiction, and the administration’s enthusiasm in acting out the role of *in loco parentis*. More biting, it dismissed Wheaton’s chapel services as “sacred vaudeville, spiritual patent remedies, and amateur psychiatry.”¹⁴ When Armerding’s administration told antiwar students that “You didn’t have to come to Wheaton,” one student retorted, “Must we cease to think, to evaluate, upon admission to the college?”¹⁵ The dissenting students complained that “the administration has done its best to keep honest critics out of official school functions, and off the chapel platform. The admissions office has been careful not to admit too many of the more radical types.” “We had better start listening to the very ones we are turning away,” a 1974 student complained. “If not,

¹² Quoted in Paul Bechtel, *Wheaton College: A Heritage Remembered, 1860-1984* (Wheaton: Shaw, 1984), 265.

¹³ Hamilton, “The Fundamentalist Harvard,” 248.

¹⁴ Hamilton, “The Fundamentalist Harvard,” 245. See Coleman Coates, “Cavalcade of Columns,” Scott Perlenfein, “Don’t Live, Write,” and Bert Greener, “O Father Wheaton,” *Brave Son* 1, No. 1 (1961).

¹⁵ Rich Bard, “Leaving Wheaton Is Not the Answer,” 90, No. 28 *Wheaton Record* (May 17, 1968), 2.

we may never wake up.” The result was “so many basically lonely people among the students and faculty of Wheaton College.”¹⁶

A milder organ of dissent, the *Wheaton Record*, kept the insurgency alive, publishing regular editorials and letters condemning fundamentalist insularity and heralding a new age of evangelicalism that would send churches and workers back to the cities from the suburbs.¹⁷ The *Record* issued repeated calls to social action in the early 1960s. Reporters wrote weekly articles on students’ participation in the Peace Corps, the National Student Association, and the Model United Nations.¹⁸ The newspaper’s editors published elaborate spreads of Wheaton students protesting for civil rights in Selma. They denounced “the coercion from the far right” upon Wheaton from donors.¹⁹ They protested presidential candidate Barry Goldwater’s 1964 appearance on campus and campaigned for Lyndon Johnson’s candidacy, purchasing a half-page ad in *The Record* that featured 120 signatures.²⁰

¹⁶ Stephen Farra, “Wheaton College—A Nest for WASPS?” *Wheaton Record* 96, No. 13 (February 8, 1974), 4.

¹⁷ M. McNeilly, “Suburbia and Christianity—We Must Transcend the Value System around Us or Else We Deny God,” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 30 (May 11, 1967), 2. McNeilly argues that middle-class values are the result of living in suburbs. Is the church “a pious club, a corporation delegated to handle divine affairs?” The article answers that God is not “a good, suburban, country-clubbing, week-end golfing, business-minded conservative Republican God, who would fit in so comfortably here.” Suburbanites are out to escape “minority groups, taxes, the mental and moral constraints of the city.”

¹⁸ For examples of calls for students to extend influence beyond the evangelical subculture, see Bob Herron, “Gospel Entails Social Implications,” *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 24 (March 25, 1965), 4; Janet Porcino, “Hubbard Urges Action on Social Issues,” *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 31 (May 20, 1965), 5; Conrad Brown, “New Students: On Wheaton’s Aura,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 1 (September 23, 1965), 2; “Wheatonites or a Student Generation?” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 1 (September 22, 1966), 2; Nancy Illback, “Ockenga Sees Social Action as Primary Student Concern,” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 2 (September 29, 1966), 1; Leif Torjesen, “Christians Must Resolve Conflict between Sacred and Secular although Ambiguity Remains,” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 18 (February 2, 1967), 2; “Anderson Urges Christians to Use their Political Power,” *Wheaton Record* 91, No. 9 (November 15, 1968), 4.

¹⁹ See, for example, Calvin Veltman, “Coercion from the Far Right” *Wheaton Record* 85, No. 15 (December 13, 1962), 2.

²⁰ See “Johnson for President” advertisement in *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 5 (October 23, 1964), 12.

Many of these signatures and dissenting articles came from students and faculty with ties to the nascent social science division, a haven for progressives seeking some measure of distance from the conservative evangelical subculture.²¹ Students and faculty in the social sciences dominated the Clapham Society, a group of self-proclaimed “liberal” students, who vehemently argued against capital punishment, nuclear proliferation, elements of free enterprise, and invited Democratic Party candidates to speak to their club. A succession of progressive clubs—Social Action Forum, Americans for Democratic Action, the Young Democrats, and the Jonathan Blanchard Association—carried on this progressive tradition through the

²¹ The creation of the social science division at Wheaton signaled a new era, given the traditional fear of social sciences at evangelical schools. In 1963 not a single evangelical college in the United States employed a professor with a Ph.D. in political science. At Wheaton and Gordon, historians taught political science courses. The discipline of sociology was similarly marginalized. Though introduced as a major already by 1935 at Wheaton, sociology did not earn its own department until 1957. Yet amidst the social ferment of the 1960s, sociology grew rapidly. At Gordon, the social sciences were revitalized in the 1950s and 1960s as the college hired young, aggressive PhDs. At Wheaton the college began to sponsor conferences in the early 1950s on “Christian Service in the Field of Social Work.” The matriarch of the department, Lamberta Voget, organized these gatherings, took students on urban immersion trips to Chicago, and founded and held together the National Association of Christians in Social Work in the 1950s and 1960s. By the 1970s Wheaton’s department of sociology featured diversity that the rest of the college lacked: African-American Ozzie Edwards, Ka Tong Gaw, Voget, and Zondra Lindblade. This department did much to promote the Peace Corps program in the 1960s and the HNGR program, which I discuss in chapter five. See Paul Henry speech, “Reflections on Evangelical Christianity and Political Action,” at Messiah College in Grantham, Pa., in 1989. The text is reprinted in Douglas L. Koopman, ed., *Serving the Claims of Justice: The Thoughts of Paul B. Henry* (Grand Rapids: The Paul B. Henry Institute, 2001), 247-248; G. Lloyd Carr, “Development of the Humanities Division,” in Ann Ferguson, ed., *Shaping a Heritage: Celebrating the Centennial* (Wenham, Mass.: Gordon College, 1989), 90-95. On the fear of the social sciences, see Hamilton, “Fundamentalist Harvard,” 134; “Department Forum to Analyze Evangelical Fear of Sociology,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 16 (January 20, 1966), 1. John Scanzoni, a graduate of Wheaton’s sociology department and new faculty member at Indiana University, had to defend against charges that sociology was socialism and communism. See Richard Cartrell, “Sociology Forum Questions Church Role, Pastorate as Highest Christian Vocation,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 18 (February 10, 1966), 5. On urban immersion trips, see Mark Olson, “Radical Social Activists Blame Chicago Machine,” *Wheaton Record* 90, No. 11 (December 8, 1967), 5, which describes the three-day visit of 40 sociology students to the Latin American Defense Organization (which included several Wheaton graduates such as Carol Tatman, ‘66), a radical group that “fights the machine” through sit-ins, rent strikes, demonstrations, and protests. On the rise of evangelical social work, see Alan Keith-Lucas, *Integrating Faith and Practice: A History of the North American Association of Christians in Social Work* (St. Davids, Pa.: North American Association of Christians in Social Work, 1994). NACSW grew from 132 members in 1963 to 1,368 in 1979. David Moberg also stresses the importance of evangelical involvement in social work in David Moberg, *Inasmuch: Christian Social Responsibility in the Twentieth Century* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), 154-157.

1980s. The latter organization strategically used the memory of Wheaton’s founding president, a stalwart abolitionist and economic reformer.²² Claiming to be the true heirs of Blanchard, progressive students in 1970 wrote a headline in a parody newspaper that read “Blanchard Rejected by Admissions; Bearded Founder Not Welcome Here.” The reasons: Blanchard’s views on civil rights, postmillennialism, government land grants, facial hair, and pacifism.²³ Longing to reclaim Blanchard’s legacy, students condemned their college “as an introspective island in a world desperate for action.”²⁴

While discontent with Wheaton’s instinctively conservative politics and pieties—its too-slow embrace of civil rights, its pessimistic view of end times that excused inaction on social issues, its antagonism with any government bureaucracy, its strict dress standards—was important to the formation of Wheaton’s young evangelicals, it was Wheaton’s ROTC program that became the flashpoint for the student agitators.²⁵ Until the mid-1970s, when mandatory ROTC participation by

²² Established in 1859, Wheaton and its founder Jonathan Blanchard were cast in the mold of the great nineteenth-century evangelical reformers. Closely tied to the activist Beecher family, Blanchard pursued an abolitionist, anti-secret society course, culminating in an ill-advised 1882 presidential campaign on the Anti-Masonic Party ticket. By the 1920s, however, Wheaton had built strong ties with the World Christian Fundamentals Association and other fundamentalist organizations less interested in pursuing social reform and political engagement than in preserving pure doctrine and spreading the gospel. This trajectory in the early twentieth century from social concern to a more individualistic orientation came to be called the “Great Reversal” by self-critical evangelicals in the 1950s. The term, coined by historian Timothy Smith, became the title of an influential book by evangelical sociologist David Moberg. See Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 85-93; David O. Moberg, *The Great Reversal: Evangelism Versus Social Concern* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1972).

²³ January 16, 1970, issue of *The Wheaton Rancor*. Copy in vertical file folder “Secondary Campus Publications,” WCA.

²⁴ Mark Noll, “Introspection May Prevent Meaningful Action,” *Wheaton Record* 90, No. 8 (November 10, 1967), 2.

²⁵ For a sense of the Wheaton administration’s rejection of social unrest, see Armerding’s commencement address in 1965 in which he is very critical of a student who calls for a “new evangelism” that would consist of “boycott, picket, strike or march.” “Long-term social reforms,” said Armerding, “can be more effectively brought about by vital spiritual activity on the part of Christians

freshmen and sophomores was lifted, students picketed the annual ROTC review. In their protests, students, while careful to differentiate themselves from Students for a Democratic Society, nonetheless borrowed many of SDS's social critiques regarding American imperialism as well as class structures and feminism. This curious mix of leftist rhetoric with an evangelical theology created a volatile situation on Wheaton's campus: a progressive student minority clashing with a conservative administration, seen by the students as a breathing caricature of the patriotic establishment.²⁶ Dozens of key evangelical left leaders emerged from Wheaton alone, including John Alexander, Phil Harnden, and Mark Olson, all founding members of The Other Side in Philadelphia; Thomas Howard, author of *Christ the Tiger*; Leighton Ford, brother-in-law of Billy Graham and an evangelist concerned with social justice; political scientist and congressman Paul Henry; historians Mark Noll and Nathan Hatch; Nancy Hardesty, founder of the Evangelical Women's Caucus; and progressive political theorists Jim Skillen and Steve Mott.

Future members of the evangelical left also emerged from other campuses, where students similarly struggled with angst over their evangelical heritage. At Seattle Pacific, college administrators suspended the student newspaper after editors denounced behavioral restrictions. This dissent, however, extended to broader social concerns. SPU students demonstrated against the Vietnam War alongside University of Washington students. Student Michael Havens felt as if he was "part of something

than by social legislation." See Natalie Strombeck, "Armerding Stresses Moral, Spiritual Tasks as Christian Education Confronts Relativism," *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 17 (February 4, 1965), 1.

²⁶ Several key faculty members mediated between the students and administration. Professors Howard Claassen, Norman Ewert, and Gilbert Bilezekian, for example, wrote progressive letters and columns in *The Record* and sponsored the Jonathan Blanchard Society.

larger and more important than simply rebelling against quaint religious restrictions.”²⁷ At Asbury College in rural Kentucky, concerns about freedom of the college press, rules, the place of African-Americans on campus, the draft, and the Vietnam War dominated the student newspaper *The Collegian* during the 1960s.²⁸ At Trinity College in suburban Chicago, students, prompted by a talented coterie of assistant professors fresh out of graduate school, began to challenge the middle-class, dispensationalist, and patriotic assumptions of their parents.²⁹ At the Oregon Extension of Trinity College, dissenting faculty and students suspicious of established evangelical institutions set up a wilderness classroom in the mountains of southern Oregon. They used an alternative curriculum that questioned evangelicalism’s symbiotic relationship with consumer culture, explored dark corners of American history, and interrogated the morality of the Vietnam War.³⁰ Each of these schools—and others such as Gordon in Massachusetts, Calvin in Michigan, and Messiah in Pennsylvania—reveal the permeability of the evangelical subculture. Evangelical colleges—touched by the same issues that captivated secular schools—were inextricably linked to popular and political culture, not partitioned from it. For many, engagement with “the world” came not in a reactionary rejection of the dramatic cultural shifts of the sixties, but rather in resonance with elements of the counterculture and friction with evangelical mores.

²⁷ Michael Havens interview, April 3, 2007.

²⁸ Joseph A. Thacker, *Asbury College: Vision and Miracle* (Nappanee, Ind.: Evangel Press, 1990), 218-219.

²⁹ Randall Balmer, *Growing Pains: Learning to Love My Father’s Faith* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2001), 102-103.

³⁰ Randall Balmer, *Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory: A Journey into the Evangelical Subculture of America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 210.

II.

Students in InterVarsity Christian Fellowship took similar steps toward moderate politics on secular campuses. Emerging from Great Britain in the 1930s as part of the postwar missions surge, InterVarsity served as a conservative alternative to the Student Christian Movement. In America, which had previously felt very little evangelical presence on its campuses, InterVarsity quickly spread under the leadership of C. Stacey Woods. From its first chapter at the University of Michigan, InterVarsity mushroomed to 200 chapters in 1945, then to over 550 by 1950, swamping the presence of mainline Protestant campus ministries. As in Britain, InterVarsity in America worked self-consciously to promote the kind of warm piety and emphasis on missions and revival that evangelicals saw as lacking in mainline denominations.³¹ One of the hundreds of para-church organizations founded by evangelicals in the 1940s and 1950s, InterVarsity became one of the chief arbiters for the rising mid-century new evangelical movement as it faced student unrest in the 1960s, for the most part balancing evangelical piety with openness to new trends in American culture.³²

³¹ Annual meetings and the thousands of chapters demonstrated this evangelical commitment. Students were encouraged to nurture a “personal devotion,” a time each day devoted to reading Scripture and praying. They were also encouraged to consider their role in “reaching the world for Christ.” For many InterVarsity members, that meant a lifetime of prayer and generous giving to missions. For some, that meant going to medical school or seminary in preparation for a lifetime of overseas ministry. For more on InterVarsity’s place in the postwar missions surge, see Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 181-186. For more on the decline of mainline denominations, see Leonard Sweet, “The 1960s: the Crises of Liberal Christianity and the Public Emergence of Evangelicalism, in George Marsden, ed., *Evangelicalism and Modern America* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 29-45.

³² Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, 239; Keith Hunt and Gladys M. Hunt, *For Christ and the University: The Story of Intervarsity Christian Fellowship of the U.S.A., 1940-1990* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1991).

The growth and piety of InterVarsity squarely positioned the organization in what historian Bruce Shelley calls the “fourth great awakening.”³³ Shelley contends that InterVarsity, Youth for Christ, Young Life, and Campus Crusade filled the void left by mainline churches in meeting the needs of adolescents and students and in seeking to realize evangelicalism’s twin ambitions of evangelism—winning the souls of youth—and cultural resurgence—winning America for Christ. Historians, however, have not yet probed the profoundly diverse characters of each of these youth organizations. InterVarsity, for example, clashed with the other large university ministry Campus Crusade, both in its competition for students and in its methods of evangelism and cultural resurgence.³⁴ In the 1950s and 1960s InterVarsity stressed a rigorous intellectual faith, for example, whereas Crusade hunted for quick conversions. In the 1960s, pronounced political contrasts emerged. InterVarsity, whose cultural mandate did not instinctively lean toward right-wing politics as Crusade’s did, empathized with student grievances.³⁵ InterVarsity’s head John Alexander blamed the universities for poor teaching, boredom, an inadequate grading system, an abysmal student/faculty ratio, and poor student housing. “There is too

³³ Bruce Shelley, “The Rise of Evangelical Youth Movements,” *Fides et Historia* 18, No. 1 (January 1986), 47-63.

³⁴ “Whenever CCC opens a work on a campus, attendance at IVCF functions drops,” wrote InterVarsity’s president. “The drop can be considerable as at the University of Georgia where the weekly meeting plummeted from 70 to 20.” “Be very careful about co-sponsoring any endeavors with CCC. Be friendly with their people. Pray for God’s hand upon them. But as far as official efforts are concerned, let Paul be Paul and Barnabus be Barnabus. . . . Their methodologies and philosophies are so different that, like Paul and Barnabus, they will do best to go their separate ways.” See John Alexander to “IVCF family,” June 11, 1965, in Box 3, Folder 3, “Campus Crusade: correspondence and materials, 1960-1976,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

³⁵ On the politics of Crusade, see John Turner, “Sharing God with Modern America: A History of Campus Crusade for Christ” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2005). A majority of articles and letters on politics in the February 1965 issue of *HIS* by contrast argued that God was not on the side of any political party.

much injustice in too many American colleges for me to sit idly by,” he wrote in 1968. Alexander urged reform of university structures and broader social structures in which racial prejudice and poverty flourished.³⁶

InterVarsity leaders in fact encountered turbulence from within their own organization. Students unhappy with established evangelical sensibilities regularly condemned the insularity and wealth of their tradition. Why were white evangelical churches leaving the cities for suburbs? Why were evangelicals growing wealthy while minorities remained impoverished? Why were American missionaries such cultural imperialists?³⁷ Articles in InterVarsity’s monthly magazine dealt increasingly with issues of social justice such as capital punishment, democracy, and the war in Vietnam.³⁸ At Urbana 67, the triennial conference, student agitation on the arena floor disquieted InterVarsity leaders. Many of the 9,200 students in attendance repeatedly challenged speakers at the convention for being white and male. Several students read a resolution complaining about a lack of “black men” in leadership positions on the national staff.”³⁹ Students also grumbled about the sexist title of the convention theme: “God’s Men—From All Nations to All Nations.” When evangelical icon John

³⁶ John Alexander, “Campus Unrest: Some Characteristics, Causes and Cures,” June 1970, in Box 21, Folder 2: “Student Unrest/Dissent (1960s),” and John W. Alexander to “Friend,” November 1968, in Box 38, Folder 38: “Testimonials,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

³⁷ On cultural imperialism, see “A Man to Reckon With,” *HIS* 23, No. 3 (January 1963), 3. On evangelical insularity, see Arlene Bird, “The Incredible Story of Bible City,” *HIS* 23, No. 3 (December 1962), 1-2; Paul Fromer, “The Church in the Sheepfold,” *HIS* 25, No. 7 (April 1965), 36-7. On evangelical wealth, see Francis Breisch, “No Shoes for the Poor,” *HIS* 30, No. 2 (November 1969), 7-9; David Adeney, “Beyond the Bamboo Curtain” *HIS* 38, No. 6 (March 1978), 1-6; Anthony Campolo, “A Sociologist Looks at the Church” *HIS* 39, No. 9 (June 1979), 2; Ron Sider, “The Ministry of Affluence: A Graduated Tithe,” *HIS* 33, No. 3 (December 1972), 6-8; Ron Sider, “A New Ring for an Old Bible Quote: Is the Liberty Bell All It’s Cracked Up to Be?” *HIS* 37, No. 1 (October 1976), 20-22.

³⁸ Mark O. Hatfield, “Can a Christian Be a Politician?” *HIS* 28, No. 1 (October 1967), 1-5. Also see Bill Conrad, “Can a Missionary Avoid Politics?” *HIS* 32, No. 7 (April 1972), 18.

³⁹ “Student Resolution, African Students,” December 30, 1967, Box 52, Folder 3, “Pannell, William; 1967-1970,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

Stott preached that “any man or woman who is faithful in preaching the gospel will suffer for the gospel,” students wondered if he had risked enough to have ever suffered. Students quizzed other speakers about civil disobedience, Vietnam, racism, and the implications of cultural revolution. For the first time at an Urbana convention, InterVarsity staffers guarded the stage to prevent students from commandeering the microphone.⁴⁰ Following Urbana 67, an editor of InterVarsity’s magazine noted that “little escaped criticism at the convention. They criticized making a distinction between nationals and missionaries, Christians and pentecostals. . . . Anything that seemed to show intolerance came under their indictment, with impatience toward racism leading the list.”⁴¹

The tumult persisted into the even more volatile Urbana 70, as InterVarsity’s leadership sought to address students’ concern about racial injustice. A special committee on race issues recruited 500 black students to attend and invited several black guests to address the convention. During the convention’s second evening, Soul Liberation, a band of African-American musicians wearing afros, colorful outfits, and Afro-centric symbols, sang “Power to the People,” a song, according to an InterVarsity historian, featuring “lyrics that borrowed heavily from Black Power idioms.” Then Tom Skinner, a former Harlem Lords gang leader and rising evangelical star, preached a searing critique of racial prejudice in American society and of white evangelical dispensationalists who preached that “Canaan was a descendant of Ham” and that “God has cursed all black people and relegated them to conditions of servitude.” For many of the 12,300 students, Skinner’s speech

⁴⁰ See Hunt, *For Christ and the University*, 252-253.

⁴¹ Ellen Weldon, “What is the Question?” *HIS* 28, No. 9 (June 1968), 10.

highlighted all that was wrong about evangelicalism. At the same time, that Skinner was saying these things at all to a receptive evangelical audience suggested that there was hope for the tradition. The convention “seemed like a glorified Sunday-school,” declared one student, “until Skinner spoke.”⁴²

Visiting journalists, taken aback by Skinner’s sudden burst, documented many other examples of the contentious tone that had enveloped Urbana 70. A correspondent from the mainline *Presbyterian Journal* wrote that students were “less attached to a traditional conservative life style in the church and out.” The correspondent also noted the large and vocal presence of black students, the spontaneous and pronounced audience reaction to addresses, the startling number of men with beards and long hair, and the underground newspaper that carried on a running dialogue with speakers. Students, he wrote, “fired questions at speakers from the floor of the Assembly Hall, revealing serious intellectual grappling with the content of the messages.” They were “more aware of how current political and social issues relate to a visible expression of Christian faith.”⁴³ Specifically, many voiced their irritation over Billy Graham’s very public connections with Nixon, particularly by the president’s presence at a recent Knoxville crusade. The temper of Urbana 70 symbolized many InterVarsity students’ repudiation of the Graham-Nixon nexus.⁴⁴

The social activism of Urbana 70 emanated out of hundreds of university chapters, numbers of which jumped headlong into the fray of radical student culture.

⁴² See Mildred Mellors, “Reactions to Urbana,” *Vanguard* (December 31, 1970), in Box 68, Folder 7, “Urbana 1961-1974,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

⁴³ James W. Reapsome, “Similar, but Different,” *Presbyterian Journal* 30 (January 20, 1971), 4-5.

⁴⁴ William R. Wineke, “Evangelical Students at Urbana ‘70: Zeal and Social Passion,” *Christian Century* 88, No. 17 (1971), 226-227.

At the University of Missouri at St. Louis, the InterVarsity chapter declared itself willing to physically inject themselves between opponents in violent demonstrations.⁴⁵ Other chapters, especially those at nursing and medical schools, voiced sympathy with the feminist movement. The chapter at the University of Wisconsin published *Manna*, a weekly newspaper that condemned the Vietnam War, exploitative rent structures, and environmental degradation. Joining the dozen or more underground newspapers that littered State Street in Madison, evangelical students hawked *Manna* alongside representatives of *Black Panther*, the *Berkeley Tribe*, *Kaleidoscope*, the *Daily Cardinal*, the *Badger Herald*, *Sound Mind*, *Ramparts*, and the *Workers League Bulletin*. In long editorials and discursive reviews of Theodore Roszak and other social critics, editors of *Manna* sympathized with the feminist movement and deplored “the Establishment,” writing that the newspaper was “just taking advantage of freedom of speech and press while they last.”⁴⁶ Harvard’s chapter distributed *The Fish*, which similarly balanced both evangelical and leftist rhetoric and exhibited an activist, evangelistic, socially aware, and intellectually curious ethos favored by the national office. A burgeoning InterVarsity Press, which published dozens of books that students found to be “honest” and authentic, nurtured these impulses nationally among hundreds of thousands of American evangelicals.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ “Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship—UMSL Chapter Position on Campus Disorders,” n.d., Box 21, Folder 2, “Student unrest/dissent (1960s),” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

⁴⁶ See undated issue of *Manna*, Vol. 1, No. 5, in Box 344, Folder 2, InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

⁴⁷ M. Bruce Dreon, “Impressions of Urbana,” *The Opinion* (circa Winter 1971), 8, in the Fuller Theological Seminary Archives. On InterVarsity Press, see Linda Doll and Andrew T. Le Peau, *Heart. Soul. Mind. Strength: An Anecdotal History of InterVarsity Press* (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Books, 2006), 33, 48, 73, 76. By the 1970s InterVarsity had helped start over 40 Logos bookstores in university towns across the nation. Logos, as well as many other evangelical bookstores, stocked IVP’s large selection of books with moderate to progressive perspectives on social issues. Boosted by

As InterVarsity students mediated their parents' fundamentalist faith in the context of the campus, few abandoned conservative doctrine and evangelism. At the same time, the implications of their faith extended beyond winning souls for Christ. Dismayed by their parents' sociological ineptitude and sensitized by the civil rights movement in the 1960s, InterVarsity students invoked faith as they agitated for social justice. By the late 1970s, over 90,000 students were reading *HIS* magazine, and InterVarsity president was articulating the political obligations of evangelicals. "We Christians," he wrote, "have a political sin to confess, a sin of neglect . . . As Christians we have simply refused to go out of our way—to spend even a little time, energy, and money—to influence political climate [and] government and social institutions which are handicapping people through oppressive customs, traditions, laws, and prejudices."⁴⁸ InterVarsity served as an important source of the emerging evangelical left—and as a catalyst for the politicization of evangelicalism more generally.

III.

InterVarsity's conservative rival, Campus Crusade for Christ, did not appear to be a promising source of recruits for the evangelical left, especially when

bestselling books by Francis Schaeffer, J. I. Packer, Rebecca Manley Pippert, and Ron Sider, IVP sales increased 500 percent in the 1970s.

⁴⁸ John Alexander, "Christians Guilty of 'Passing By,'" *The Branch* (October 1, 1976), 5, in Box 124, Folder 12, InterVarsity Collection, BGC Archives. A student articulated a similar critique of apathy: "The average churchgoer would not know, from what he hears in church, that we're engaged in a war in Vietnam, that peace talks are underway in Paris, that people are starving by the thousands in Biafra, that the Middle East is a ticking time bomb that could destroy the world, that students have been rioting in the numerous colleges and universities, that the problems of our cities are not being solved, that local elections are taking place that may deeply affect his community, or that a new administration is discovering the complexities of making a government work." See Frank Breisch, "Young Prophets," *HIS* 30, No. 1 (October 1969), 28.

combined with California's Jesus Movement. After all, Campus Crusade resonated with right-wing political causes and pursued evangelistic outreach to the "straight, fraternity-sorority crowd." Moreover, the Jesus Movement, given its reputation for anti-intellectualism and lack of a coherent program for social action, seemed to offer few converts to progressive politics.⁴⁹ Yet out of these unlikely sources percolating in the ferment of late-1960s Berkeley emerged a Crusade chapter dedicated to socially progressive causes. The evangelical left in the 1970s would cite the Christian World Liberation Front as an example of youthful enthusiasm rightly focused.

Founded on Telegraph Avenue next to the volatile University of California-Berkeley campus by Penn State statistics professor Jack Sparks and two Crusade staffers, Pat Matrisciana and Fred Dyson, CWLF began as an experimental evangelistic outreach to street people and radical students. Matrisciana and Dyson never quite adapted to the style of the streets and soon left Berkeley. Sparks, on the other hand, after getting tear-gassed in a street riot on his first day in Berkeley, became "Daddy Jack," ditching his academic suit, big glasses, and short hair for a beard, long hair, and overalls.⁵⁰

Within months of his February 1969 arrival, Sparks had already caused a stir, no small accomplishment in Berkeley. His fledgling Campus Crusade chapter, named in a blatant rip-off of the Third World Liberation Front, pursued tactics nearly as aggressive as the antiwar protestors against whom they initially counter-protested. They infiltrated SDS meetings, trying to convert the politically radical students both

⁴⁹ Sharon Gallagher interview, July 7, 2006.

⁵⁰ "How to Start Something, No. 21 Jack Sparks," *Newsletter of the American Scientific Affiliation* 17, No. 1 (February 1975).

to Christ and to non-violent methods of protest.⁵¹ In April, Sparks, goading campus radicals by reserving the steps of Sproul Hall, sponsored a lecture by Chinese refugee Calvin Chao on the evils of Mao and the virtues of Christ. Wanting the steps of Sproul for themselves on Moratorium Day, inflamed antiwar activists and Maoists set up an amplifier next to Chao, threw rocks into the crowd, and set fire to the nearby ROTC building.⁵² In July, a four-paged tabloid called *Right On*, preaching spiritual liberation from “the exploiters” and “rich men,” rolled off the press.⁵³ In the fall semester, CWLF became an official Cal student organization. They blanketed Berkeley with tracts—“Moratorium on Internal Wars; Sproul Plaza; Noon Today” and “Radicalize the Revolutionary Movement!” Their message was that a deeper oppression plagued America. Political wars, racism, imperialism, poverty, and the population explosion were rooted in spiritual oppression. The answer, according to the tracts, was that “someone who is not a man has all the answers we need—someone who loves YOU.”⁵⁴ In November, 200 CWLF members marched with 150,000 protesters in San Francisco’s Mobilization Parade which urged the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. CWLFers distributed 60,000 copies of a leaflet, both urging withdrawal and arguing that Jesus was the real answer to war. Some in the antiwar movement, the leaflet added, “have as their real purpose

⁵¹ For an account of the fierce confrontation between SDS and CWLF at the 1969 SDS regional conference in Berkeley, see Edward E. Plowman, *The Jesus Movement in America: Accounts of Christian Revolutionaries in Action* (New York: Pyramid, 1971), 70-1.

⁵² Edward Plowman, “Battle for Berkeley,” *Christianity Today* 14, No. 16 (May 8, 1970), 40.

⁵³ “The People of Berkeley Passionately Desire Personal Fulfillment, Vital Interpersonal Relationships, and Inner Peace,” *Right On* 1, No. 1 (July 1, 1969), 3.

⁵⁴ “Moratorium on Internal Wars,” October 27, 1969, copy of flyer in Box 23, Folder 30, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, Cal.

the destruction of our society.”⁵⁵ CWLF thus walked a tightrope, essentially critiquing both SDS and Young Americans for Freedom and proselytizing all the while.

CWLF’s appropriation of activist methods and strident rhetoric for religious purposes infuriated Berkeley leftists, who worried that faith was merely a pacifying diversion from total resistance to Nixon and the war.⁵⁶ Richard York, a long-haired Episcopal priest who ran the Free Church of Berkeley told the *Los Angeles Times* that CWLF “only looks like part of the radical movement.” He suspected that many of their members “are not converts off the street but fundamentalist college students. They put on hippie clothes to go over to Telegraph.”⁵⁷ An editorial in the *Daily Californian* likened religion to a chili pepper—“it takes just a taste to get the point across. . . . But around Berkeley, though, the tart spice of Theology is doled out in shovelfull. Like any overly-rich dish, it is often apt to make you puke.” The writer explained that he did not mind proponents of Eastern religions. The “Krishna Krazies” and “the little Buddhist ladies” were merely “a manifestation of our time, like dope and rock music.” But groups like CWLF were in a different category altogether: “What riles me is the Goddam Christians!” Through 1970, leftists threatened, spit on, and cursed CWLF members at rallies, and SDS members repeatedly ejected CWLF members from meetings.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Daryl Lembke, “Christian Front in Berkeley,” *Los Angeles Times* (February 8, 1970), 20B; Plowman, *Jesus Movement*, 74.

⁵⁶ Stephen A. Kent, *From Slogans to Mantras: Social Protest and Religious Conversion in the Late Vietnam Era* (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 2001), 180s.

⁵⁷ Lembke, “Christian Front in Berkeley,” 20.

⁵⁸ “How to Start Something, No. 21 Jack Sparks”; Bill Squires interview, September 5, 2006. See story and photograph of the ejection of CWLF’s Curtis Norris from the West Coast Conference of SDS

Despite leftist resistance, dozens of students and street people on Telegraph Avenue began to embrace “Jesus the Liberator” at the behest of CWLF evangelists. “Susan,” for example, had been an activist with SDS for several years when she heard that CWLF was “brazenly co-opting the Movement in the name of Jesus.” The daughter of a Republican “middle-class bag with a pool and all the rest,” Susan angrily drove a bus straight to Berkeley to “find out who in hell these people were and rebuke them.” Instead, like dozens of others, she “got saved.”⁵⁹ By early 1970, less than a year after Sparks moved to Berkeley, thirty people lived in three community houses.⁶⁰

The antiwar, anti-establishment rhetoric utilized for evangelistic purposes by CWLF in its first years evolved in the early 1970s into more authentic expressions of angst over middle-class hypocrisy. Susan and Carolyn Hudson, for example, retained their leftist politics and worked with farm workers after their spiritual conversions. New tracts urged readers to come to a meeting in which CWLF would plan action against war, high rents, environmental degradation, oppression, racism, poverty, Nixon, drugs, and “tyrannical forces and powers.” Another pamphlet read “OFF ROTC—Out of Viet Nam.”⁶¹ As their political dissent became more explicit, CWLFers erased signs of their Campus Crusade for Christ affiliation from their leaflets, instead variously calling themselves the Christian World Liberation Front,

in undated, untitled CWLF newsletter, Box 38, New Left Collection, Hoover Institution Archives, Palo Alto, Cal.

⁵⁹ Donald A. Heinz, “Jesus in Berkeley” (Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1976), 56.

⁶⁰ Lembke, “Christian Front in Berkeley,” 20.

⁶¹ See protest flyers entitled “Off ROTC—Out of Viet Nam,” “New Berkeley Liberation Program,” “Proposed Social and Economic Foundations for a Christian Society,” and “The People of Berkeley” in Box 21, Folder 41, Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, Cal.

the Christian Information Committee, the Christian Revolutionary Art Center, Christian Revolutionary Medical Committee, and the New Berkeley Liberation Committees. Though CWLF continued to promote spiritual liberation through Jesus Christ rather than political liberation through Mao, its language and grievances, especially as more radicals converted, increasingly mirrored that of the New Left. Campus Crusade thus became a victim of its own evangelistic success. As the new emphases frayed relations between CWLF and its well-scrubbed, middle-class sponsors, the organizations parted ways.⁶² The divorce, while amicable, was so pronounced that most members in the 1970s were oblivious to CWLF's origins. David Gill, a prominent CWLF leader who had joined only two years after the organization's founding, was appalled to discover that "some right-wing Crusade types" had founded the group.⁶³

No longer under Crusade's constraints, CWLF burgeoned and grew less orderly. Sparks increasingly attracted motley sorts: leftist radicals, homeless people off the streets, students on drug trips, recent patients from mental hospitals, and adherents of marginal cults. Pedro Ramos, a Puerto Rican youth picked up in New York City by a touring group of CWLF members, was a typical convert from the streets. "I watched them and it seemed real—not a lot of jargon. They didn't lay any doctrine on me. They were just nice to me," he said of CWLF. Ramos traveled across the country back to Berkeley with the group. There he lived in Dwight House, where he was immersed in Christian piety and "dried" out from LSD and alcohol use. Before dying of liver disease several years later, Ramos played Jesus in a guerilla

⁶² Sharon Gallagher interview, July 7, 2007; Walter and Virginia Hearn interview, July 9, 2006.

⁶³ David Gill interview, March 2, 2006.

theater skit and wrote several articles in *Right On*.⁶⁴ While some street people stayed with CWLF for years and made significant contributions to CWLF leadership—Brooks Alexander, Carolyn Hudson, and David Fetcho, for example—many street people came and went in rapid succession.⁶⁵

To this fringe element, Sparks drew stable evangelical students discontented with the cultural idiosyncrasies and isolationism of their tradition.⁶⁶ “A sad characteristic of American Fundamentalism,” wrote David Gill, one such disaffected evangelical student, “has been to stop at the point of individual salvation. . . . But it is well to remember He is Lord of political life, economic life, academic life—all of our life, not simply of our eternal destiny.”⁶⁷ Other evangelical youth such as Sharon Gallagher, a recent graduate of Westmont College in Santa Barbara, shared Gill’s sentiment. Gill and Gallagher, both frustrated by the quietist ethos of their fundamentalistic Plymouth Brethren tradition, sought to engage politics and arts in CWLF. Others, irritated by restrictions on cinema-going, dancing, and other evangelical taboos, flowed from Wheaton, Taylor, and Westmont. All sought a more authentic faith unencumbered by the demands of authoritarian structures, super-patriotism, and laissez-faire capitalism. One CWLF member wrote, “Far from being a white, middle class, Gentile, Nordic war god, born in Kansas City—who defends the

⁶⁴ Walt and Ginny Hearn interview, July 11, 2006; Pedro Ramos, “Jonah in America,” *Right On* 6, No. 4 (November 1974), 9.

⁶⁵ Alexander, for example, was a TM initiate, a drug user, and had lived in the Haight-Ashbury community in across the Bay. He went on to lead the Spiritual Counterfeits Project for much of the 1970s. Fetcho was a practitioner of Ananda Marga in the 1960s.

⁶⁶ Sparks went on lengthy fundraising and recruitment trips to evangelical centers. One nearly two-month-long trip in 1973, filmed by documentary producer Owen Landow, covered colleges, seminaries, and churches in twenty-three states. The film that resulted was entitled “A Film of Their 1973 Spring Tour Commissioned by Christian World Liberation Front of Berkeley.” See Jack N. Sparks to “Brothers and Sisters,” n.d., Box 2 CWLF, GTU Archives.

⁶⁷ David Gill, “The Messiah(s) of Miami Beach,” *Right On* 4, No. 1 (July 1972), 3.

‘American way of life,’ I found that He was a Jew, probably black by Western standards, poor, a conscientious objector, born in a ghetto in the Middle East, and a defender of truth and justice.”⁶⁸ Another member, disillusioned with the authoritarian structures at home, colorfully wrote, “My parents suck wind. They wanted me to be a doctor like my father. They gave me everything I ever wanted except love and time from their ‘busy schedules.’ I got plenty sick of seeing people work their asses off for nothing but money. Bigger cars, bigger houses, bigger. They want me like them in every way. For a steady job I have to have: Haircut, their clothes, degree.”⁶⁹ In a free-verse poem one CWLF member wrote, “We left our parents squabbling over their strength, comparing laundry ... we left that small town ... and carried no schedules.”⁷⁰ Donald Heinz, a participant-observer in CWLF, noted that “it was of immense importance, especially in the early years of CWLF, for its followers to know that Jesus was not middle class. To have freshly stolen him back from the churches, where he had been kept for years, was a major cause of group cohesion and strength.”⁷¹ Angst over middle-class culture—and the rapid spread of *Right On* through networks of churches and colleges—drew hundreds of evangelical students to Berkeley in search of something more authentic.⁷²

⁶⁸ Arnie Bernstein, “Captured by the King,” *Right On* 4, No. 5 (November 1972), 1.

⁶⁹ “Reach Me,” *Right On* 1, No. 15 (April 24, 1970), 2.

⁷⁰ Gia Chester, “The Paraphrased Testimony of a Young Evangelical,” *Right On* 9, No. 2 (September-October 1977), 17.

⁷¹ Donald Heinz, “The Christian World Liberation Front,” in Charles Y. Glock and Robert N. Bellah, eds., *The New Religious Consciousness* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 154.

⁷² CWLF enjoyed generous publicity from books on the Jesus Movement, *Christianity Today* and other evangelical periodicals, especially those identifying with the young evangelical movement. See, for example, Edward Plowman, *The Jesus Movement in America: Accounts of Christian Revolutionaries in Action* (New York: Pyramid, 1971). CWLF also received coverage from the *Los Angeles Times* feature articles which were picked up off the wire by other American newspapers. See, for example, Daryl Lembke, “Christian Front in Berkeley: Religious Group Turns ‘Hippie’ to Win

For the next decade, street people and radical leftists joined with disillusioned evangelical college students to form a vibrant community with a reputation disproportionate to its size. CWLF coordinated nearly half a dozen communal houses dotting the Berkeley hills. It published roughly 15,000 copies of *Right On* each month and up to 100,000 for special issues.⁷³ Members produced a crude hippie translation of the New Testament called “Letters to the Street Christians” that sold by the hundreds on the streets of Berkeley and then by the hundreds of thousands on campuses and evangelical bookstores across the nation.⁷⁴ They leafleted Berkeley over and over again. They protested against the Vietnam War, nuclear power plants, Richard Nixon, and “the establishment.” Members helped unionize farm workers. They founded Rising Son Ranch, an organic farm in Northern California, where drug addicts dried out.⁷⁵ They sent representatives to report on the 1972 national party conventions. They launched a guerrilla street theater that performed on Cal’s campus. They launched a free university. By 1974 CWLF comprised nearly 200 members in

Youth,” *Los Angeles Times*, February 8, 1970, p. 20; Russell Chandler, “Transcendental Meditation Growing; Faces Challenge,” *Los Angeles Times*, May 12, 1974, p. 1, 20; Russell Chandler, “Jesus Movement Still Going Strong,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 13, 1975, p. 34-35. On coverage of CWLF on the East Coast, see Edward B. Fiske, “A Religious ‘Woodstock’ Draws 75,000,” *New York Times*, June 16, p. 1, 19; Edward B. Fiske, “Jesus Papers: Read about the Heavy Solution,” *New York Times*, January 17, 1971, p. E6. This letter from Phoenix was typical of the reactions of some young evangelicals upon hearing about CWLF.: “My head is spinning. My joy knows no bounds having met you. I didn’t know there were others who felt as I do: those you refer to as ‘radical’ Christians.” See Doris Ritchie, “Letters,” *Right On* 10, No. 4 (January-February 1979), 1.

⁷³ “Berkeley, California: World Christian Liberation Front” promotional pamphlet, p.7 (circulation numbers), Box 2 of Edie Black Collection, Graduate Theological Union Archives. The *New York Times* reported that *Right On* enjoyed a circulation of 65,000, which was likely exaggerated. See Fiske, “Jesus Papers,” E6.

⁷⁴ Larry Eskridge, “God’s Forever Family: The Jesus People Movement in America, 1966-1977” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Stirling, 2005), 196.

⁷⁵ CWLF produced the “People’s Medical Handbook,” which instructed readers on the effects and nature of drug use and how to survive riots. See Reel 79, Box 25, Folder 20, Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library.

what they called “God’s forever family” and a staff of 30 that oversaw its mushrooming programs.

IV.

Like evangelical students drawn to CWLF, the Post-American community in Chicago grew directly out of the increasing disillusionment of young fundamentalist evangelicals with their own heritage. A coterie of seminarians from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, a new bastion of evangelical orthodoxy located in the suburbs of Chicago, began to articulate in 1970 a radical political critique of America rooted in opposition to the Vietnam War. Renamed Sojourners in 1975, the Post-American community and its leader Jim Wallis emerged as the most recognizable face of the evangelical left for the next three decades.

Drawn initially to radical politics by racial civil rights, young Wallis, feeling trapped by his church’s disengagement from social causes in the suburbs of Detroit, wondered why the only blacks he saw in his church were from Africa, not nearby inner-city Detroit. He began asking questions at his church, whose members stiffened in resistance to his queries. Once he got his driver’s license, he began forays into downtown Detroit in search of answers. As he wandered the streets full of a multitude of ethnic groups, militant advocates of Malcolm X, even prostitutes, Wallis got a palpable sense that “life seemed more real there, more human, and more interesting than in the suburbs, which now felt so artificial and isolating to me.” A factory job taken to earn spending money brought him even closer to the injustices. A black co-worker told Wallis that instead of looking for a policeman for help, as Wallis’s

mother taught him to do, his co-worker's mother had instructed him to "quickly hide down a stairwell or behind a building. Just don't let him find you! After he passes by, it's safe to come out and find your way home." "Detroit," Wallis recalls, "was my baptism of fire, teaching me how racism had betrayed the ideals I had been taught as a child."⁷⁶

His radical education continued at Michigan State University, where Wallis joined student government. This stint soon led to MSU's SDS chapter, which had mobilized after revelations of campus ties to defense contractors and the CIA, ROTC programs on campus, heavy-handed treatment of protesters, the May 1970 Kent State shootings, and the U.S. military incursion into Cambodia.⁷⁷ By his senior year Wallis was activating 10,000 people in a few hours' time for protests and was a key organizer in the national student strike in the spring of 1970.⁷⁸ As he watched leather-clad Weathermen and his SDS comrades smash the East Lansing City Hall, however, he turned away from SDS, mourning how such a "powerful movement could so quickly collapse into moral confusion." The "humanistic platitudes" of the secular radical movement turned him back to the source of his childhood faith, which he had lost while in college.⁷⁹ "I started reading the New Testament again," Wallis recalls, "which I hadn't done in many years, just on my own. What I began to see in the first three Gospels was a Jesus who stood with the poor and marginalized and who taught

⁷⁶ Wallis, *Faith Works*, 7-10.

⁷⁷ Carol Langston, "Campus Rebel Finds New 'Revolt,'" *Tulsa Tribune*, March 26, 1971, p. 5B. For more on Wallis' background, see the student government candidate platform of Jim Wallis, Jim Moore, Bob Sabath, and Tom Morris in Box VII8, Folder 6, "Jim Wallis at Trinity," Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

⁷⁸ "Crucible of Community," *Sojourners* 6, No. 1 (January 1977), 14.

⁷⁹ On "humanistic platitudes," see James H. Bowman, "They Oppose 'Personal Salvation in a Vacuum,'" *Chicago Daily News*, June 16-17, 1972, p. 37.

his followers to be peacemakers, a Jesus I had never heard much about in church but was now rediscovering.” This spiritual awakening, coupled with a powerful admiration for Martin Luther King, Jr., and the faith-rooted origins of the civil rights movement, led him to theological training at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, a rapidly growing conservative evangelical seminary on the outskirts of Chicago.

On a summer day in August 1970, mere months after watching MSU’s SDS chapter self-immolate, Wallis motored around the southern tip of Lake Michigan in his Ford Falcon to Deerfield, Ill., intent on combining his revived evangelical faith with a radical critique of American politics and international policy. Wallis quickly pushed the conservative campus into heated debate about the war in Vietnam. Every Wednesday at noon, students and faculty met for lunch and debate at The Pits, a small café in the basement of the administration building, where polite discussion often spiraled into heated arguments between just war advocates and pacifists. Wallis, a “noisy” student with red hair and a bushy red beard was “the archetype of a prophet,” a classmate remembers, and often served as the lightning rod in these debates. His fellow students would “sit there with mouths agape getting really mad at him” as he charged Trinity with having departed from biblical ideals.⁸⁰

Wallis nonetheless persuaded many classmates with his unrelenting appeals to Scripture. Jonathan Bonk, a student from an Evangelical Free church in Manitoba, found Wallis’s emphasis on the Sermon on the Mount compelling. Wallis, Bonk remembers, also liked to rip out all the pages in the Bible that dealt with money and poverty, leaving only a tattered shell remaining, to make his point that social justice

⁸⁰ Jonathan Bonk interview, January 12, 2006.

mattered. While others in the New Left made their case using sociological arguments, Wallis “made it theological” and insisted on scriptural justification for arguments, perhaps the only tactic that could convince conservative divinity students.⁸¹ Soon an articulate coterie of a dozen other disenchanting students gathered around Wallis. Yet for all their angst about social structures, the group—which included Boyd Reese, John Topliff, Bob Sabath, Glen Melnik, Herb McMillan, Barry Turner, Thom Morris, Jim Moore, and Jim Wallis—rallied first against stringent campus standards.⁸² After a faculty vote rejected a 93% student vote urging the loosening of campus parietals, they released a manifesto, titled “At Trinity—Students Are Niggers,” charging that the school “will become either a center of progressive evangelical thought, or a fundamentalist enclave of legalism, sell-out religion, and reactionary thought. The choice is yours.”⁸³ They invited the Chicago Tribune to observe a mock funeral held in front of the administration building, where they played Taps, “buried student opinion,” and built a makeshift graveyard.⁸⁴ They particularly targeted the eminent evangelical theologian and dean of the seminary Kenneth Kantzer, who told students “returning to engage in student action for the reform of the academic structure here at Trinity outside the framework of legitimately elected student government” to consider themselves “not welcome.” Faculty, he reasoned, had come from the “greatest

⁸¹ Jonathan Bonk interview, January 12, 2006.

⁸² The “Bannockburn Seven,” as the Post-Americans were initially called, came from fundamentalist and new evangelical backgrounds. Jim Moore was president of the InterVarsity chapter at Michigan State University and had worked for Wycliffe Bible Translators. Bob Sabath had attended Moody Bible Institute and had worked with missionaries at a Native American reservation. Thom Morris was a member of the InterVarsity chapters at MSU and the University of Illinois.

⁸³ “At Trinity—Students Are Niggers,” circa May 1971, Box VII8, Folder 6, “Jim Wallis at Trinity,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

⁸⁴ Jim Wallis, *Revive Us Again: A Sojourner’s Story* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1983), 80.

universities on earth, prepared to write volumes on the decisive theological issues of the day”; instead they were getting “tied up for significant amounts of time debating whether visiting hours for girls should be from 3-12 or 4-11 on Saturdays and Sundays.”⁸⁵

Evangelical non-engagement of broader social structures, however, soon overtook campus rules as the primary target of the “Bannockburn Seven’s” critiques. Bob Sabath spoke of his “deep alienation from the church.” He told a Milwaukee newspaper reporter, “I felt the evangelical church had betrayed me, betrayed itself. It was not dealing with those questions of racism, war, hunger. I was in fact contributing to them.”⁸⁶ In their “Deerfield Manifesto,” the seminarians stated that “The Christian response to our revolutionary age must be to stand and identify with the exploited and oppressed, rather than with the oppressor.”⁸⁷ By the summer of 1971, these seven divinity students had formed the People’s Christian Coalition (though they more often called themselves the Post-Americans) to address violence, race, poverty, pollution, and other “macro-ethical subjects.” Aghast that an informal poll of Trinity’s dormitories showed 80% support for Nixon, the group began to meet regularly for prayer, Bible study, sociological study, celebrations called “God parties” (which always opened with a rendition of Three Dog Night’s “Joy to the World”),

⁸⁵ Kenneth S. Kantzer to students, June 3, 1971, Folder VII8, “Jim Wallis at Trinity,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

⁸⁶ Quoted in “Magazine Helped Publish Church’s Activism,” *Milwaukee Journal* (April 11, 1979). Copy in Box IV3, Folder 2, “News Releases,” Sojourners Collections, WCSC.

⁸⁷ Boyd T. Reese, Jr., “Resistance and Hope: The Interplay of Theological Synthesis, Biblical Interpretation, Political Analysis, and Praxis in the Christian Radicalism of ‘Sojourners’ Magazine” (Ph.D., Temple University, 1991), 47.

and demonstrations against the war.⁸⁸ Under threat of expulsion, Wallis and his compatriots finally stopped taking classes at Trinity as the Coalition rapidly grew and took up more of their time, but their common “alienating seminary experience,” as Bob Sabbath put it, continued to bind them together.⁸⁹ In early 1972, 25 current and former Trinity students formed intentional communities, first in an apartment building in Rogers Park and then in the impoverished Uptown area of Chicago.

The seminarians’ most enduring legacy, however, came in its tabloid called the *Post-American*, whose content was dominated in the early years by civil rights and Vietnam.⁹⁰ The first issue of *The Post-American*, issued in the fall of 1971, featured a cover with Jesus wearing a crown of thorns and cuffed with an American flag that also covered his bruised body. America, the depiction implied, had re-crucified Christ. Inside Wallis wrote that the “American captivity of the church has resulted in the disastrous equation of the American way of life with the Christian way of life.” The gravity of Wallis’ new cause struck him particularly hard as he bundled tall stacks of the first issue after staying up all night editing and taking proofs to the printer. Pausing, he put a copy on his bed and stared at it. He then dropped to his knees and began to pray. “Strong feelings of gratitude, expectation, and bold, confident faith rushed over me,” he remembers, as he reflected over the long journey

⁸⁸ “An Open Letter to Students and Trinity Evangelical Divinity School,” circa Fall 1972, Box VII8, Folder 6, “Jim Wallis at Trinity,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC. Also see Wallis, *Revive Us Again*, 81.

⁸⁹ “Crucible of Community,” 17; Kenneth S. Kantzer to Jim Wallis, April 10, 1973, Box VII8, Folder 6, “Jim Wallis at Trinity,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC. On the financial contributions to Trinity lost because of publicity related to the *Post-Americans*, see Wallis, “The Business of Seminaries,” *Sojourners* 6, No. 8 (August 1977), 6-7.

⁹⁰ See “A Joint Treaty of Peace between the People of the United States South Vietnam and North Vietnam,” *Post-American* 1, No. 1 (Fall 1971), 15, which declared that the American and Vietnamese people were not enemies and called for the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops.

that had led him to this point. “Most of us had been raised in the evangelical heartland of the country. The gospel message that had nurtured us as children was now turning us against the injustice and violence of our nation's leading institutions and causing us to repudiate the church's conformity to a system that we believed to be biblically wrong.”⁹¹

The Post-Americans distributed 30,000 copies of the first edition, printed with \$700 in pooled money.⁹² They blanketed 15 colleges and seminaries in the Chicago area and sold copies for 25 cents in Old Town, New Town, and downtown Chicago. Within several months, they had sold 225 full subscriptions. The real growth potential, however, lay in the thousands of other disillusioned evangelical students at dozens of other colleges and seminaries across the country. They borrowed mailing lists and took their searing critique on the road in an attempt to awaken sleepy evangelical campuses. In spring 1971 Wallis received a rousing reception when he told students at an American Association of Evangelical Students conference that their “hearts were larger than the narrow faith they had been given.”⁹³ Wallis and Clark Pinnock, his mentor and a professor at Trinity, traveled to the University of Texas at Austin under the auspices of InterVarsity to preach and condemn the war on the streets.⁹⁴ One 16-day trip in spring 1972 took the Post-Americans to evangelical campuses, major universities, intentional communities, and churches in northern Indiana, lower Michigan, northern Ohio, central and eastern Pennsylvania, and up the east coast

⁹¹ Wallis, *Revive Us Again*, 15-16.

⁹² “Crucible of Community,” 16.

⁹³ Wallis, *Revive Us Again*, 89.

⁹⁴ Wallis, *Revive Us Again*, 87.

from Washington, D.C. to Boston.⁹⁵ They brought copies of their magazine, distributed reading lists full of New Left writers, and offered free university courses in Christian radicalism, the New Left, women's liberation, and racism.⁹⁶

The group created such a stir that U.S. Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon called Wallis to inquire, "Is it true that there are actually other evangelical Christians against the war?"⁹⁷ When Wallis accepted Hatfield's invitation to visit him in Washington, Hatfield asked Wallis if he would consider moving to Washington, D.C., a move the group would make four years later.⁹⁸ In an intriguing alliance that confounded many evangelicals, Hatfield served as a benefactor-mentor for Wallis and the Post-Americans. Several other key evangelical leaders gave aid and comfort to the Post-Americans as well. John Stott, a respected British evangelical theologian, wrote "Like drugs, a Jesus religion can be an escape from our technoculture. In contrast to this kind of 'cop-out' I was greatly encouraged to meet some of the leaders of the People's Christian Coalition."⁹⁹ Thousands of young evangelicals around the nation found the Post-American sensibility compelling as well. Within two years, 1,200 people had subscribed to the Post-American; within five years, nearly 20,000.¹⁰⁰ The

⁹⁵ "Newsletter No. 4," May 1972, Box VII7, Folder 6, "Peoples Christian Coalition Trinity," Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

⁹⁶ Minutes of the Peoples Christian Coalition, September 26, 1971, in Box VII7, Folder 6, "Peoples Christian Coalition Trinity," Sojourners Collection, WCSC. They sent 1,000 copies of the Post-American requested by several young evangelical professors to distribute to students affiliated with a campus ministry. See "Newsletter Number 3," Box VII7, Folder 6, "Peoples Christian Coalition Trinity," Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

⁹⁷ Zach Kincaid, "Salting the Seen," *Trinity Magazine* (Summer 2002), 12-13.

⁹⁸ Minutes of the Peoples Christian Coalition, October 17, 1971, Box VII7, Folder 6, "Peoples Christian Coalition Trinity," Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

⁹⁹ Stott, "Impressions of American Christianity," copy in Box VII8, Folder 6, "Jim Wallis at Trinity," Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

¹⁰⁰ Ed Spivey, Jr., interview, June 22, 2005.

Post-Americans had clearly tapped into a market of evangelical students searching for authentic faith.

V.

If the Post-Americans nurtured a broad-based critique of American culture, The Other Side (TOS) trained its critical eye more narrowly. Launched in 1965 in rural Ohio, TOS single-mindedly championed civil rights for blacks. Fred Alexander, a Southern Baptist preacher, at first printed his 12-page newsletter *Freedom Now* out of a barn with an antiquated press. The newsletter quickly grew into a full-fledged magazine that reached 500 paid subscribers in 1965, 3,000 in 1973, 7,300 in 1978, and 13,000 in 1988.¹⁰¹

A cadre of young men, all sons of Baptist ministers, redirected TOS's trajectory in the late 1960s and early 1970s in a more radical direction beyond straightforward support of Martin Luther King, Jr. For John Alexander, son of the founder, the impetus for TOS's new politics came from his experiences in college. As an undergraduate Alexander chafed under the conservatism of his campus ministry group, which refused to take up an offering for the starving of the world. Souls, the ministry leaders explained, were more important than bodies, a stance that "fundamentally offended" Alexander and left him ready to denounce his faith. A long pilgrimage through Scripture, however, led him to fall "in love with the God of the Bible" even as he continued to "utterly reject" the god of the campus group.

Alexander went on to teach philosophy at Wheaton College, where he gained

¹⁰¹ Kyle Cleveland, "The Politics of Jubilee: Ideological Drift and Organizational Schism in a Religious Sect" (Ph.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1990), 124.

notoriety as one of the more radical members of the faculty. At Wheaton he encountered future TOS members Phil Harnden and Mark Olson. Harnden hailed from a staunchly conservative Republican family. Olson, himself a strong Goldwater supporter, came from a fundamentalist church. Enrollment in the sociology department at the suburban Chicago college, however, transformed both students. During “jarring first-hand” fieldwork in inner-city Chicago ghettos, Harnden and Olson encountered poverty and racism. They soon joined the NAACP chapter and the nascent activist movement on campus, protesting the Vietnam War at teach-ins and rallies led by Alexander. Harnden’s new pacifistic views brought him into direct conflict with his parents’ conservative religiosity, and he quit attending church, questioning his evangelical faith. Olson’s activism and tenacious coverage of growing cynicism on campus as editor of the yearbook brought him into conflict with the college’s president.¹⁰² Both students worked through existential crises of faith as they resisted parents and tradition in searches for authenticity.

Like Jim Wallis, Olson and Harnden recovered their evangelical faith but did not retain their tradition’s socially conservative accoutrements. Along with dozens of other like-minded evangelicals, they moved to the Germantown section of Philadelphia to start an intentional community. While attention to civil rights had gained it a loyal following in the 1960s, TOS in the 1970s extended its platform to include progressive issues such as global justice, gender issues, communal living, and simplicity. The group, for example, launched Jubilee Crafts, which sold fairly traded third-world goods. By the mid-1970s, the area around TOS had become something of

¹⁰² Cleveland, “The Politics of Jubilee,” 58-63, 72-73.

an unofficial East Coast regional headquarters for the emerging evangelical left, renting out office space to socially moderate and leftist organizations such as Evangelicals for Social Action, American Christians for the Abolition of Torture, Clergy and Laity Concerned, Center on Law and Pacifism, Coalition for a Simple Life-Style, Nuclear Moratorium Project, and the Central America Organizing Project. TOS by the late 1970s enjoyed a reputation and influence that far exceeded its modest size.

VI.

By themselves, the emerging members of the evangelical left might have been reticent in their rebellion. But two Protestant groups historically on the fringes of evangelicalism—Anabaptists and Dutch Calvinists—began to emerge out of their ethnic enclaves in rural Pennsylvania, Ohio, and western Michigan just as the evangelical left began to gain momentum. By the early 1970s, a faction of politically progressive Mennonites established an office in Washington, D.C. for political lobbying. At Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Mich., and the Institute for Christian Studies (ICS) in Toronto, Canada, similar pushes for political relevancy were in full swing among Reformed evangelicals. Each tradition offered rigorous theological critiques of the new evangelicalism and American society, and by the mid-1970s important Anabaptist and Reformed leaders joined the burgeoning network of the evangelical left.

With Anabaptist roots in the Reformation, American Mennonites and Brethren emerged in the middle half of the twentieth century from centuries of political and

social quietism.¹⁰³ Anabaptist ideals of simplicity, non-conformity, the “priesthood of all believers,” and most especially nonviolent resistance to evil found resonance in the context of the 1960s. John Howard Yoder, author of *The Politics of Jesus*; Ron Sider, author of *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*; and Arthur Gish, author of *The New Left and Christian Radicalism*, all espoused pacifism as a Christian duty and challenged the evangelical consensus on just war theory, rising social status, conventional political involvement. Each of them figured prominently within the evangelical left during the 1970s and 1980s.

Goshen College, a Mennonite institution, typified the transition from the traditional passive nonresistance to a more active pacifism. Social activist clubs such as the Peace Society swelled to over 60 members in 1966.¹⁰⁴ Several key Goshen graduates and future professors and administrators joined the “Concern” movement, a loosely structured group that critiqued the Mennonite establishment for its isolationism.¹⁰⁵ Gordon Kauffman in “Non-resistance and Responsibility,” for example, called social responsibility a “derivative of Christian love.”¹⁰⁶ Concern pushed for radical discipleship and egalitarian relations between the races, sexes, and in church polity. These emphases shaped the social and theological frameworks of

¹⁰³ Perry Bush, *Two Kingdoms, Two Loyalties: Mennonite Pacifism in Modern America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998); Keith Graber Miller, *Wise as Serpents, Innocent as Doves: American Mennonites Engage Washington* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1996).

¹⁰⁴ Seven members of the Peace Society took a trip to Chicago to meet with editors of *Ebony* and *The Defender* as well as officials from Urban Renewal and the Chicago Housing Authority. David Larsen, “Evangelical Christian Higher Education, Culture, and Social Conflict: A Niebuhrian Analysis of Three Colleges in the 1960s” (Ph.D. dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1992), 159-171.

¹⁰⁵ Perry Bush, “The Flexibility of the Center: Mennonite Church Conflict in the 1960s,” *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 72, No. 2 (April 1998), 189-206.

¹⁰⁶ Gordon Kaufman, “Non-Resistance and Christian Responsibility,” *Concern* No. 6 (1958).

many in the evangelical left, particularly those associated with the Post-American and The Other Side communities.

American Dutch Calvinists, also ethnically and theologically rooted in the Reformation but mediated in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries by Kuyparian theology and the ecclesiastical tradition of the Christian Reformed Church, nurtured a very different sort of social sensibility. Reformed evangelicals articulated the pointed message that Christ is Lord over all of creation, that Christians have been charged with a cultural mandate to influence “power organizations.” Disgruntled with the state of the existing church and society, so-called “Reformationalists” contended that Christians ought to be in the forefront of intellectual and social thought. Arguing that the “Gospel must not be confined to Christian institutions,” they punctuated their rhetoric with words such as “all” and “every.” One Reformationalist declared, “Jesus Christ is the Ruler, Redeemer, and Reconciler of *all things*, including the political, social, educational, artistic, racial, economic, labor, management, and scientific dimensions of life.”¹⁰⁷ The Institute for Christian Studies, a Reformed think tank and graduate school in Toronto, sought to lay the groundwork for a movement that would shape the social and political spheres by bypassing applied disciplines in favor of theology, philosophy, and political theory.¹⁰⁸ *Vanguard*, a magazine closely associated with ICS, printed articles on the arts, economics, and theology as well as

¹⁰⁷ Martin LaMaire, “All-Out Christianity,” *The Other Side* 7, No. 2 (March-April 1971), 28-31.

¹⁰⁸ A dynamic trio of Dutch Calvinist educators—Hendrik Hart, James Olthuis, and Bernard Zylstra—launched ICS in 1967. Initially a tiny graduate school with only one instructor and no degree programs, ICS by 1971 ICS enjoyed five teaching and research faculty, 26 full-time students, and 100 part-time students several more faculty and offered a master’s degree in philosophy. The Free University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands worked closely with ICS, providing a steady flow of faculty and doctoral students across the Atlantic. See advertisement from “A Community of Christian Scholars Shaking the Foundations,” *Vanguard* (January 1971), 23.

criticisms of the church. These Reformed Protestants, while not historically rooted in the Great Awakenings or tied to Billy Graham and the revivalist ethos of the new evangelicalism more generally, nevertheless affirmed many of the same theological tenets and sometimes made common cause with the evangelical left.

The most biting critique and clearest statement came from a book called *Out of Concern for the Church*. An “explosive little book,” wrote one reviewer, “its five essays by as many different Evangelical authors, drag the Evangelical world, kicking and screaming, to the operating room where possibly its life can be saved.”¹⁰⁹ Its authors contended that the Church was teetering toward irrelevance. It could only be saved by closing Calvin Theological Seminary, disbanding denominational committees, stripping ministers of their credentials, and letting “ruling elders in the congregations designate as instructors in the Word whosoever can bring the Word of Life from the Scriptures.”¹¹⁰ Most of all, the book scorned the American church for complicity in the injustices of American culture, accusing Christians of “awhoring after that great American Bitch, the Democratic Way of Life.”¹¹¹

Slightly less strident calls for Christian authenticity came from many of Calvin College’s 3,000 students. Troubled by the college’s move from urban Grand Rapids to a suburban estate in the early 1960s, students in a blistering editorial in the *Chimes* pointed out the hypocrisy of enforcing behavioral restrictions while abandoning their tradition’s social and cultural mandate. “The faith of our fathers ...

¹⁰⁹ Thomas Kennalt, “Out of Concern for the Concerned,” *Vanguard* (January 1971), 12-15; “Where Are All the Christians Hiding?” *Vanguard* (November 1971), 8-11, 20.

¹¹⁰ See Calvin G. Seerveld, “A Modest Proposal for Reforming the Christian Reformed Church in North America” 47, in John Olthuis, ed., *Out of Concern for the Church* (Toronto: Wedge Publishing, 1970).

¹¹¹ Hendrick Hart, “The Gospel Is Radical,” 40, in *Out of Concern for the Church*.

is clearly out of date,” editors of *Chimes* declared in an editorial that exploded like a bombshell in the CRC community.¹¹² Campus unrest percolated through the 1960s, carried along by a “sizeable group brilliant in thought and expression, spiritually sensitive, and deeply concerned about fundamental social and theological problems.” They were also, according to a college historian, “noisy, ill-mannered, and enamored with the tactics of overkill and shock.”¹¹³ The unrest culminated in a “Youth Manifesto” presented to the 1970 synod of the Christian Reformed Church. CRC youth complained about racism, male chauvinism, lack of support for conscientious objection to war, moralistic and sentimental sermons, and the denomination’s “edifice complex” in the face of poverty. “We feel cheated, neglected, yet still hopeful,” said announced writers of the Manifesto. “We ask that you reaffirm that not only is God’s Word relevant to all of life, but begin to make a concerted effort to implement God’s Word to all of life.” The Calvin students, pleading with denominational leaders to avoid a paternalistic attitude toward youth, proposed to refashion the liturgy in a more authentic and contemporary style.¹¹⁴ Even young professors, functioning as gadflies to Calvin’s administrators, embodied the sense of disillusionment. A faculty

¹¹² John Lagerwey, “The Great Gap” *Chimes* 60, No. 25 (April 22, 1966), 3. The article went on to declare, “send legalism to the hanging tree”; “learn to read scripture like any other book”; and “stop heresy-hunting and jump on the ecumenical bandwagon.” A joint judicial committee of faculty and students suspended circulation of the issue, called a moratorium on the topics in the editorial, demoted the editor to reporter assigned him a mentor, and appointed a new committee to review editorial policy. On the move to the suburban Knollcrest campus, see Roger Helder, “Suburban Segregation,” *Chimes* 63, No. 7 (November 1, 1968), 2.

¹¹³ John J. Timmerman, *Promises to Keep: A Centennial History of Calvin College* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), 102, 151. For examples of the new contentious style, see “Demonstration Precedes Board Rationale on Gregory Decision,” *Chimes* 62, No. 12 (January 12, 1968), 1; “The Dean Burns in Effigy During Ad Hoc Demonstration,” *Chimes* 63 (April 25, 1969), 3. In the late 1960s, students rallied against a Board of Trustees decision that banned Dick Gregory from speaking on campus with signs that read “Get the Dead Wood off the Board”; “Bored of Procrustes” “No More Hip-Pocket Sanhedrins.” In another incident students burned Dean of Students Philip Lucasse in effigy in protest about student residence policies.

¹¹⁴ “Youth Manifesto,” printed in *The Other Side* 7, No. 3 (Summer 1971), 8-11, 34.

member's article entitled "I Am Not One of Us" reflected the bifurcated sense of identity as disenchanting members of CRC and evangelicalism as a whole.¹¹⁵

The Coalition for Christian Outreach, while primarily centered on faith and educational concerns, also nurtured many of the same dissenting impulses as Calvin and ICS. Based in Pittsburgh and spread throughout the Allegheny region, CCO brought in many speakers on the evangelical left to its conventions that drew tens of thousands of students during the 1970s and 1980s. Several of CCO's staffers maintained close ties with ICS, taking students to Toronto for conferences. Jennie Geisler, a Grove City College student and member of CCO, remembers that staffers disillusioned with evangelicalism's tepid sense of social mandate pounded into her head that "ALL of life is religion." One staffer Pete Steen gave Geisler and others a stack of *Post-Americans* to read. The influences of CCO, ICS, and the Post-American led her on a path of social justice far from her evangelical upbringing. In the 1970s Geisler refused to pay taxes for several years, moved to Pittsburgh to start an intentional community, joined political campaigns, and protested the nuclear arms race.¹¹⁶ While this sense of disillusionment and the burden to shape all spheres of life was not new, the way in which the Reformationalists melded it with the heady radicalism of the 1960s and 1970s was.

¹¹⁵ Richard J. Mouw, "A Bit of a Gadfly," 115, in *Serving the Claims of Justice: The thoughts of Paul B. Henry*, ed. Douglas L. Koopman (Grand Rapids: Calvin College, 2001). This was also true at many other colleges. Richard Mouw at Calvin, John Alexander at Wheaton, Theron Schlabach at Goshen, Clark Pinnock at Trinity, Milo Rediger at Taylor, Hendrik Hart at ICS, Richard Pierard at Indiana State, and Robert Linder at Kansas State encouraged dissent. On Pinnock, see Wallis, *Revive Us Again*, 81. On Hart, see Theodore Plantinga, "The Reformational Movement: Church and Worship," *Myodicy*, No. 25 (January 2006). Plantinga notes that Hart traveled to university campuses throughout Ontario meeting with and encouraging Christian students. On Milo Rediger at Taylor, see "Signs of a New Order," *Post-American* 2, No. 3 (May-June 1973), 12. On Theron Schlabach, see Larsen, "Evangelical Christian Higher Education," 171.

¹¹⁶ Jennie Geisler interview, March 19, 2008.

Evangelical ethnic institutions profoundly shaped many evangelicals such as Geisler who were emerging out of an apolitical conservatism. Three Reformed scholars with roots in the new evangelical world were important interpreters of the Reformed vision: Carl McIntire, the son of the notorious fundamentalist preacher of the same name; Paul Henry of Calvin College and son of Carl F.H. Henry; and Robert Carvill, a fundamentalist Baptist graduate of the evangelical Gordon College.¹¹⁷ Evangelical draft-dodgers who made their way up to ICS in Toronto found an ethos wary of capitalism, hostile to the Vietnam War, surprisingly tolerant of marijuana use, and generally anti-establishment.¹¹⁸ In the early 1970s evangelicals started coming in droves to the Christianity and Politics conferences at Calvin College.

Reformationalists also traveled to evangelical sites.¹¹⁹ *Vanguard*, the unofficial magazine of the movement, got its start at InterVarsity's Urbana 70 convention with four straight days of elaborate four-page spreads decrying the stifling middle-class character of the event: "We have tried such a vast pantheon of idols," wrote Richard Forbes, "Individualism, Capitalism, Democratism, Militarism. Just how do we escape them all?"¹²⁰ By "transforming North American Christianity,"

¹¹⁷ For more on Carvill's politics and ecumenical tendencies, see Bernard Zylstra, "Robert Lee Carvill, 1943-1974," *Vanguard* (September-October 1974), 9-11.

¹¹⁸ Morris and Alice Greidanus interview, January 20, 2008.

¹¹⁹ Richard Mouw writes, "This annual conference was, as I see things, one of the most important instruments for the opening up of Calvin College to the larger Christian world." See Mouw, "A Bit of a Gadfly," 118. On ICS representatives at Wheaton College, see "Philosophy Conference Concludes Tonight with Seminar on 'New Left,'" *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 8 (November 7, 1969), 1.

¹²⁰ Richard Forbes, "Is Urbana Really Lost?" *Vanguard* (December 31, 1970). Copy in Box 68, Folder 7, "Urbana 1961-1974," InterVarsity Collection, BGCA. The rhetoric prompted a Christian Reformed Church executive to write a letter of apology to InterVarsity executives. CRC's recruitment secretary wrote, "While we recognize the magnificence of their quest, we regret that they feel it necessary to so ranker and disorder to achieve their goals. Believe me we shall do all that we can toward reconciliation and a productive integration of their energies into Christ's mission." See Eugene Rubingh to David Howard, March 2, 1971, in Box 68, Folder 7, "Urbana 1961-1974," InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

answered John Hultink. The transformation, wrote Hultink, was already “slowly but surely being driven into the spinal cord of complacent North American Christianity.”¹²¹

By 1972 ethnic dissenters boasted 6,000 *Vanguard* subscribers, a small but growing graduate school of 125 students, a publishing house, a prolific stable of writers, and new motivation to reform evangelicalism. Though neither the Reformationalists—nor the Anabaptists—would capture large chunks of broader evangelicalism, their influence was significant. Mennonites John Howard Yoder and Ron Sider and Reformed figures Richard Mouw and Jim Skillen shaped evangelical thought and practice through participation in InterVarsity, *Christianity Today*, and a multitude of conferences on social action. Their influence, welcomed among college-educated new evangelicals for their more fully developed political and social theory, was so strong in fact that the movement would later fragment in part along Reformed-Anabaptist theological lines.

While a set of older, politically progressive evangelicals would soon offer a measure of stability to the emerging evangelical left, young evangelical students in the late 1960s and early 1970s gave the movement much of its vibrancy.¹²² Consumed on an existential level with evangelical hypocrisy and revulsion toward their tradition’s apolitical conservatism, young evangelicals lashed out at the most egregious forms of evangelical respectability. Robert Schuller’s Crystal Cathedral

¹²¹ John Hultink, “Wedge and Its Vision for the Seventies,” Folder “Wedgewood Foundation Financial Records, 1970-1981,” Vanguard Publishing Foundation Collection, Calvin College Archives.

¹²² For an informal history of the *Reformed Journal*, see Henry Stob, “The Years of the Journal,” *Reformed Journal* 26, No. 3 (March 1976), 10-18.

became a symbol of what authenticity was not and the favorite target of young evangelicals' ire for its gaudy displays of prosperity, and its too-ready accommodations to middle-class sensibilities.¹²³ An observer of Urbana 70 captured their complaint against Schuller: "Many older evangelicals who had developed an inferiority complex during years of being ignored while mainline churches with educated clergy and cathedral buildings were touted are proud to see Billy Graham in the White House: at long last, evangelicalism has come to seem social respectable. But their children, college educated, secure in their social positions, see such trappings of culture religion as despicable, as contrary to the biblical injunctions against putting anything in the place of God."¹²⁴ Thus, the vitriolic response of one student at Urbana 70: "Here we are, most of us well-off off-spring of middle-class parents. Not a whole lot for many of us to worry over, suffer for. Looking at us here, who would guess what victims we are? We are victims of our past. Our Evangelical history with its immersion in the American Way of Death seems almost to drown us."¹²⁵ The evangelical push toward wealth and respectability in the face of social injustice felt like rank hypocrisy.

Such sentiments reflected the remarkable sense of alienation and disorientation felt by young evangelicals. Many cited Alvin Toffler's best-selling book *Future Shock*, which contended that individuals were experiencing

¹²³ Ben Patterson, "The Tower of Babel," *Wittenburg Door* (June-July 1975), 4-5; "Robert Schuller: Loser of the Month," *Wittenburg Door* (December 1976-January 1977), 3. Young evangelicals also cited public relations expert Russ Reid as sidestepping authenticity in his manipulative marketing technique of direct mail. "Door Interview with Russ Reid," *Wittenburg Door* 27 (October-November 1975), 9-14.

¹²⁴ William R. Wineke, "Evangelical Students at Urbana '70: Zeal and Social Passion," *Christian Century* 88, No. 7 (February 17, 1971), 226-227. See a similar statement in Donald Tinder, "The Care and Feeding of Evangelical America," *Vanguard* (May-June 1975), 23-25.

¹²⁵ Forbes, "Is Urbana Really Lost?"

psychological disruptions from experiencing “too much change in too short a period of time.”¹²⁶ A satirical magazine called the *Wittenburg Door* merrily jabbed at evangelicalism’s foibles.¹²⁷ Early drafts of the 1973 Chicago Declaration, in which young evangelicals sought to reconstruct an authentic faith free from the cultural accretions of mid-century evangelicalism, mourned a sense of “loneliness and alienation” and called for a recovery of “mutual belonging and support” missing from their parents’ generation.¹²⁸

This generational crisis, exacerbated by turbulent cultural shifts of the 1960s and by young evangelicals’ position on college campuses where they could think critically about their religious heritage, drove students to embrace some of the more radical political impulses that flourished in the 1960s and 1970s.¹²⁹ Because of the timing—coming in the midst of a new evangelical push toward cultural relevance—“the sixties” had a rather exceptional impact on young evangelicals. As the children

¹²⁶ Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock* (New York: Random House, 1970).

¹²⁷ The *Wittenburg Door* was launched in 1969 as a four-page mimeograph for southern California youth workers. The first issue in 1971 spelled “Wittenberg” incorrectly. The chagrined editors decided to let the mistake remain, as if to violate traditional literary convention as much as the insipid middle class conventions of their parents. The magazine soon grew from a small newsletter to a full-blown magazine dedicated to satirizing the evangelical world.

¹²⁸ “From the Group Considering Life Styles,” Folder “1973 Chicago Declaration,” ESA Archives. For specific stories of generational conflict within evangelical families, see Virginia Hearn, *What They Did Right: Reflections on Parents by Their Children* (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House Publishers, 1974), a title implying that the contributors once thought their parents did plenty wrong. Also see Virginia Hearn, ed., *A Struggle to Serve: The Stories of 15 Evangelical Women* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1979). Many young evangelicals said that they were trying to live out the essence of their parents’ faith: “All I’m doing is taking seriously what I was taught as a kid in church.” Quoted in “When Religion Blends with Social Activism,” *U.S. News & World Report* (December 31, 1979), 81-82.

¹²⁹ This story remains untold in a historiography first preoccupied with SDS elites on Ivy League campuses, then with African-American, female, and blue-collar state university activists. See Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam, 1989); James Miller, *Democracy Is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987); Doug Rossinow, *Politics of Authenticity*; Sarah Evans, *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women’s Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement & the New Left* (New York: Vintage, 1979). Alice Echols, *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967-1975* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989); and Kenneth J. Heineman, *Campus Wars: The Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era* (New York: New York University Press, 1993).

of a rising religious tradition, young evangelicals began to mobilize, armed with tools to rebut the instinctive social conservatism of their very own tradition. As the 1970s progressed, evangelicals would begin to more forcefully tie social issues to faith and insert themselves “as Christians” into party politics.

CHAPTER THREE

GLOBAL REFLEX: THE THIRD WORLD SPEAKS TO AMERICAN

EVANGELICALISM

*“Make every international student a good ambassador of your country. When he leaves the USA he will tell to his fellow citizens that not all Americans are racists, materialists and individualists. ... But if frustrated, he will be your enemy and the enemy of your people for the rest of his life.”*¹ —Osner Fevry, Haitian student attending Wheaton College, on third-world visitors to the United States

Barbara Benjamin, granddaughter of English and Polish immigrants to New York City, grew up, as did most young evangelicals, with hard-earned middle-class comfort. Her father had started his career in the 1940s as a mechanic, then rose in rank at a trucking company, finally opening his own Shell fuel station on Long Island. As a young adult she remembered her father’s drive to own “a decent car, a house of his own, the best tools, money to enlarge his stamp collection, time for bowling clubs, even some savings.”² The Benjamins’ social climb continued as Barbara attended college, a first for the family. At Queens College she joined the campus’s InterVarsity chapter along with dozens of other white, middle-class students from evangelical congregations in the area.

¹ Osner Fevry, “My Last Letter to Wheaton,” *Wheaton Record* 101, No. 25 (May 13, 1977), 5.

² Barbara Benjamin, “Immigrant Love: Embracing Our New Neighbors,” *HIS* 42, No. 2 (November 1981).

College life transformed Benjamin's evangelical sensibilities. If on Long Island she had forgotten her early childhood exposure to urban poverty, student unrest at Queens in 1969 reawakened her sensitivity to social inequality. Benjamin and her fellow InterVarsity members found themselves attending classes as the minority race in what was essentially an international university. She staffed student recruitment tables next to SDS, the Jewish Defense League, the Abortion Alliance, Young Socialists, and the Black Club. Talks with campus radicals about Herbert Marcuse, Theodore Roszak, and other social critics challenged her to question the American economic system and doubt liberal assertions of racial progress.³

Queens College, however, did not completed Benjamin's political transformation. After graduation she went to Ecuador as a missionary, where she encountered the vagaries of American economic markets and foreign policy.⁴ Her neighborhood in the grimy port city of Quito was stricken with poverty after U.S.-owned fruit giants United Brands and Chiquita pulled out of the region. American attempts in the 1960s to strengthen the Latin American economy through the Alliance for Progress, she observed, "never touched the masses." Benjamin mourned over the "ridiculous policy of working only through government channels, so the money was greedily devoured by opportunists. Political expedience determined how money flowed." Inept U.S. policy, she concluded, had resulted in 50% unemployment for

³ Barbara Benjamin, *The Impossible Community: A Story of Hardship & Hope at Brooklyn College in New York* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1978), 33-35.

⁴ Scott Flipse charts a mainline and Mennonite parallel to this evangelical phenomenon in his chapter on Protestant humanitarian efforts in Vietnam. After interactions with the American military and foreign policy, many humanitarian workers became staunch critics of American intervention. See Scott Flipse, "To Save 'Free Vietnam' And Lose Our Souls: The Missionary Impulse, Voluntary Agencies, and Protestant Dissent against the War, 1965-1971," in *The Foreign Missionary Enterprise at Home: Explorations in North American Cultural History*, ed. Daniel H. Bays and Grant Wacker (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2003).

men in her neighborhood, naked children whose families could not afford clothing, and hostility toward the United States.⁵

Encountering evangelical passivity to these conditions upon her return to the United States in the mid-1970s only embittered Benjamin more. “You cannot separate social concerns and evangelism,” she wrote in an article read by tens of thousands of InterVarsity students. Railing against “middle-class gentry out in suburbia-land [who] talk about illegal aliens,” she urged students to move to cities where they could follow “God’s mandate to take the Gospel to the poor.” Benjamin also urged political activism: “Christian churches must become centers of action. We need to exercise a stronger prophetic voice to our culture, speaking up against the sins and shortcomings of our society. When I read the Old Testament, I become convinced that our churches need to be addressing the president, the Congress, and all those in high places.” She continued, “The prophets spoke out loudly and plainly. We must too—more than we do. We can’t just sit and mutter, ‘But they’ll call me a liberal.’ Let them call you a liberal—let them call you a Communist if they have to—but speak up! I believe there’s a real moral majority out there that will hear us and respond.”⁶

The bulk of scholarship on cultural exchanges between missionaries and their potential converts focuses on the misadventures of American proselytizers. The relationship between Americans and foreign nationals, however, went beyond the imposition of foreign values upon indigenous peoples; it was a relationship, however

⁵ Benjamin, “Immigrant Love,” 13.

⁶ Benjamin, “Immigrant Love,” 13.

unequal, of mutual exchange.⁷ The encounter forced American evangelicals to think more critically about their own heritage and assumptions. If travel to Marxist countries by SDS leaders in the 1960s encouraged radicalization of the New Left, exposure to the third world pervaded the evangelical left even more.⁸ Evangelical missiologist C. Peter Wagner noted in 1966 that “on mission fields such as Latin America, where people are deeply involved in one of the most explosive and widespread social revolutions in history, the relation of the Church to society is a top-priority issue. There is no pulling back. Christians, like everyone else in Latin America, are caught in a whirlpool of rapid social change, and they demand to know what the Bible has to say to them in this situation.”⁹ Interpreting the Bible for themselves—and increasingly for American evangelicals—substantial numbers of non-Western converts and missionaries offered sharp criticisms of American politics and culture and capitalism.¹⁰ These critiques, sacralized by their origins on the mission field, helped turn some young evangelicals toward Vietnam protests, civil rights, and a tempered nationalism. By the 1970s, these progressive elements—and a more resolute global concern generally—had become important markers of the evangelical left.

⁷ One of the first scholarly treatments of this “missions reflex” came out of a conference at Wheaton College in 1998. The papers were published in Joel A. Carpenter and Wilbert R. Shenk, *Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880-1980* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1990).

⁸ See Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (Toronto and New York: Bantam Books, 1987).

⁹ C. Peter Wagner, “Evangelism and Social Action in Latin America,” *Christianity Today* 10 (January 7, 1966), 338.

¹⁰ To be sure, not all American missionaries, nor all missionary converts, nurtured hostility toward American systems. See for example Carol Ackerman, “Vietnam Missionary Urges Christian Dedication to Halt Communist Front,” *Wheaton Record* 90, No. 19 (March 8, 1968), 8.

I.

Spurred on by growing wealth and American victory in World War II, evangelicals embarked on a postwar missionary boom.¹¹ The number of North American Protestant missionaries grew from 14,000 in the early 1920s to more than 39,000 in the mid-1980s. An overwhelmingly evangelical surge, reflecting the declining interest in traditional missionary work among Protestant mainliners and evangelicals' continued preoccupation with evangelism, evangelicals supplied over 90% of Protestant career missionaries in the postwar era.¹² The number of short-term missionaries, comprised primarily of evangelical youths taking advantage of inexpensive air transportation, soared even higher. Transatlantic flights from New York to Calcutta cut the months-long voyage from America to India of the nineteenth century down to twenty hours in the twentieth century. An increasingly prosperous postwar climate meant that some students could spend academic breaks volunteering

¹¹ On the importance of World War II's role in "reviving the idea of 'global conquest' among evangelical missions promoters," see Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 178. Richard Pierard also links missions and the war in "Pax Americana and the Evangelical Missionary Advance" in *Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880-1980*, eds. Joel A. Carpenter and Wilbert R. Shenk (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 166-169.

¹² Carpenter and Shenk, *Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880-1980*, xii-xiv, 12. Also see chapters 10 and 11 of William L. Svelmoe, "A New Vision for Missions: William Cameron Townsend in Guatemala and Mexico, 1917-1945" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2001). Svelmoe laments the small amount of literature devoted to twentieth-century evangelical missionary work. He argues that the study of American fundamentalism and evangelicalism has focused too narrowly on fundamentalism's reaction to modernism. The real heart of the movement, Svelmoe maintains, was its impulse toward evangelism and missions. Missiologist Samuel Escobar notes that the "missionary work of the old mainline denominations, which pioneered evangelization at the end of the nineteenth century and in the period prior to World War II, declined significantly after that war. It was substituted by the so-called 'non-historic' independent mission boards and faith missions that grew rapidly during the post-war period." See J. Samuel Escobar, "The Church in Latin America after Five Hundred Years: An Evangelical Missiological Perspective," in *The New Face of the Church in Latin America*, ed. Guillermo Cook (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1994), 27.

overseas instead of working to pay for tuition.¹³ InterVarsity, for example, sent thousands of youth overseas each year and founded an organization of international InterVarsity affiliates. With the help of InterVarsity, the interdenominational Latin American Mission, and thousands of Pentecostal missionaries, evangelicalism became an international movement during the postwar era.¹⁴

Given the conversionist theology of American evangelicalism, missionaries focused almost exclusively on soul-winning.¹⁵ For some, however, the hard realities of local conditions shattered illusions about the ease of proselytizing third-world nationals. The work of Bible translation, for instance, exposed deep cultural chasms.¹⁶ Many missionaries felt compelled to feed bellies and correct injustices before

¹³ Dozens of evangelical youth organizations such as Youth with a Mission, InterVarsity, Campus Crusade for Christ, Young Life, Youth for Christ, Christian Service Brigade, and Pioneer Girls catalyzed this new phenomenon. Many were funded by prominent businessmen such as Herbert Taylor, president of Chicago's Club Aluminum Products Company. See Bruce Shelley, "The Rise of Evangelical Youth Movements," *Fides et Historia* 18, No. 1 (1986), 47-63. Youth with a Mission (YWAM) was a particularly important broker in this explosion of short-term mission work. Founded in the early 1960s by Loren Cunningham, a Californian youth minister, YWAM began by taking groups to Hawaii, then to Liberia to work at a leper colony, then to the West Indies, Samoa, Mexico, and Latin America. By 1970 YWAM had begun sending "Mercy Ships" to ports around the world to provide medical assistance and sending tens of thousands of students on summer-long mission trips. See Loren Cunningham and Janice Rogers, *Is That Really You, God?* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Chosen Books, 1984). Today, YWAM has over 11,000 full-time workers, demonstrating the continuing growth and vitality of youth missions in America.

¹⁴ Philip Jenkins, *The Next Christendom: The Rise of Global Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002). Some young evangelicals objected to the new international emphasis, arguing that evangelicals were racist and indifferent toward the urban poor and had "passed over the city in their zeal to evangelize people abroad." See Hefleys, *The Church That Takes on Trouble*, 145.

¹⁵ See, for example, the impression of Samuel Escobar in Grant Wacker and Daniel H. Bays, *The Foreign Missionary Enterprise at Home: Explorations in North American Cultural History* (Tuscaloosa, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 2003), 200.

¹⁶ Lamin Sanneh, "The African Transformation of Christianity: Comparative Reflections on Ethnicity and Religious Mobilization in Africa," in Athalya Brenner and J. W. van Henten, eds., *Bible Translation on the Threshold of the Twenty-First Century*, (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 76; Sanneh, *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1989).

attempting conversions.¹⁷ Working at a Costa Rican hospital, for instance, drove Latin America Mission's David Howard to consider the role of "social concern" in traditional evangelistic efforts. "I had been of the persuasion that social concern smacked of the old social gospel, which earlier fundamentalists had repudiated," Howard remembered. But seeing the sick and dying triggered "a major change in my ... missiological development."¹⁸ Howard, Benjamin, and countless other evangelical missionaries found themselves far more socially active overseas than they had been in the United States.¹⁹ When they returned to the United States, many sought to engage social and political issues with increased energy, often with less conservative perspectives.

One of the earliest and most fascinating examples of this global reflex among evangelicals was W. Cameron Townsend, one of the fathers of twentieth-century evangelical missions and the founder of Wycliffe Bible Translators. A missionary to Mexico in the 1930s, Townsend became Mexico's socialist president Lázaro Cárdenas' principal apologist in the United States. Drawn to Cárdenas' idealistic program of rural education and Indian rights, Townsend and the president became close friends in the 1930s. Townsend defended Cárdenas' agrarian reforms, nationalization of foreign oil companies, and stress on socialist education. By the

¹⁷ See, for example, the story of a missionary to Ethiopia distraught by poverty in Diane Dadian, "Abroad View," *HIS* 41, No. 3 (December 1980), 31.

¹⁸ David M. Howard, "My Pilgrimage in Mission," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 21, No. 3 (July 1997).

¹⁹ See Charles Van Engen, "A Broadening Vision: Forty Years of Evangelical Theology of Mission, 1946-1986" in Carpenter and Shenk, *Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880-1980*. Samuel Escobar notes that other Latin American Mission missionaries confirm Van Engen's observation. See Samuel Escobar, "The Two-Party System and the Missionary Enterprise," in *Re-Forming the Center: American Protestantism, 1900 to the Present*, ed. Douglas and Trollering Jacobsen, Jr., William Vance (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998).

1940s and 1950s Townsend was taking regular tours of the United States, speaking with American oil officials, writing editorials in U.S. newspapers, and giving talks to fundamentalist churches. In the year 1938 alone, Townsend, along with his wife Elvira, visited eighty colleges and churches, all with solid evangelical or fundamentalist ties. His tour was a success, Townsend wrote to Cárdenas. In fact 80% of the American public would agree with the Mexican stance on nationalization of the oil companies, Townsend suggested, if only he could spread the word fast enough. “But how can one inform them of the truth,” Townsend complained, “when the press is capitalistic and twists the news?” He became such an apologist of Cárdenas and a critic of American foreign policy—he loved to rail against the hypocrisy of America’s “Good Neighbor” policy—that he drew an FBI file and surveillance. Townsend, thus, was an anomaly in his embrace of socialistic policies, his criticism of U.S. foreign policy, his staunch defense of cultural sensitivity, and his commitment to “spreading the gospel.”²⁰

Missionary reports and novels offered a more direct route to the minds of young evangelicals, who were only toddlers at the time of Townsend’s tours. *No Graven Image*, written for impressionable missionary prospects by Elizabeth Elliot, surveyed the horrors of life in a foreign urban context. Elliot described a man with no eyes and no feet sitting on the pavement “with his back against a building ... his head lolling back on his neck.” “Two holes where his eyes had been were directed toward me,” she continued. “A girl of about eight lay in his lap, emaciated and limp, with immense black eyes rimmed with shadows and shining with fever.” The young

²⁰ For an in-depth treatment of Townsend, see Svelmoe, “A New Vision for Missions: William Cameron Townsend in Guatemala and Mexico, 1917-1945.”

female missionary heroine, Margaret, from a middle-class American home realizes that “witnessing” to him is not enough, despite the evangelical mandate to “tell them of Christ.” “I found it hard to acknowledge,” confided Margaret to the reader, “that spiritual need was not somehow correlative to physical.” Along the way Margaret encounters a well-meaning, but culturally insensitive American missionary executive. As Margaret takes “Mr. Harvey” on her daily rounds of visiting the Quichua Indians, he takes photographs insensitively, turns up his nose at food, and distributes tracts to the illiterate Quichua. Elliot, in painting this portrait of ethnocentrism, primed millions of evangelical children to question the superiority of American culture and politics.²¹

Actual travel overseas more vitally helped form the evangelical left. InterVarsity, for example, sent students to its Overseas Training Camps in Europe, Guatemala, and Costa Rica, where they learned about current issues from indigenous teachers. In Switzerland in 1968 administrator Hans Burki assembled nearly 100 recent college graduates from all over the world to discuss contemporary culture, the family, and politics. Burki took delight in watching some international leftists challenge a group of right-wing American students.²² InterVarsity students at a Costa Rican camp in July 1972 heard from “Padre Chemita,” a rebel priest “disowned by the hierarchy but who has held on to his parish and is carrying out progressive innovations”; Jorge Monterroso, “a leftist evangelical lawyer”; and Marco Tulio Cajas, “an evangelical university student who is carrying out a creative social work

²¹ Elisabeth Elliot, *No Graven Image: A Novel* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), 6-7, 19, 191-192.

²² H.W. Sutherland to Dr. Hans Burki, April 29, 1968, in Box 20, Folder 2, “Hans Burki, 1948, 1968-1971,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

program coupled with evangelism.” Local missionaries took InterVarsity students to Costa Rican farms, discussed socialism, and discussed the politics of the Peace Corps. InterVarsity leaders hoped to force students to come “to terms with their own innate attitudes of cultural superiority” through encounters with Latin American farmers, priests, and intellectuals.²³

InterVarsity also deluged students who did not travel overseas with international perspectives. In each issue of *HIS* magazine, a “World in Transit” insert addressed international concerns, often from the perspective of foreign writers. A monthly newsletter treated readers to regular features about InterVarsity affiliates in Asia, Latin America, and elsewhere.²⁴ InterVarsity regularly lauded the civil responsibility of the Peace Corps, urging its members to sign up for a year of service. Urbana conferences also featured this global flavor. Dozens of speakers and hundreds of students from all over the world converged on the University of Illinois campus every three years. At Urbana 70, planners provided over 100 headphones with translations to international guests.²⁵ At Urbana 73, Colombian Gregorio Landero told InterVarsity students that “the human race cannot get along just on spiritual ministry; we must minister to the material needs also, that which is necessary for daily life.”²⁶ Speakers trained students to contextualize the gospel and address salient social and political concerns. InterVarsity administrators offered seminars on agriculture and

²³ See Box 58, Folder 10, “Overseas Training Camp; 1962-1976,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

²⁴ See, for example, the 1971 issues of *The Branch* in Box 124, Folder 10, “Student Newspaper; 1971-1977, *The Branch*,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

²⁵ On headphones, see Box 68, Folder 4, “Conferences—Sites; 1968-69”; on travel scholarships, see Box 144, Folder 3, “Urbana Latin America Correspondence—1967,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

²⁶ Gregorio Landero, “Evangelism and Social Concern,” *Right On* 6, No. 4 (November 1974), 1, 11.

“the impending world food crisis,” anthropology “as a tool in the task of world evangelism,” urban problems overseas, “social concern and the Gospel,” and “War, Peace, and Missions.”²⁷ A global reflex shaped the politics of InterVarsity students in the 1970s.²⁸

This reflex cracked insularity on evangelical college campuses as well. Wheaton’s student newspaper in the 1960s and 1970s contained a remarkable number of articles by international students, many of whom enjoyed a minor celebrity status on campus.²⁹ Indigenous students, for their part, wrote copiously about international politics and urged participation in the Peace Corps.³⁰ Moreover, campus programs such as the Student Missionary Project and the Human Needs and Global Resources Program (HNGR) sent students all over the world. HNGR, offering a minor degree, periodic seminars, and a mandatory 9-month overseas internship, launched dozens of

²⁷ See Box 68, Folder 7, “Urbana 1961-1974,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA. Readers of CWLF’s *Right On* also heard surprisingly international perspectives. The magazine published dozens of letters from overseas each year. See for example a letter from a group called Frente Cristiano por la Liberación Spiritual del Mundo from Mexico City who started a coffee house and a paper called *Vida*. See “Right On in Mexico,” *Right On* 3 No. 7 (January 1972), 2.

²⁸ On encounters between evangelical seminary students and theologian Bernard Ramm in Buenos Aires; between evangelicals and World Vision delegates in Cordoba; between leftist evangelicals and Paul Rees in Cochabamba; and between Brazilian and Argentine students in Campinas, see Samuel Escobar, “Reflections,” 119-120, in Ron Sider, ed., *The Chicago Declaration* (Carol Stream, Ill.: Creation House, 1974). John Stott, Paul Rees, and Carl F.H. Henry were also key evangelical icons who worked under World Vision and InterVarsity and who introduced important third-world leaders such as Kwame Bediako, Zac Niringiye, and Caesar Molebatsi from Africa; Melba Maggay of the Philippines; and Vinay Samuel of India to American evangelicals. See Carpenter, “How Much Has Changed?” 12-13.

²⁹ An African exchange student was elected president of Westmont’s student body in the mid-1960s. See Paul Edwards, “Off the Record,” *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 28 (April 29, 1965). On the substantial influence of Filipino sociology professor Ka Tong Gaw, see David MacDonald and Alicia Byrd, “A Last Word with Ka Tong Gaw,” 97, No. 17 *Wheaton Record* (May 16, 1975), 3.

³⁰ See for example Gordon Dykstra, “Third World Review,” *Chimes* 62, No. 17 (February 23, 1968), 6.

careers in international development.³¹ Upon re-entry into the United States, HNGR students (and those in similar programs on other evangelical campuses) offered some of the most militant evangelical critiques of American diplomacy and culture.

As third-world criticism of American imperialism, materialism, and antipathy toward social justice peaked in the 1970s, many American evangelicals responded with surprising resonance. At the Congress on the Church's Worldwide Mission, recommendations from eight African, nineteen Asian, and twenty-eight Latin American evangelicals "weighed heavily in determining the final shape of the Declaration," reported one observer regarding the unprecedented attention given social problems in the 1966 Wheaton Declaration. Similar third-world pressure shaped documents written at the World Congress on Evangelism in Berlin in 1966, the Asia-South Pacific Congress on Evangelism in Singapore in 1968, the Latin American Congress on Evangelism in Bogotá in 1969, the European Congress on Evangelism in Amsterdam in 1971, and the All India Conference on Evangelical Social Action in Madras in 1979, among many others.³² Even Billy Graham's virulent rhetoric against communism and for the Vietnam War softened in the early 1970s as Graham traveled extensively, nurtured ecumenical contact, and interacted with Christian leaders in Africa, Asia, and Latin America who "communicated Third

³¹ Wayne G. Bragg and Marilyn Carlson, "Third World Study and Service: A Manual for HNGR Interns," Vertical file "HNGR," WCA; Katherine Halberstadt, "A Matter of Perspective," *Wheaton Magazine* 9, No. 4 (2006), 20-23.

³² Papers given at these conventions included "The Evangel and Social Upheaval" by Ceylonian Benjamin E. Fernando, "The Social Responsibility of the Church" by Ecuadorian Samuel Escobar, and "Social Implications of Evangelism" by Paavo Kortekangas. See C. René Padilla, "Evangelism and Social Responsibility: From Wheaton '66 to Wheaton '83," *Transformation* 2, No. 3 (July 1985), 27-33.

World perceptions to him.”³³ The global concern more decisively shaped emerging evangelical left’s politics, the contours of which can be seen in an intriguing encounter between the Latin American Theological Fraternity and U.S.-based Latin America Mission.

II.

Latin America Mission, a vast network of missionaries, radio stations, medical clinics, seminaries, publications, and camps, circulated comfortably in the new evangelical orbit. Founded in 1921, LAM by the 1950s nurtured close ties with Billy Graham, recruited missionaries from Wheaton College, and received the bulk of their funding from evangelical sources. LAM concentrated its efforts in Costa Rica and Columbia at first; within decades it had spread throughout Latin America to become the largest evangelical mission agency in that part of the world. North Americans administered the many arms of LAM until 1971, when the organization completed a process of “latinization.” Turning over all administrative power to Latin American leadership launched a new era in Latin American missions.³⁴

LAM’s new administrators immediately began sponsorship of *Fraternidad Teológica Latinoamericana* (FTL), known in the United States as the Latin American Theological Fraternity. Organized at CLADE I, a 1969 meeting of North American

³³ Richard V. Pierard, “From Evangelical Exclusivism to Ecumenical Openness: Billy Graham and Sociopolitical Issues,” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 20, No. 3 (Summer 1983), 435.

³⁴ On “latinization,” see David Stoll, *Is Latin America Turning Protestant? The Politics of Evangelical Growth* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 131. There were several other key sources of this criticism, one of which was the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students (IFES). Founded by InterVarsity, IFES was composed of affiliates of the American organization. Since most Latin American universities were enmeshed in political ferment even more than their American counterparts and since IFES members often met with their American counterparts, IFES was a key source of politicization and anti-American sentiment for the young evangelical movement.

missionaries and Latin American church leaders, FTL emerged as an alternative to Church and Society in Latin America (ISAL), a mainline Protestant movement that “interpreted the Christian faith through eyes of the poor.”³⁵ FTL sought to refute this “liberation theology,” while at the same time still engaging social issues.³⁶ The meeting, however, sparked an unexpected result with long-term repercussions. Peruvian Samuel Escobar, a participant in CLADE I, explained, “Once Latin churchmen were brought together, they discovered that they were tired of North Americans telling them how to think.”³⁷

FTL, a critical medium for the global reflex in the 1970s, soon emerged less as an alternative to liberation theology than as an alternative to what it saw as an American theological imperialism and its conflation of capitalism and faith. While a few members, such as José Miguez Bonino, outspokenly advocated liberation theology, most remained somewhat critical of the movement. Still, the seriousness and sympathy with which most FTL members treated both Bonino and liberation theology signaled a clear break from the political sensibilities of American evangelicals.³⁸ In time, FTL’s self-conscious effort to bridge the critiques of

³⁵ The National Association of Evangelicals, the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, and Latin American Mission financed CLADE I.

³⁶ Orlando Costas delineates what he calls the “Gospel in context” position in Orlando E. Costas, *Liberating News: A Theology of Contextual Evangelization* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1989). On liberation theology, see Gustavo Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics and Salvation* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1988); Christian Smith, *The Emergence of Liberation Theology: Radical Religion and the Social Movement Theory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

³⁷ Samuel Escobar, quoted in Stoll, *Is Latin America Turning Protestant?* 131. When CLADE II was held in 1979, organizers limited non-Latin American participation to 10% of the 250 participants. It was “a thoroughly Latin affair.” See copy of article in CWLF: Hoover Institution: David Stoll Collection: Box 28: FTL including IFES folder.

³⁸ Roy Bissell Cooper, “A Critical Analysis of Liberation Theology in the Works of José Miguez Bonino and Ronald J. Sider” (Ph.D. dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1986). Politically conservative American evangelicals were critical of FTL’s politics. On accusations that the

liberation theology and evangelical piety and doctrine coalesced around a home-grown theory they called “contextualization.”³⁹ The new terminology implied a middle-road approach to hermeneutics and social structures that stressed sin both in social terms (like liberation theologians) as well as personal terms (like American evangelicals). FTL, in the words of one Latin American theologian, became “an evangelical variant of the Latin American theological ferment of the decade.”⁴⁰ Compared to new evangelical attempts to engage social structures, FTL’s efforts carried a harder edge. With roots in a colonial context and in the underclass of the western hemisphere, evangelical theologians in Latin America were willing to attack structural inequities in more than just a theoretical sense.

Despite its ambivalence toward American evangelicalism, FTL remained closely tied to its northern counterpart. Many of its members worked for LAM. World Vision and the unlikely National Liberty Foundation, whose founder was a large donor and board member of Campus Crusade for Christ, partially funded the organization.⁴¹ With this financial support FTL grew to nearly one hundred members—many of them Latin Americans trained in the United States and Europe—by the late 1970s with annual meetings and a journal. Three of them in particular—

Latin America Biblical Seminary in San José, Costa Rica, was succumbing to liberation theology, see John Maust, “Seminary Crisis a Case Study in Political, Doctrinal Tensions,” *Christianity Today* 25, No. 9 (May 8, 1981), 40-43.

³⁹ The most developed description of contextualization within LATF is Antonio Carlos Barro, “Orlando Enrique Costas: Mission Theologian on the Way and at the Crossroads” (Ph.D. dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1993), 8-40. But the idea was developed among FTL members as far back as the late 1960s.

⁴⁰ Orlando E. Costas, *Christ Outside the Gate: Mission Beyond Christendom* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1982), xii.

⁴¹ Stoll, *Is Latin America Turning Protestant?* 131.

René Padilla, Orlando Costas, and Samuel Escobar—found themselves in the 1970s positioned to prophetically speak against American evangelicalism from within.

René Padilla, born the sixth of eight children in Quito, Ecuador, traveled widely in Latin America as a child after his family was converted in the 1960s by American missionaries. In Bogotá, Columbia, his evangelist father moved from neighborhood to neighborhood starting new churches and preaching against the Catholic Church. In Ecuador, his father worked for the evangelistic radio station HCJB. Connections with American evangelicals there led to an invitation to attend Wheaton College. There he joined InterVarsity, befriended Mexican migrant workers, and tried to avoid getting drafted by the U.S. military. After graduating from Wheaton and marrying an InterVarsity worker, Padilla was hired by IFES to start InterVarsity chapters at universities across Latin America as he pursued doctoral studies at the University of Manchester.⁴²

Orlando Costas, born in Puerto Rico, moved to Bridgeport, Connecticut, with his family as a young boy after his father's grocery business failed. Encouraged by friends and teachers to forget his language and culture, Costas immediately felt the sting of American ethnocentrism. "For three years I suffered the impact of a strange cultural environment, full of hostility and prejudice," remembered Costas. Initially rejecting his parents' evangelical faith as a teenager, Costas was converted at Billy Graham's 1957 crusade at Madison Square Garden in New York City. After finishing high school at Bob Jones Academy in South Carolina and attending college at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Garrett Theological Seminary, Winona Lake School of

⁴² Carlos René Padilla interview, audio tape in Collection 361, BGCA.

Theology, and the Free University of Amsterdam, Costas split his pastoral and academic career between the United States and Latin America. A pastorate in Milwaukee among the Hispanic community sparked an interest in social activism. He joined Milwaukee's "War on Poverty" campaign and formed the Latin American Union for Civil Rights. He transferred this social concern to Costa Rica, where he served as dean of the Latin American Biblical Seminary and joined FTL.⁴³ All the while, Costas maintained a close interest in American evangelicalism as a contributing editor of *The Other Side* and author of a 1974 book *The Church and Its Mission: A Shattering Critique from the Third World*, which disparaged American church growth theory.⁴⁴

Samuel Escobar, born in Peru, was perhaps the staunchest critic of American evangelical quietism. After training at San Marcos University in Lima and in Madrid, Spain, Escobar helped found FTL and served as its president between 1970 and 1984. At CLADE I, Escobar delivered a paper, "La Responsabilidad Social de la Iglesia," that articulated his conviction that "one could be profoundly evangelical doctrinally as well as relevant and committed socially."⁴⁵ Escobar, like Padilla and Costas, reversed the trajectory of the American missionary diaspora and began to circulate in the North American evangelical world. Escobar left Latin America to become a missionary to the United States, serving as General Director of InterVarsity-Canada

⁴³ For biographical material on Costas, see Barro, "Orlando Enrique Costas: Mission Theologian on the Way and at the Crossroads," 9-44.

⁴⁴ Orlando E. Costas, *The Church and Its Mission: A Shattering Critique from the Third World* (Wheaton: Ill., Tyndale House Publishers, 1974).

⁴⁵ Quoted in Pablo P. Moreno, "Baptists in Latin America and Their Theological Contributions at the End of the Twentieth Century," *Baptist History and Heritage* 36, No. 1 (Winter-Spring, 2001). For more on Escobar, see "On the Eve of Departure: A Conversation with Samuel Escobar," *Vanguard* (September-October 1975), 20-24.

from 1972 to 1975 and then at International Fellowship of Evangelical Students for the next 25 years. A main speaker at InterVarsity's Urbana conventions of 1970, 1973, and 1981, Escobar also participated in key international congresses on world evangelism in Berlin (1966), Bogotá (1969), Toronto (1970), Madrid (1974), and Lausanne (1974). At Lausanne, he served as one of four members of a committee that drafted the "Lausanne Covenant," a statement urging simple living and international sensitivity.

The Lausanne Congress of World Evangelization in fact offered Escobar, Padilla, and Costas an unprecedented opportunity to speak to North Americans. Four thousand evangelical leaders from around the world gathered in Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1974 to discuss methods of global evangelism.⁴⁶ The trio held prominent roles at Lausanne, delivering plenary addresses that sharply criticized what they saw as a truncated North American concept of evangelization. First, they described North American evangelism as technique-driven and rooted in cold efficiency. Responding to G.W. Peters of the fundamentalist Dallas Theological Seminary who spoke at Lausanne of confrontation evangelism, friendship evangelism, camp evangelism, dinner evangelism, and mass media evangelism, Costas denounced such short-sighted campaigns as incomplete. Too often, he contended, these activities became "a commercial, manipulative whitewash."⁴⁷ Later

⁴⁶ The concern for diversity on the part of Lausanne's planners (they raised money to fly thousands of third-world evangelicals to Switzerland) reflected a growing trend in evangelicalism during the era. For a similar concern, note the attempt by Robert McCan, a member of Church of the Savior in Washington, D.C., to establish the polycultural Dag Hammarskjold College, which was meant to simulate a "miniature world community." See O'Connor, *Journey Inward, Journey Outward*, 167.

⁴⁷ Orlando E. Costas, "In-Depth Evangelism in Latin America," 212, in *Let the Earth Hear His Voice*, ed. J.D. Douglas (Minneapolis: World Wide Publications, 1975).

in the Congress, citing the social critic Jacques Ellul's critique of an American "technological mentality," Padilla criticized evangelicalism's penchant for turning "the strategy for the evangelization of the world into a problem of technology."⁴⁸ Evangelism shaped by an obsession with efficiency and the "systematization of methods and resources to obtain pre-established results," stated Padilla, found precedent not in Scripture but in a "fierce pragmatism" that "in the political sphere has produced Watergate." Padilla concluded, "We in the Third World cannot and should not be satisfied with the rote repetition of doctrinal formulas or the indiscriminate application of canned methods of evangelization imported from the West."⁴⁹

Instead of evangelism concerned primarily with numerical growth that "turned the Gospel into a cheap product," Padilla urged evangelical activity in the political arena that would ameliorate social injustices. "A church that is not faithful to the Gospel in all its dimensions," he contended, "inevitably becomes an instrument of the status quo."⁵⁰ This statement pointed to FTL's primary critique at Lausanne—that American evangelism was too one-dimensional. Charging that many evangelicals lacked an appreciation of "the wider dimensions of the gospel," Padilla maintained that "it is not possible to speak of salvation with no reference to the world of which

⁴⁸ A Ugandan similarly mocked American evangelical preoccupation with methods and technology, writing that "Americans will even teach you how to get that gift [speaking in tongues] because they are technologically minded." See Festo Kivengere, "Revival, Persecution, and Evangelism in Uganda," *Right On* 9, No. 4 (January-February 1978), 14-17.

⁴⁹ René Padilla, "Evangelism and the World," 125, 126, 132, 139-14, in *Let the Earth Hear His Voice*, ed. J.D. Douglas (Minneapolis: World Wide Publications, 1975), 125-126, 132, 139-140. Padilla also objected to the imperialism of North American evangelism: "The church in the Third World has nothing to say on the matter. Isn't this again a way to identify the Gospel with worldly power, a way to perpetuate the dominion/dependence patterns that have often characterized missionary work for the last hundred years?"

⁵⁰ Padilla, "Evangelism and the World," 137.

[the individual] is a part.”⁵¹ He argued against “an individualistic Jesus who is concerned with the salvation of individuals.” Likewise, Costas used words such as “comprehensive” and “structural,” urging that evangelicals integrate acts of social justice and evangelism.⁵² Escobar’s speech sounded the same theme. It was hard for third-world nationals not to believe that religion was an opiate, he declared, since “Christians, evangelicals in particular, oppose the violence of revolution but not the violence of war; they condemn the totalitarianism of the left but not that of the right; they speak openly in favor of Israel, but very seldom speak or do anything about the Palestinian refugees; they condemn all the sins that well-behaved middle class people condemn but say nothing about exploitation, intrigue, and dirty political maneuvering done by great multi-national corporations around the world.”⁵³ “Jesus’ work had a social and political dimension,” Padilla contended, which worked itself out in the politically charged, Jewish-Roman context of first-century Palestine.⁵⁴

Padilla urged a non-conformist politics. He condemned North American evangelicalism for its “culture Christianity.” He told the Lausanne throng, “The Gospel of culture-Christianity today is a message of conformism, a message that, if not accepted, can at least be easily tolerated because it doesn't disturb anybody. The racist can continue to be a racist, the exploiter can continue to be an exploiter. Christianity will be something that runs along life, but will not cut through it.”⁵⁵

⁵¹ Padilla, “Evangelism and the World,” 139-140.

⁵² For similar rhetoric, see Emilio Castro, “Strategies for Confronting Unjust Social Structures” *Reformed Journal* 25, No. 4 (April 1975), 17-21

⁵³ Samuel Escobar, “Evangelism and Man's Search for Freedom, Justice and Fulfillment,” 304, in *Let the Earth Hear His Voice*, ed. J.D. Douglas (Minneapolis: World Wide Publications, 1975).

⁵⁴ Padilla, “Evangelism and the World,” 130.

⁵⁵ Padilla, “Evangelism and the World,” 138.

Recalling how Christian mission work in Africa and Asia was so closely connected with European colonialism, he accused North American Christians of committing the same sin internationally, of promoting “the American Way of Life” abroad. Citing David Moberg’s *The Great Reversal*, Padilla said, “We have equated ‘Americanism’ with Christianity to such an extent that we are tempted to believe that people in other cultures must adopt American institutional patterns when they are converted.” This control of “large numbers of middle class whites” in the church and overseas explains, Padilla diagnosed, “the confusion of Christian orthodoxy with socio-economic and political conservatism present in Evangelicalism in the United States.” This harms the Christian witness overseas, he continued. “At least in Latin America today the evangelist often has to face innumerable prejudices that reflect the identification of Americanism with the Gospel.”⁵⁶

Enjoying unexpected resonance from delegates, Padilla and Escobar organized a dissenting group that tried to force the committee drafting a “Lausanne Declaration” to incorporate clearer statements about social involvement as a type of evangelism. On the Sunday evening of the Lausanne congress, the two led 500 delegates in an ad hoc discussion of “the social and political implications of radical discipleship today.” They emerged with a document, “A Response to Lausanne,” that pronounced attempts “to drive a wedge between evangelism and social action” as “demonic.” Members of the drafting committee of the Lausanne Declaration, working just two weeks before Nixon’s resignation, obliged. They replaced “social action” with “socio-political involvement” and inserted more explicit statements that

⁵⁶ Padilla, “Evangelism and the World,” 125.

denounced injustice and oppression.⁵⁷ FTL, only one of many third-world communities dedicated to radical evangelical political action, challenged American evangelical quietism and conservatism.⁵⁸

III.

International criticism of American evangelicalism on college campuses, at churches, and in dozens of evangelical magazines carried on FTL's striking performance at Lausanne.⁵⁹ These prophetic voices offered aid and inspiration to the American evangelical left, which likewise professed devotion to traditional evangelical piety even as they took progressive positions on social and political matters. Third-world evangelicals most profoundly shaped American evangelical social thought regarding two major themes: American imperialism and social justice.

Historian Richard Pierard has argued that victory in World War II and a "deep sense of national chosenness" shaped postwar global evangelization by American evangelicals. This sense of a transcendent mission and evangelicals' acceptance of a "syncretic confusion of Christianity and Americanism," he argues, led in many cases

⁵⁷ Athol Gill, "Christian Social Responsibility," 91-92, in *The New Face of Evangelicalism*.

⁵⁸ Such international communities included a "group of thinkers at Potchefstroom University who are a lot like *Radix/Sojourners/The Other Side* except with a strongly Calvinist ethos; Cape Town Cathedral in South Africa; the "radical" British magazine *The Third Way*; Buzz Christian Ministries in Britain; St. Johns Bangalore in India. See David Prior, "The Church in South Africa," *Right On* 10, No. 1 (July-August 1978), 15-18; Chris Sugden, *Radical Discipleship* (London: Marshalls, 1981).

⁵⁹ C. René Padilla, "Evangelism and Social Responsibility from Wheaton '66 to Wheaton '83," 4-17, in C. René Padilla and Chris Sugden, eds., *How Evangelicals Endorsed Social Responsibility: Texts on Evangelical Social Ethics, 1974-83—A Commentary* (Nottingham: Grove Books Limited, 1985). This article stresses the importance of two-thirds world participation in evangelical conferences.

to cultural insensitivity and imperialism.⁶⁰ Many evangelical missionaries and their converts echoed Pierard's assessment with a strident, sometimes bitter, voice. One Middle Eastern student at a 1962 InterVarsity event declared, "We are the generation of a part of the world where misery, sickness and poverty are predominant, despite the fact that we have many resources. This has been the result of 500 years of colonialism and imperialism. ... Your religion is serving the interest of the imperialist."⁶¹ Most international evangelicals were more ambivalent than that—after all, Americans had brought them the gospel—but as a whole most resented the American-ness of the evangelical gospel with its cultural, economic, and political trappings.⁶²

⁶⁰ Richard Pierard, "Pax Americana and the Evangelical Missionary Advance," 155-179, in *Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880-1980* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990).

⁶¹ John Goodwin, "A Man to Reckon With," *HIS* 23, No. 3 (December 1962), 3. An InterVarsity student similarly reported, "These restless students aren't ready to look up to the missionary as a 'Great White Father' as many of their parents did. In this day of throbbing nationalism they are more likely to regard him as a 'Gringo imperialist.' They want no more imported, made-in-USA Christianity. They want self-identity as a national church, so they can work out the implications of the gospel within the cultural context that they know firsthand. But what Americans, and especially those who contact foreign students, should understand is that Latin Americans are brought up in different circumstances from ours. We are all too prone to jump to the conclusion that a Latin leftist or socialist or revolutionary is automatically a 'Commie' or 'red-lining.' Our own outlook, however, might be quite different had we been brought up in the poverty and humiliation of an underdeveloped country." See C. Peter Wagner, "Forced to Choose," *HIS* 26, No. 6 (March 1966), 23-24. Also see Orlando Costas, "The Mission of an Affluent Church," *Reformed Journal* (September 1973). "It is no surprise to see coming out of the same lands a movement of domination and exploitation together with the message of freedom imbedded in the gospel. What is hard to take is how the values that undergird the imperialistic philosophy make their way into the church."

⁶² An Indian student in InterVarsity, for example, told American students that internationals loved to analyze and critique American society. When confronted with such critiques, Balraj Sökkappa cautioned, American students "should remember to be honest and truthful and to think objectively. The temptation to exaggerate and believe his ways better than other people's is great. ... Chauvinistic nationalism should never be a trait of a true Christian." See Balraj Sökkappa, "International Students Speak," *HIS* 19, No. 2 (November 1958), 11. Also see William Girao, "Is Nationalism a Friend or Foe of the Gospel?" in *The Message, Men, and Mission* (Manila, the Philippines: Intervarsity, 1971), 80-86.

This broad charge—that American evangelicals had confused the gospel with the American way of life, and then imposed that corrupted gospel on the world—came in several specific forms. First, some resented evangelicals’ imposition of American-style laissez-faire capitalism and democracy. InterVarsity’s Paul Little related the story of a conversation with an overseas friend, who complained, “You in America want us to become Christians in my country so we will be a democracy. I don’t believe that democracy is the answer for our country. Socialism is a much better solution for our problems.” It took several weeks of intense conversation for Little to convince his friend that “‘the American way of life’ and democracy are not a necessary part of Christianity.”⁶³ International students and HNGR participants at Wheaton regularly sounded the warning that in tying faith to anti-communism, missionaries were blinding the third world to the gospel. Kenyan Ayub Waitara, for instance, accused the United States of using Africa as a battleground against communism. “Political morality,” Waitara asserted, was not “a Western monopoly.” Waitara told his Wheaton classmates that Africans should “find something that preserves African moralities and sensibilities,” something “outside of the ideological struggle between communism and capitalism.”⁶⁴ Emilio Núñez, a conservative evangelical from El Salvador, contended that the United States was guilty of “tightly controlling the economic world, setting prices and determining markets, loaning

⁶³ Paul Little, “Neither East nor West,” *HIS* 25, No. 1 (October 1964), 23.

⁶⁴ Ayub Waitara, “Perspective,” *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 20 (February 25, 1965), 2.

massive capital at unbearably high interest rates, and at the same time imperialistically imposing a free-enterprise economy on Latin America.”⁶⁵

René Padilla’s assertion that socialism was “far more compatible” to New Testament ideals than capitalism undergirded the critiques of American imperialism that flowed north and west from many third-world evangelicals.⁶⁶

Many young evangelicals took such complaints seriously, beginning themselves to question the evangelical matrix that tied together faith, patriotism, capitalism, and democracy.⁶⁷ Wheaton student Fred Smith, goaded by African exchange students, wrote that “Many leaders abroad are becoming disillusioned with democracy, because we who should best represent it too often represent not democracy, but only anti-Communism or capital investment.”⁶⁸ InterVarsity and Latin America Mission executives worried about conservative evangelical leaders such as Billy Graham, Harold Lindsell of *Christianity Today*, NAE, and Campus Crusade banding together to “form an anti-socialist block in the name of the Gospel.” Such a move would not bode well for missions work overseas, they argued. “In the Third World,” wrote InterVarsity’s Charles Troutman, “the idea of the free enterprise

⁶⁵ Emilio Antonio Núñez and William David Taylor, *Crisis in Latin America* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1989), 102.

⁶⁶ René Padilla, “The Church and the Third World,” *Right On 7*, No. 3 (October 1975), 6. Padilla wrote, “There is no doubt that the whole economic system is in the hands of exploiters. It is a conspiracy against the poor. The big multinational companies are backed up by the U.S. government, but that is because of the interest of those who are powerful politically. ... The big companies are buying politicians—everywhere.”

⁶⁷ See, for example, Karmel and Hugh McCullum, “That Old Demon Racism,” *Vanguard* (November-December, 1977): 10. The McCullums noted that the native peoples in Canada were virtually ignored until oil was found in their territory, at which point the Canadian imposed its educational system upon them and drilled for oil. This is also when missionaries went North.

⁶⁸ Fred Smith, “Needed: Reappraisal of U.S. Attitudes,” *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 15 (January 14, 1965), 3; Steve Brobeck, “Communist Unity Broken,” *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 18 (February 11, 1965), 2; David Adeney, “Beyond the Bamboo Curtain,” *HIS* 38, No. 6 (March 1978), 1-6.

system is so utterly discredited, even among those who maintain it for personal advantage, that Lindsell's union of the Gospel and capitalism is going to appear like childish stupidity."⁶⁹

Institutions such as InterVarsity and LAM observed what less globally oriented evangelicals could not: the economic aggression of American corporations that often followed in the wake of missionary activity. While tardy, given American corporate activity in Latin America in the heyday of the Monroe Doctrine, accusations of economic imperialism dominated young evangelical rhetoric in the 1970s. Barbara Benjamin's horror in the 1960s at Chiquita's rapid expansion and then departure in Ecuador signaled the growing antipathy among the emerging evangelical left to the vagaries of free markets and the failure of the Alliance for Progress.

The high mark of evangelical antipathy toward American imperialism came in the 1970s with a flurry of denunciations of U.S. intervention in Vietnam and Latin America. In 1973 the *Post-American* reprinted articles entitled "America's Empire" and "How We Look to the Third World," which painted the United States as a "status-quo-seeking, interventionist monolith."⁷⁰ In 1977 a group of Latin Americans launched a campaign to support the renegotiation of the terms of the Panama Canal Treaty. In an "Open Letter to North American Christians," Orlando Costas of FTL and seven other evangelical leaders lambasted North Americans for their "ignorance,

⁶⁹ Troutman continued, "The frustration we have is to convey to the North the all-pervasive presence of 'liberation' in Latin America. I suppose it is like 'democracy' used to be in the USA. Just as Spanish is the language here, so 'liberation' is in the air in everything we do and say and think." See Charles Troutman to Jim McLeish, May 23, 1976, in Box 20, Folder 3, "Campus Crusade: Correspondence and Materials, 1960-1976," InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

⁷⁰ Boyd Reese, "America's Empire," *Post-American* 2, No. 5 (November-December 1973), 10-11, 14; Eqbal Ahmad, "How We Look to the Third World," *Post-American* 2, No. 5 (November-December 1973), 8-9. Reprinted from *The Nation*, March 3, 1969.

greed, and ethnocentrism.” Arguing that the United States had stolen, not bought, the Canal, the Latin Americans maintained that the United States had cut fees for American companies at the expense of Panama. They condemned Reagan’s rhetoric and continued colonialism in Latin America, charging that “Your precious ‘American Way of Life’ ... feeds in no small proportion on the blood which gushes ‘from the open veins of Latin America.’”⁷¹ Members of InterVarsity’s International Fellowship of Evangelical Students in Costa Rica similarly wrote,

Panama has waited patiently while you procrastinated in the renegotiation of the treaty through the years of Vietnam, Watergate, and the recent elections. You condemn the relics of colonialism in Rhodesia and South Africa. Why are you so slow to see the ‘beam in your own eye?’ During the construction of the canal more than 25,000 poor laborers from the Third World laid down their lives on the altar of the First World economic development—yet your politicians have the gall to boast ‘we built it’! Your senators have been swamped with letters from citizens blinded by ignorance, greed, and ethnocentrism. We exhort you as brothers and sisters in Christ to write your senators today, indicating your support for the new treaty as a step toward justice for Panama and better relations with all Latin America.⁷²

In a similar “Letter of Tears to North American Christians,” evangelical leaders across Latin America complained that “your precious ‘American way of life,’ the opulence of your magnates, and your economic and military dominion, feeds on the

⁷¹ See “An Open Letter to North American Christians,” *Vanguard* (January-February 1977), 4-5. A similar statement came from a Chilean student: “As a Chilean Christian I have cried many times out of disappointment at the lack of interest and active concern of American Evangelical Christians here in the U.S.A. for what this country’s foreign policy has done, and is doing, in other countries in the name of justice.” See Clelia Buastavino, “Letters to the Editor,” *HIS* (March 1979), 2. For another criticism of U.S. policy regarding the Panama Canal from a professor at Seminario Biblico Latinamericano in San José, Costa Rica, see Paul Leggett, “Panama Canal: Three Myths” *Sojourners* 5, No. 8 (October 1976). The United States, wrote Leggett, did not buy the Canal; it “imposed its will on the new republic of Panama by means of a treaty in which the peoples affected had no say.” For more examples of anti-American literature from Seminario Biblico Latinamericano, see Elsa Tamez, *Bible of the Oppressed* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1982).

⁷² “Letter from Central America,” *Sojourners* 6, No. 10 (November 1977), 9.

blood which gushes from the open veins of Latin America.”⁷³ Prominent moderate and progressive evangelicals in North America published these letters in many of the most prominent evangelical magazines and urged readers to contact their senators.⁷⁴

American evangelical progressives began to voice similar arguments. Tony Campolo, an evangelical sociologist who ran for congress in 1976 as a Democratic candidate, decried the economic imperialism of the American conglomerate Gulf & Western in the Dominican Republic. On evangelistic trips to the Caribbean nation in the early 1970s, Campolo observed that the company “was largely responsible for creating an economically oppressive system there. ... Gulf & Western bought up more and more sugar land, they were getting interest in the banking system, and they controlled the hotel industries. They were basically controlling the life of the people in a very negative way.”⁷⁵ Likewise, U.S. Senator Mark Hatfield, denouncing the views of President Ford and CIA chief William Colby as imperialistic, introduced legislation to place missionaries under the same category as Fulbright scholars and Peace Corps workers, effectively limiting the CIA’s use of missionaries as informants.⁷⁶ Such sentiments, while decreasing within broader evangelicalism in the

⁷³ Plutarcho Bonilla, Saul Trinidad, et. al., “A Letter of Tears to North American Christians,” in Folder “Discipleship Workshops,” ESA Archives.

⁷⁴ Including InterVarsity’s *HIS*, Christian World Liberation Front’s *Right On*, ICS’s *Vanguard*, and *Sojourners*.

⁷⁵ “Door Interview: Dr. Anthony Campolo,” *Wittenburg Door*, No. 32 (August-September 1976), 12-13. Campolo went on to argue for evangelical involvement in politics in order to stem this kind of imperialism: “We couldn’t expect the U.S. Congress to monitor this company because like most companies, Gulf had made significant contributions to campaign funds.” Also see the May-June 1972 issue of *HIS*, which featured several articles on how U.S. foreign policy “encourages interest-group exploitation of those unloved neighbors” (23).

⁷⁶ “‘Valuable Sources’: Missionaries and the CIA,” *Sojourners* 5, No. 1 (January 1976), 8-9; “Hatfield Urges Ban on CIA Use of Missionaries,” *Eternity* 27, No. 3 (March 1976), 9; Joseph Bayly, “Missionaries and the CIA: Succumbing to Mammon or Patriotism,” *Eternity* 27, No. 4 (April 1976), 51-52. For the new regulations, see page 78 of the September 1976 issue of *Eternity*.

1980s, persisted among a small but strident evangelical left who found Reagan's intervention in Latin America increasingly intolerable.

Beyond economic and political imperialism, third-world evangelicals worried about American cultural and intellectual hegemony. "The western model of ministry imposed upon the Third World churches," asserted Jonathan T'ien-en Chao of Hong Kong, could be blamed for a failure to develop indigenous leadership.⁷⁷ Zimbabwean Pius Wakatama echoed that too often "the task of making disciples for Jesus Christ was often confused with that of 'civilizing the primitive and savage tribes.' There was a tendency to regard all things traditional as pagan and most things Western as Christian." Missionaries, Wakatama lamented, forced converts to discard their own ethnic markers in the face of the "paternalistic attitude that views mature nationals as being like children who need to be constantly supervised."⁷⁸ Specifically, international evangelicals complained that missionaries imposed Western notions of numerical success and highly rational methods of interpreting Scripture. Like Padilla's objections to "the technological mentality" at Lausanne, Wakatama said that American missionaries had tried to "understand and explain" the Trinity because the "Western man is dichotomistic and his philosophical bent is pragmatic rationalism. His tools are scientific empiricism. He wants to dissect, compartmentalize and

⁷⁷ Jonathan T'ien-en Chao, "Education and Leadership," 191-204, in *The New Face of Evangelicalism*.

⁷⁸ Pius Wakatama, "Cultural and Social Qualifications for Overseas Service," speech delivered at Urbana 73. Salvadoran Emilio Núñez likewise complained about "the imitation of foreign life-styles." See Núñez and Taylor, *Crisis in Latin America*, 126.

quantify things.” This approach, criticized Wakatama, had corrupted the African “wholistic approach to life”⁷⁹

Accumulating grievances over evangelical missionary efforts and American imperialism prompted a group of international evangelicals to call for an end to American missionaries in Africa. This appeal, spearheaded by Wakatama found its voice in a cutting book called *Independence for the Third World Church*. Recounting story after story of cultural insensitivity, Wakatama called for “a selective moratorium” in which only evangelical missionaries trained in anthropology and meeting certain spiritual criteria would be permitted to work in Africa. Even then, Wakatama urged, the missionaries should only train nationals to build churches themselves.⁸⁰

Many young American evangelicals listened. Some, for instance, cooled in their zeal for overseas missions work.⁸¹ One student wrote InterVarsity’s president

⁷⁹ See, for example, Padilla, “Evangelism and the World,” 139. Padilla criticized North Americans for establishing “an absolute criterion on the basis of which one should seek, in all areas of human life, the systematization of methods and resources to obtain pre-established results. It is to this absolutization of efficiency, at the expense of the integrity of the Gospel, that I object. Also see Samuel Akono, “Sit Down,” *The Other Side* 8, No. 3 (May-June 1972), 10-11, 38. Akono, a Presbyterian minister from Cameroon, wrote about evangelical imperialism in Africa: “The missionaries said, ‘Silver and gold we have lots of. In the name of Jesus Christ sit down and watch how we transform your country.’” The missionaries, charged Akono, introduced foreign music, church buildings, and foreign ethics.

⁸⁰ Pius Wakatama, *Independence for the Third World Church: An African's Perspective on Missionary Work* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1978).

⁸¹ See, for example, an internal InterVarsity memo in which David Howard writes about “anti-missionary feeling” at a weekend conference in southern California. “It was the toughest IVCF weekend conference I have ever had,” wrote Howard. “I felt as though I was up against a brick wall, trying to get through to students on behalf of missions.” See David Howard to Peter Northrup, April 17, 1973, in Box 52, Folder 2, “Brooks report [Western staff]; 1968-1973,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA. Sojourners worked with Mark Hatfield to clarify and change rules on CIA use of American missionaries for intelligence-gathering purposes. See news release by Religious News Service entitled “Many Loopholes in CIA Agreement on Missionary Sources Are Cited,” June 9, 1976. Copy in Box IV3, “News Releases and Post-American,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC. Also see Wes Michaelson, “CIA and Missionaries: Half a Loaf,” *Sojourners* 5, No. 5 (May-June 1976), 7-8; Campolo, “Door Interview,” *Wittenburg Door*, 12-13.

that the Urbana convention's "foreign mission emphasis seemed irrelevant during a time of prejudice, war, poverty and a whole gamut of social issues that is pressing in on the Christian student of today."⁸² Joseph A. Grabill, a contributor to *Freedom Now*, warned that Protestant missionaries—along with spreading the Gospel—had substantially contributed to the Westernization of Asia, Africa, and the Pacific.⁸³ Even Americans who persisted in missionary work took the third-world critique of American imperialism seriously. Bill Conrad, a missionary to Peru, wrote in InterVarsity's *HIS* magazine that "All too long I linked Christianity with U.S. democracy, but now I feel that U.S. democracy is probably not the answer for most of the world, and that—amazing enough—Christ's believers can well live under, and perhaps even participate in, a wide range of political ideologies."⁸⁴

Other young evangelicals also voiced conventional objections to American economic imperialism and foreign policy. For a decade, from the mid-sixties to the mid-seventies, the Wheaton student newspaper and InterVarsity's magazine printed more articles critical of U.S. foreign policy and corporations than articles in support. And the more acerbic *Vanguard* and *Sojourners* magazines printed unremitting denunciations of U.S. policies.⁸⁵ A student at the Institute for Christian Studies—and

⁸² Letter to John Alexander, in Box 72, Folder 6, "Problems for Solving; 1973," InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

⁸³ Joseph A. Grabill, "The 'Invisible' Missionary: A Study in American Foreign Relations," *Church and State* 14 (Winter 1972), 93-105.

⁸⁴ Bill Conrad, "Letter to the Editor," *HIS* 32, No. 7 (April 1972), 18; Kathryn A. Lindskoog, "Dark Continents of Men's Minds," *The Other Side* 8, No. 3 (May-June 1972), 28-29, 38; James W. Skillen, "Failing to Love our American Neighbors," *Vanguard* (May-June 1972), 23-25.

⁸⁵ See, for example, the March-April 1977 issue of *Vanguard*, which was dedicated to U.S. imperialism and paternalism in Africa. It contained articles by Kefa Sempangi, a former pastor of a church (Redeemer Church) of 14,000 in Uganda, and James Sangu of Tanzania. Sempangi, an accomplished sculptor and painter, headed the Fund for Uganda under the auspices of Voice of

former worker for the Environmental Defense Fund—called the U.S. government hypocrites for supporting dictatorships while trying to build markets for American agricultural products.⁸⁶ Calvin students in 1967, partly on the basis of objections from the Netherlands, argued that the United States “should stop the war in Vietnam without delay.”⁸⁷ One InterVarsity worker on a medical team serving on the Nicaragua-Honduran border did his best to disabuse readers of the virtue of American support of the contras. Calling them “terrorists,” the worker described unmarked helicopters (which he was sure were American) flying across the border attacking Sandinista villages. “So even if there really is a communist threat, I cannot justify a covert terrorist campaign against noncombatants, because it is wrong to kill innocent people. If what our government is doing in Central America is right, why must it work in secret? ... Although most Hondurans sincerely desire peace, they feel trapped by remote decisions made in Washington instead of in Tegucigalpa. ... If we turn a deaf ear to them, we may be guilty before God of having ignored the cry of the oppressed.”⁸⁸ A Presbyterian physician working with poor rural farmers in Nicaragua

Calvary. The fund assists Ugandan refugees in exile and trains Ugandans for the future development of their country. He fled Uganda in 1973 after narrowly escaping an attempt on his life.

⁸⁶ Joyce K. Ribbens, “The C.I.A. Capers: Keeping the World Safe,” *Vanguard* (January-February, 1976), 22-23; Delton Franz, “On Why the Hungry Aren't Being Fed,” *Vanguard* (June 1976), 11. Franz wrote, “Just as private defense industries greatly influence Pentagon arms sales decisions, so private grain corporations greatly influence USDA decisions on the quantity and destiny of food grains.”

⁸⁷ The student reporter noted a Reformed synod statement in 1967 from Netherlands that stated, “It is all the more regrettable that we are compelled to point out to you that your nation is losing the confidence placed in it, since it is [casting doubt on] the sincerity of its pleas for freedom and justice. ... For that reason alone the United States should stop the war in Vietnam without delay by taking new initiatives.” See Russell Straayer, “Draft Alternatives Explained by Student Booth and Forum,” *Chimes* 62, No. 10 (December 1, 1967), 4. On the Dutch Calvinist influence on the evangelical left, particularly in the Kuyparian mandate to address all forms of life, including politics, see James Skillen, “APJ’s Vision Continues to Unfold,” *Public Justice Report* 9, No. 6 (March 1986), 3-5; Morris and Alice Greidanus interview, January 20, 2008.

⁸⁸ Rex Adamson, “A Student’s View from the Honduran Border,” *HIS* 44, No. 3 (December 1983), 27.

wrote to the Sojourners community about the atrocities of the Contras—and the complicity of the Reagan administration in helping to fund kidnappings and violence.⁸⁹ As these statements suggest, instinctive criticisms of American imperialism coalesced around several key international issues—U.S. intervention in Vietnam and Central America, sponsorship of repressive regimes in Latin America, and apartheid in South Africa. Encouraged by third-world evangelicals, the emerging evangelical left in the United States comprised a minority political voice that sounded often and insistently.

IV.

As penance for their sins of imperialism, international evangelicals encouraged Americans to pursue a new agenda of social justice. Colombian Gregorio Landero told American audiences of his intention to extend evangelism beyond winning the souls of non-believers. “A new life can’t come to them,” he declared, “not truly, till both their bodies and their souls become well.” He told students at InterVarsity’s Urbana conferences inspirational stories of economic uplift through teaching crop rotation and starting micro-enterprises, both of which lifted Colombians out of poverty and primed them to receive the Gospel. Your task, Landero told the students, was to “help mobilize the resources of the churches and to minister to their social needs.”⁹⁰

⁸⁹ Justin Stormo Gipson to Sojourners, March 7, 1986, in Folder III, “Postmark Letters,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

⁹⁰ Victor Landero, *Victor: The Victor Landero Story* (Old Tappan, N.J.: Revell, 1979), 128-143; Gregorio Landero, “Evangelism and Social Concern,” speech given at Urbana 73.

Landero—as third-world evangelicals had for decades—pointed out the very long way American evangelicals had to go in regard to social justice, even within their own borders. Others cited the racial caste system and continuing evidences of racial injustice.⁹¹ At a meeting on African race issues of Wheaton’s progressive Clapham Society, an Ethiopian student pointed out America’s own race problem as he argued for a more consistent foreign policy toward Africa.⁹² At a 1966 NAACP meeting at the college, Kenyan Wilson Okite urged evangelicals to join the civil rights movement, mentioning that independence from colonial powers in Africa inspired him and many others to agitate for equality in America.⁹³ At Calvin College, a missionary to Nigeria told students that Africans were closely watching the 1964 presidential election. That Goldwater might win, despite his retrograde views on civil rights, “shocks them,” Harry Boer reported. Africans received American missionaries more openly, he explained, when the United States promotes civil rights.⁹⁴ A Fuller Theological Seminary student, urging involvement in civil rights, wrote that the race question “reaches also around the world, where other nations look and ask, ‘Is that Christianity?’”⁹⁵ Howard Jones, an associate evangelist to Billy Graham in Liberia,

⁹¹ This was a broader phenomenon. Historian Mary L. Dudziak argues that the cold war and international pressure spurred on civil rights reform. See *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy, Politics and Society in Twentieth-Century America* (Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000).

⁹² “International Student Addresses Claphams,” *Wheaton Record* 85, No. 20 (February 14, 1963), 1.

⁹³ “Okite Relates African Strides to U.S. Civil Rights Movement,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 19 (February 17, 1966), 4; So Yan Pul, “Senior Deprecates Racial Attitudes,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 18 (February 10, 1966), 4. This tactic of pointing out America’s internal racial problems paralleled the phenomenon of civil rights activists and the U.S. government using international criticism to reform America’s civil rights laws.

⁹⁴ John LaGrand, “Christian Political Action?” *Chimes* 59, No. 7 (October 30, 1964), 3.

⁹⁵ Carol Reiss, “Relationship in Action,” *The Opinion* 7, No. 2 (November 1967).

was amazed at the knowledge of the American South by Liberians. “From the modern cities to the underdeveloped bush sections of the country, Africans plagued us with questions concerning Dr. Martin Luther King and the 1955 bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama,” Jones told InterVarsity students. “They quizzed us about the Emmett Till lynching in Mississippi and other racial disturbances.” They learned this information, Jones reported, on shortwave from Radio Moscow and Radio Peking. “We knew that the broadcasting of such tragic news by the Communists spoils America’s image abroad, and impedes the progress of Christian missions in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world.”⁹⁶ Not only was America perpetrating injustice internationally through its economic and political aggression, it was failing within its own borders. This critique aroused sensitivity to racial injustice among many young evangelicals.⁹⁷

International evangelicals, for all their passion about civil rights, also critiqued American habits of consumption. For many internationals, travels in the United States confirmed stories they had already heard about American wealth. FTL member René Padilla remembers the “very luxurious buildings” he encountered when he arrived at

⁹⁶ Howard Jones, “Missions Prejudice,” *HIS* 25, No. 4 (January 1965), 1,3. For similar statements, see “Day-by-Day Synopsis,” *HIS* 25, No. 6 (March 1965), 7-8, Ruben Lores, “Feedback,” *HIS* 25, No. 7 (April 1965), 28; Mary Anne Klein, “Feedback,” *HIS* 25, No. 7 (April 1965), 29; J. Isamu Yamamoto, “Interracial Marriage,” *Right On* 8, No. 3 (November-December 1976), 19; Warren and Shirley Webster, “Segregation and World Missions,” *Freedom Now* 3, No. 1 (January-February 1967), 11-13; Howard O. Jones, *White Questions to a Black Christian* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975), 80-81.

⁹⁷ In another example of the multidirectional nature of the global reflex, many young evangelical minorities turned around to help embattled minorities elsewhere in the world. A prominent article in InterVarsity’s *HIS* magazine noted that “It is no coincidence that three black Christian leaders of our civil rights movement—author John Perkins, Southern Christian Leadership Conference president Dr. Joseph Lowery and the Reverend Jesse Jackson—are all advocates of Palestinian rights.” See Rob Wright, “Homeless in the Homeland: Are There Any Answers to the Palestinians’ Plight?” *HIS* 45, No. 6 (March 1985), 9. Richard Mouw explains that his sympathy for the civil rights movement heightened after watching television news from a Canadian perspective while a student in Alberta. See Richard Mouw interview, July 12, 2006, Pasadena, Cal.

Wheaton College as an undergraduate. Coming from a context of “suffering,” Padilla was disappointed to discover a church with “no comprehension of poverty.”⁹⁸ Kenyan Peter Rucro, who studied at Wheaton College in the mid-1960s, told his classmates, “The United States is a unique society bogged down with plenty, leisure and waste.”⁹⁹ InterVarsity chapters, many of whom started programs to help such students adjust to American culture, heard the same critique. *HIS* magazine reported that nine-tenths of foreign students at the University of Michigan considered Americans “overly preoccupied with money.” An Iraqi student studying in Minnesota said that Americans “are too busy running to live. An Egyptian said that the “U.S. looks like a car race.”¹⁰⁰ Such critiques impressed American students. One American evangelical student told of his encounter in Brazil with a shopkeeper who condemned North American missionaries for living too extravagantly: “I hastily surveyed my reflection in a shop window. Fortunately, I was wearing old sandals. My pants and shirt were old. I hoped I might pass inspection.” “How different,” he reflected, “our lifestyle is from that of Jesus! Our Christian lives in North America and Europe are patterned more after Herod and Pilate than after Jesus and Paul.”¹⁰¹

This third-world critique of acquisitiveness implied that American wealth was inherently unjust, that resources and justice were somehow distributed (or taken) inequitably. One of the first substantial statements on global injustices came from the

⁹⁸ René Padilla interview, Collection 361, BGCA.

⁹⁹ Peter Rucro, “Materialism Blights American Sensitivity,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 12 (December 9, 1965), 2.

¹⁰⁰ “Foreign Students Speak,” *HIS* 22, No. 5 (February 1961), 17.

¹⁰¹ Dennis Paper, “Big Bucks, Big Preachers,” *HIS* 43, No. 4 (January 1983), 31.

4,000 international participants at the Lausanne Congress in 1974.¹⁰² Similar statements soon came from American evangelicals. Due in part to this international influence, young evangelicals began to maintain that not only were American evangelicals spoiled, they were part of the problem; they were perpetuating structural injustice.¹⁰³ CWLF distributed flyers in the early 1970s throughout Berkeley charging that the “rich privileged minority partys [sic] while millions die in Biafra.”¹⁰⁴ God, wrote CWLF’s Ron Mitchell, is not “the father of systems and of the acts of Euro-American exploitation.”¹⁰⁵ Herb McMullan of *The Post-American* wrote that “economic growth and available resources are finite. In this situation, the technological ‘have’ nations remain committed to exploitive robbery, monopolizing the raw materials available in the world, domestically accelerating commodity production and productive exploitation.”¹⁰⁶ Evangelical Senator Mark Hatfield, who represented the United States at the 1974 World Food Conference in Rome, returned convinced of a global food crisis and horrified by the Ford Administration’s dismissal of the Conference’s recommendations. Charging that the State Department was giving aid on the basis of potential for future economic markets to sell American products, Hatfield encouraged millions of evangelicals to lobby the government to

¹⁰² J. D. Douglas, ed., *Let the Earth Hear His Voice* (Minneapolis: World Wide Publishers, 1975). “All of us are shocked by the poverty of millions and disturbed by the injustices which cause it. Those of us who live in affluent circumstances accept our duty to develop a simple life-style in order to contribute more generously to both relief and evangelism.”

¹⁰³ Other statements against evangelical materialism included John White, *The Golden Cow: Materialism in the Twentieth-Century Church* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1979).

¹⁰⁴ Flyer from “Christian Information Committee,” Carton 23, Reel 86, Folder 30, “Religion, 1966-82,” Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, Cal.

¹⁰⁵ Ronald G. Mitchell, “Christianity and Oppressed Peoples,” *Right On* 5, No. 11 (May 1974), 3, 10.

¹⁰⁶ Herb McMullan, “Man and Technocracy,” *The Post American* 1, No. 2 (Winter 1972), 4-5.

pass the Food for Peace program which would remove political considerations from the distribution of aid.¹⁰⁷ Doris Longacre, author of *Living More with Less*, concurred, noting that avoiding wasteful living was not enough. There were structural injustices—exceedingly high tariff barriers imposed by affluent nations against poor nations, lack of involvement by poor nations in international economic agencies, corporate farming, global unemployment, unfair farm policy, and arms sales to third world dictators—that deserved attention. Longacre urged readers to write letters to lawmakers in addition to cooking simple, healthy meals.¹⁰⁸ In the early 1980s, two colleagues at the Latin American Biblical Seminary in Costa Rica wrote books on “biblical categories” of structural oppression.¹⁰⁹

Of all these statements on global injustice, Ron Sider’s 1977 book *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger* was by far the most influential. Readers of *Rich Christians*, which opened with the sentence “Hunger and starvation stalk the land,” found the book a darkly written tome. “Ten thousand persons died today,” intoned Sider, “because of inadequate food. One billion people are mentally retarded or physically deformed because of a poor diet. The problem, we know, is that the

¹⁰⁷ Mark Hatfield, “An Economics for Sustaining Humanity,” *The Post-American* 4, No. 3 (March 1975), 16-21. For more on Hatfield and his work on global hunger, see the chapter entitled “Blessed, and Hungry, Are the Poor,” in Robert Eells and Bartell Nyberg, *Lonely Walk: The Life of Senator Mark Hatfield* (Portland, OR: Multnomah Press, 1979).

¹⁰⁸ See especially Doris Janzen Longacre, *Living More with Less* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1980), 22-29; Delton Franz, “There’s Many a Slip Twixt Hand and Lip: On Why the Hungry Aren’t Being Fed,” *Vanguard* (June 1976), 10-13. Franz urges public policymakers to develop stronger incentives to increase foreign food production, constrain U.S. global corporations, curb military aid and sales, and institute trade preferences for the poorest countries.

¹⁰⁹ Thomas Hanks, *God So Loved the Third World: The Biblical Vocabulary of Oppression* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1983); Elsa Tamez, *Bible of the Oppressed*, English translation (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1982). Hanks argued that oppression is a fundamental structural category of biblical theology. Tamez contended that oppression was the primary cause of poverty in Scripture.

world's resources are not evenly distributed. North Americans live on an affluent island amid a sea of starving humanity.”¹¹⁰ The perpetuation of current American policy, explained Sider, would lead the world toward global economic collapse.

Sider's overarching tone, however, carried a moral rather than economic edge: Evangelicals shouldn't merely take action to avoid economic collapse; they should take action because Christians have a moral obligation to right injustices.

Evangelicals, Sider complained, all too often failed to do so because of an inadequate conception of sin. “Christians frequently restrict the scope of ethics to a narrow class of ‘personal’ sins,” he explained. “But they fail to preach about the sins of institutionalized racism, unjust economic structures and militaristic institutions which destroy people just as much as do alcohol and drugs.” White flight from the cities to the suburbs, with the concomitant loss of resources from such a demographic shift, only exacerbated structural injustice embedded in the current economic and political system. Even the purchase of bananas, Sider continued, confronted evangelicals with moral questions. Why are bananas from Central America so much more inexpensive than apples from a neighboring state? They're cheaper, Sider answered, despite added shipping costs, because U.S. fruit conglomerates pay such unfair wages to Latin American workers.¹¹¹ “If God's Word is true, then all of us who dwell in affluent nations are trapped in sin,” Sider concluded. “We have profited from systematic injustice. ... We are guilty of an outrageous offense against God and neighbor.”

¹¹⁰ Ronald J. Sider, *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger: A Biblical Study* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1977), 172.

¹¹¹ Sider, *Rich Christians*, 163-165.

Sider's incorporation of the language of sin offered a uniquely evangelical contribution to broader debates on global poverty.¹¹²

Sider concluded *Rich Christians* with a call to political engagement. The virtue in individual acts of economic penance, he suggested, would extrapolate if Christians would band together to change foreign and domestic policy. "We must demand a foreign policy that unequivocally sides with the poor. If we truly believe that 'all men are created equal,' then our foreign policy must be redesigned to promote the interests of all people and not just the wealthy elites in developing countries or our own multinational corporations." He urged evangelicals to lobby Congress to drop trade barriers to imports from developing countries and to devote more money to third-world nations than to the arms race.¹¹³ He addressed the structure of world trade and the international debt crisis. This detailed attention to economic structure represented significant movement from Carl F. H. Henry's posture in *Uneasy Conscience of Fundamentalism*. In taking Henry to his logical conclusion, Sider and *Rich Christians* represented one of the final clinches in evangelicals' slow engagement of the social realm through the twentieth century.

Observers also noted the striking global perspective in Sider's *Rich Christians*. In an era when global hunger had not yet captivated the public's attention with images on television of the distended bellies of African children, *Rich Christians* offered an unrelenting international focus with stories from Africa and statistics from

¹¹² Tim Stafford, "Ron Sider's Unsettling Crusade," *Christianity Today* 36, No. 27 (March 17, 1992), 18-22. Miriam Adeney similarly contended, "The marvel of the U.S. standard of living, made possible by the systematic rape of the raw materials of developing countries, enforced by unequal trade treaties with a local opulent oligarchy." See Adeney, *God's Foreign Policy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 67.

¹¹³ For a similar critique of the \$221 billion U.S. national defense budget compared to a foreign-aid budget of \$4.2 billion, see Adeney, *God's Foreign Policy*, 8.

the Southern Hemisphere. He lambasted Richard Nixon for a 1973 speech that said, “I have made this basic decision: In allocating the products of America’s farms between markets abroad and those in the United States, we must put the American consumer first.” “Such a statement may be good politics,” rebutted Sider, “but it certainly is not good theology.”¹¹⁴ Launched with the help of a continuing third-world witness, Sider’s themes of American materialism, imperialism, and social injustice coupled with global need represented much of the developing evangelical left agenda.¹¹⁵

Rich Christians—in addressing structural issues as much as personal sin, in embracing politics as a method of structural correction, and in its global focus—was an innovative work in its evangelical context. Remarkably, it also sold well. Despite its depressing tone and scathing indictment, by 1997 it had gone through four editions and sold over 350,000 copies. Sider received glowing reviews from *HIS* magazine, which rejoiced that finally “it is not as socially damaging to question the motives of the government/military/business complex in the U.S. The time may have arrived for American evangelicals to venture an extension of official belief into riskier economic and social areas.”¹¹⁶ Sider even appeared as guest on the 700 Club, before the Pat Robertson turned so explicitly right-wing, to discuss the book.¹¹⁷ Many InterVarsity chapters, churches, and evangelical college classrooms assigned the text in classes

¹¹⁴ Sider, *Rich Christians*, 172.

¹¹⁵ Sider in part cited South African apartheid as “the way I got to the Chicago Declaration.” Quoted in Jeffrey McClain Jones, “Ronald Sider and Radical Evangelical Political Theology” (Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University 1990), 406. Gordon Aeschliman, son of missionaries to South Africa, similarly nurtured ESA’s global vision through his critique of apartheid. See Aeschliman, *Apartheid: Tragedy in Black and White* (Ventura, Cal.: Regal Books, 1986).

¹¹⁶ Kem Luther, “Undercover,” *HIS* 38, No. 1 (October 1977), 20-21.

¹¹⁷ Ron Sider to Everett Larreynaga, August 31, 1977, in Folder “Rich Christians,” ESA Archives.

and seminars. Among the young evangelical literati who repeatedly affirmed its themes, *Rich Christians* enjoyed a status as the cult classic.¹¹⁸

Sider, however, drew fire from politically conservative evangelicals. Conservative economists, who tended to hold third-world nations responsible for not emulating western prosperity, criticized Sider's fairly liberal economic position that held the wealthy responsible for not alleviating global poverty. A coterie of conservative evangelical economists associated with a think tank called the Institute for Christian Economics—Gary North, Robert Chilton, and Ronald Nash—popularized a second strain of misgivings to the evangelical community. Sider, they contended, embraced the idea of zero-sum markets, which posits that economic exchanges benefit one economic actor at the expense of another economic actor. On the contrary, capitalism, the best possible system in an inherently sinful world, offered a positive-sum game in which both parties could win.¹¹⁹ Chilton's book *Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt Manipulators*, an explicit rejoinder to *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*, and other critiques instead suggested that third-world poverty could be traced to "cultural, moral, and even religious dimension" that reveals itself in a "lack of respect for any private property," "lack of initiative," and a

¹¹⁸ Wallis, for example, wrote, "We are finally coming to understand a discomforting but central fact of reality: people of the non-industrialized world are poor because we are rich, that the poverty and brutalization people experience is maintained and perpetuated by our political and economic systems and by the way we live our lives. In other words, the oppressive conditions of life in the Third World, like the causes of poverty and misery in our own land, are neither accidental nor avoidable, nor because of the failures of the poor nations. We have hidden behind the convenient ideology of anti-communism and used it to self-righteously justify our actions in the world." See Jim Wallis, "The Invisible Empire," *Post-American 2*, No. 5 (November-December 1973), 1. Also see Sugden, *Radical Discipleship*, vii, 7.

¹¹⁹ Sider himself acknowledged his lack of training and sophistication in economics. Twenty years after *Rich Christians* was published, he said he "didn't know a great deal of economics when I wrote the first edition of *Rich Christians*." See Kevin D. Miller, interview with Ron Sider, *Christianity Today* (April 28, 1997), 68-69.

“high leisure preference.”¹²⁰ University of Michigan philosopher George Mavrodes also complained of *Rich Christians*’ lack of economic sophistication. Sider, wrote Mavrodes, did not take into account the dozens of unintended changes that occur when changing only one part of an economic system.¹²¹

Despite criticism from some conservative evangelicals, *Rich Christians* nonetheless enjoyed a rather deep influence in the broader evangelical world. Sider helped promote a rising concern for third-world relief and economic development, both projects more palatable to a broad swath of evangelicals than the prospect of overhauling the American economy.¹²² Other young evangelicals soon echoed Sider’s

¹²⁰ Greg Grandin, “Good Christ, Bad Christ,” *Counterpunch* (September 9-10, 2006); David Chilton, *Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt Manipulators: A Biblical Response to Ronald Sider* (Tyler, Tex.: Institute for Christian Economics, 1981).

¹²¹ “Sider,” he wrote, “seems unaware that his policies may have different results than what he intends. Suppose that we [Americans] voluntarily increased the price that we pay for crude rubber (a recurrent suggestion of Sider’s), then, Sider says, rubber workers would get higher wages. Fine. But wouldn’t rubber producers scramble to increase production? And wouldn’t land and labor be diverted from other enterprises, such as food production, to cash in on higher rubber prices? Since we don’t need more rubber, the increased production would represent a waste of resources. Sider seems not to notice such consequences.” Quoted in Ronald H. Nash and James P. Gills, *A Biblical Economics Manifesto* (Creation House, 2002), 8-9.

¹²² Xenos Fellowship in Columbus, Ohio, for example required that students in leadership training classes read *Rich Christians*. See Dennis H. McCallum to Ron Sider, October 12, 1989, in Folder “1989,” ESA Archives. For other statements on global hunger, see W. Stanley Mooneyham, *What Do You Say to a Hungry World?* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1975); Ronald J. Sider, *Cry Justice! The Bible on Hunger and Poverty* (Downer’s Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1980); Arthur R. Simon, *Bread for the World* (New York: Paulist Press, 1975); Richard J. Barnet, *The Lean Years: Politics in the Age of Scarcity* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1980). Dozens of feature articles on hunger also appeared in all of the mainstream evangelical publications including *Eternity*, *Wittenburg Door*, *Vanguard*, *HIS*, *The Other Side*, and *The Post-American*. The issue soon entered the pages of more mainstream evangelical publications. See “Why Are People Starving?” *Christianity Today* 19 (October 25, 1974), 35; “Where Is Tomorrow’s Food?” *Christianity Today* 18 (September 13, 1974), 53; “Full Hearts and Empty Stomachs,” *Christianity Today* 20, No. 3 (November 7, 1975), 47-48. See an entire issue devoted to global hunger: J.D. Douglas, “The Bible on Hunger—A Source of Discomfort?” Stanley C. Baldwin, “A Case against Waste and Other Excesses,” Ron Sider, “Mischievous by Statute: How We Oppress the Poor,” and Arthur Simon, “Hunger: Twenty Easy Questions, No Easy Answers,” in *Christianity Today* 20, No. 21 (July 16, 1976), 8-22. In the same issue, see advertisements for evangelical organizations devoted to hunger relief such as Compassion, Inc., Food for the Hungry, World Relief, MAP International, and World Vision. For Southern Baptist interaction with Sider and other action to address global hunger in the late 1970s, see Boxes 36 and 51, “Christian Life Commission Resource Files,” AR. 138-2, Southern Baptist Historical Library and Archives, Nashville, Ten.

concern over population projections of 5 billion people by 1990 that would exacerbate current conditions in which “seven hundred and fifty million people in the poorest nations live in extreme poverty with annual incomes of less than \$75.”¹²³ Many evangelicals responded positively to these new evangelical concerns about global hunger, adopting Sider’s suggestion, heard in lectures across the country, of a “graduated tithe.” He urged evangelicals to increase giving beyond the standard 10% rate. As your income grows, he contended, so should the proportion of your giving.¹²⁴ Evangelical senator Mark Hatfield also promoted the cause by holding a press conference that turned out to be a hunger simulation, the latest rage among evangelical youth groups. Hatfield served journalists, senators, staffers, and ambassadors a 67-calorie meal that cost 8 cents, the very same meal that World Vision’s president Stanley Mooneyham had seen Indians eating during a recent tour of the world’s “hunger belt.”¹²⁵

Relief agencies, including World Vision, World Relief, Mennonite Central Committee, and Bread for the World, flourished during the 1970s as evangelical contributions to the third world quadrupled from \$62 million to \$238 million between 1969 and 1982.¹²⁶ Others sought to address structural roots of global poverty.

¹²³ Sider, *Living More Simply*, 14-15.

¹²⁴ Ron Sider, “The Ministry of Affluence,” *HIS* 32, No. 3 (December 1972), 8. Also see Sider, *Living More Simply*, 14-5, 73-96.

¹²⁵ “Door Interview with Stanley Mooneyham,” *Wittenburg Door* 23 (February-March 1975), 12. For other global hunger simulations and “hunger clubs” in evangelical congregations and colleges, see Folder “Discipleship Workshops,” ESA Archives.

¹²⁶ Linda Diane Smith, “An Awakening of Conscience: The Changing Response of American Evangelicals toward World Poverty” (Ph.D. dissertation, American University, 1986), *ii*. Bread for the World, with a membership of 43,000, cast its appeals in evangelical terms. The organization, led by Arthur Simon, the brother of U.S. Senator Paul Simon of Illinois, formed educational and political lobbying arms with over 250 local chapters. See Arthur Simon, *Christian Faith and Public Policy: No Grounds for Divorce* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976); *A Report on the State of World Hunger*

Dominated at first by food delivery and emergency medical care, evangelical aid had shifted to long-term approaches to hunger. Economist George Monsma, for example, decried the lack of U.S. aid to the poorest of the world's nations and condemned the rise of multinational corporations and their tendency to eliminate indigenous firms in third-world nations.¹²⁷ Evangelicals increasingly cited secular, mainline, and Catholic research on global hunger and justice.¹²⁸ They urged acts of moral suasion, boycotts, selective investment, and shareholder resolutions in order to constrain American corporations.¹²⁹ Evangelical agencies developed urban food-for-work and leadership training programs; built roads, hospitals, and schools; established cooperatives, credit unions, and loan programs; started micro-enterprises for small industry; and taught new agricultural techniques.¹³⁰ By 1978 *Time* magazine could write, "Evangelical missionaries have always cured bodies as well as saved souls. There is a new emphasis, however, on help as a good thing in itself—rather than just as bait to attract

(Washington, D.C.: Bread for the World Institute, 1990); Hoover, "Political Mobilization of the Evangelical Left," 97-99. Work and interest in international concerns spiked in the late 1970s and early 1980s with relief work and a boycott of Nestle to stop third-world exploitation. See Becky Irvin, "Conference Delegates Discuss Social Action," *Wheaton Record* 105, No. 3 (October 3, 1980), 3.

¹²⁷ Alan Nichols, "An Evangelical Commitment to Simple Life-Style," Lausanne Occasional Paper 20; George N. Monsma, "A Christian Critique of Neoclassical Welfare Economics." Paper presented at the seminar "The Relevance of Christian Studies" at the Institute of Christian Studies, Toronto,

August 3-11, 1978. Monsma in *Reforming Economics: A Christian Perspective on Economic Theory and Practice* (Grand Rapids: Calvin College Center for Christian Scholarship, 1986).

¹²⁸ See for example Jack Nelson, *Hunger for Justice: The Politics of Food and Faith* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1980), cited in the July 1980 issue of *Sojourners*.

¹²⁹ Adeney, *God's Foreign Policy*, 71-73; Tony Campolo, "The Greening of Gulf and Western," *Eternity* (January 1981), 30-32; George Fuller, "Making Business Behave," *Eternity* (May 1980), 17-22.

¹³⁰ Smith, "An Awakening of Conscience," 111-22. Wade Coggins of the Evangelical Foreign Missions Association in 1980 noted that development and relief work had always been done overseas, writing, "Evangelicals were doing a great deal of educational work and medical work, and frequently were not even writing about it because of the climate of their constituency back home. They would emphasize the church work and how many souls were saved when they might in fact be giving half their time to medicine and education." Quoted in Smith, "An Awakening of Conscience," 340-41.

converts. The number and variety of Evangelical projects at home are broadening dramatically as ministries bring care as well as conversion to the despairing and needy of America.”¹³¹ The trend continued in the 1980s both with burgeoning development organizations and hundreds of others smaller ones that flew below the radar. Such initiatives included HEED, Jubilee Crafts, Tearcraft, Worldcrafts, Oxfam, The International Institute of Development, Society for Community Development, Partnership in Third World Ministry, United Action Association, World Evangelical Fellowship, *World Christian*, and *Transformation*—all evidence of a new global vision shaped by the insistent voices of third-world evangelicals.¹³²

¹³¹ “Back to That Old-Time Religion,” *Time* (December 26, 1977).

¹³² Other key third-world voices in the 1980s included Lamin Sanneh, Kwame Bediako, Zac Niringiye, Caesar Molebatsi, and Njuguna Kabugi from Africa; Melba Maggay and Lysander Molo of the Philippines; and Vinay Samuel of India. On *Transformation*, see “1985 Report to Supporters of *Transformation*,” Folder “1985,” ESA Archives. Four issues published in 1985, for example, took fairly progressive stances on Central America, international caste systems, the Middle East, and U.S. foreign policy. On Molo, who contended that “the critical questions that need to be asked about U.S. foreign policy toward the Philippines are very closely related to questions about ... other Third World countries,” see Molo, “The United States and the Philippines: What Kind of Crises,” *Public Justice Report* 8, No. 9 (June-July 1984), 1-5. On how “Filipino evangelicals call their sisters and brothers to repentance ... for past apathy and to become engaged in nonviolent struggle for justice, human rights, and freedom in the Philippines,” see “A Church Awakened,” *Sojourners* 12, No. 10 (November 1983), 21. On Julia Esquivel, the Guatemalan editor of *Dialogo*, a “gutsy, often shrill voice of opposition to Guatemala’s military government,” see “Guatemalan Journalist Speaks Out,” *Public Justice Report* 3, No. 10 (August-September 1980), 3-5. Esquivel maintained connections with Seminario Biblico Latinamericano. On veteran missionary and WEF General Secretary Waldron Scott, see *Bring Forth Justice* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980). On missionary James Dekker’s opposition to Reagan, see “Narrow Escape from Guatemala,” *Public Justice Report* 6, No. 4 (January 1983), 5; Dekker, “Government Stability and Human Rights in Latin America,” *Public Justice Report* 6, No. 9 (June-July 1983), 5-7; Dekker, “The U.S. and Nicaragua: Some Background,” *Public Justice Report* 7, No. 8 (May 1984), 3. On the intriguing role of *el Consejo Evangélico Pro-Ayuda a los Damnificados* (CEPAD), an Nicaraguan evangelical relief organization, in fomenting American evangelical left resistance to Reagan’s funding of contra forces, see chapter 11 of this dissertation; “When Relief Work Turns to Revolution,” *Public Justice Newsletter* 3, No. 3 (December 1979), 1-4; Jim Wallis, “In Defense of CEPAD,” *Sojourners* 13, No. 10 (November 1981), 4-5; “A Plea from Christians in Nicaragua,” *Public Justice Report* 5, No. 8 (May 1982), 3-4. On a delegation of Nicaraguan evangelical pastors who toured the United States on behalf of the Sandinista government, see James Skillen, “Does Liberation Theology Have a Christian Political Ethic?” *Public Justice Report* 8, No. 4 (January 1985), 3-5; Beth Spring, “Does the Sandinista Regime Promote Religious Freedom?” *Christianity Today* 28, No. 17 (November 23, 1984), 43-44. Nicaraguan evangelical Nicanor Mairena explained, “I was educated under the control of the North Americans. They prohibited us from politics. I accepted that. But after three years of the revolution, I have become convinced of the opposite.” See Tom Minnery, “Why the Gospel Grows in Socialist Nicaragua,” *Christianity Today* (April 8, 1983),

As Peruvian evangelist Samuel Escobar helped draft the 1973 Chicago Declaration, which rhetorically bludgeoned American materialism and imperialism in a dingy YMCA, he reflected upon the great change in evangelicalism signified by the progressive document.¹³³ Decades earlier, as a university student in Lima, Peru, Escobar first read in an Argentine ecumenical magazine about a book called *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism* and a man called Carl Henry.” That American evangelicals were beginning to care about social structures shocked Escobar and gave him “real joy.”¹³⁴ Little did Escobar realize that it would take the efforts of thousands of third-world evangelicals like himself during the intervening decades to complete the transformation. By the 1970s one evangelical seminary professor was telling critics of liberation theology not to “complain when the liberationist smuggles politics into the Bible when evangelicals have been smuggling politics out of the Bible for centuries.”¹³⁵ Third-world evangelicals, in smuggling politics back into the Bible, gave shape to the very social engagement that Henry called for, but never fleshed out. Despite evangelical participation in the civil rights

34-42. On Nicaraguan pleas for American evangelicals to oppose the contra forces, see Joyce Hollyday, “A Shield of Love,” *Sojourners* 12, No. 10 (November 1983), 10-13.

¹³³ The Declaration in part read, “We must attack the materialism of our culture and the maldistribution of the nation's wealth and services. We recognize that as a nation we play a crucial role in the imbalance and injustice of international trade and development. Before God and a billion hungry neighbors, we must rethink our values regarding our present standard of living and promote a more just acquisition and distribution of the world's resources.” See Ronald J. Sider, ed., *The Chicago Declaration* (Carol Stream, Ill.: Creation House, 1974). Organizers invited 13 individuals from its “Third World Participant List” and held a seminar on “Third-World Women.” See “Third World Participants,” in Folder, “1974 Chicago Workshop,” ESA Archives; “Workshops,” in Box 4, Folder 15, “Evangelical Women’s Caucus; records; November 1974-May 1976, n.d.,” Evangelicals for Social Action Collection, BGCA.

¹³⁴ Ron Sider, *The Chicago Declaration* (Carol Stream: Creation House, 1974), 119.

¹³⁵ Quoted in Brian Walsh, “The Evangelical Theological Society,” *Vanguard* (June 1976), 24-25.

and antiwar movements described in the next chapters, their critical posture toward their own tradition and nation was never solely indigenous.¹³⁶

¹³⁶ A burgeoning evangelicalism in the two-thirds world points to the likely persistence of this global reflex in the twenty-first century. In 1910, 80% of the world's Christians lived in Europe and North America. Less than a century later, 60% now live outside the North Atlantic region. See Mark A. Noll, "Who Would Have Thought?" *Books & Culture* 7 (November-December 2001), 21. Tite Tienou, a West African theologian, now dean of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, recently stated that "the future of Christianity no longer depends on developments in the North." See "Christian Scholarship and the Changing Center of World Christianity," speech given at Calvin College, September 29, 2001. Cited in Carpenter, "How Much Has Changed?" 16. For a contemporary critique of American politics from a global perspective, see Lindy Scott and C. René Padilla, *Terrorism and the War in Iraq: A Christian Word from Latin America* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Kairos, 2004).

CHAPTER FOUR

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE CREATION OF AN EVANGELICAL LEFT

In the late 1960s Calvin College professor Richard Mouw, a newly minted Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, sat in his Grand Rapids office with a student who was in tears. His parents, he told Mouw, opposed the civil rights movement. His voice cracking and tears dripping from his eyes, the student wondered how his parents could “be like that.” After all, they were the ones who had taught him to sing “red and yellow, black and white; they are precious in His sight. Jesus loves the little children of the world.”¹ How could they follow a God of love, yet claim states’ rights over the rights of downtrodden Negroes? That his own evangelical parents would not

¹ Richard Mouw interview, July 12, 2006, Pasadena, Cal. This song served a powerful rhetorical role among young evangelicals. Clarence Jordan, founder of Koinonia Farm, remembers the incongruity of singing this song in the segregated South. In his personal journal as a graduate student, he remembered singing the song as a boy: “The question arose in my mind: Were the little black children precious in God’s sight just like the little white children? The song said they were. Then why were they always so ragged, so dirty and hungry? Did God have favorite children? ... A little light came when I began to realize that perhaps it wasn’t God’s doings, but man’s. ... My environment told me that they were not very precious in anybody’s sight. A nigger was a nigger and must be kept in his place—the place of servitude and inferiority.” See Dallas Lee, *The Cotton Patch Evidence* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), 7-8. Also see the cover of the March-April 1970 issue of *The Other Side*, which featured the text “Red & Yellow, Black & White.” Lewis Smedes tells a similar story of how an early encounter with racism sparked a resonance with later civil rights action. He writes, “I heard a young white man curse an aging black man who had gotten in his way, cussed him out with God-rattling oaths; and what is more, he did it in front of the old man’s friends. I had never known a black person. I had never before seen racism in action. But when I heard its words and saw its face on that early morning in Atlanta, Georgia, I knew for sure that racism was a terrible thing.” See Lewis Smedes, *My God and I* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 2003), 120-121.

support the efforts of Martin Luther King, Jr. to end Jim Crow laws seemed the height of hypocrisy.

This student's embrace of racial equality, however, came very late in the civil rights movement. Consistent evangelical objections to segregation appeared only after much of the South was integrated—and after the civil rights activists had moved on to other matters of racial justice.² Many more evangelicals added their support in the early 1970s to these new matters, namely those of structural reform such as urban housing and school busing to create more fully integrated schools. Yet they remained distraught that their tradition had forfeited its moral voice early in the civil rights movement and frustrated that their attempts to form racially integrated communities were not working.

I.

The evangelical encounter with the civil rights movement reflected Carl F. H. Henry's emphatic, but vague call for increased social action in *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*. Like Henry, most northern evangelicals spoke forthrightly against segregation yet hesitated to use protest to force an end to Jim Crow. Preferring electoral and legislative solutions, most evangelicals had little appetite for the bus boycott in Montgomery in 1955, nor for the freedom rides sponsored by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in the early 1960s.

² On the belated response to civil rights among American Catholics (though not as belated as evangelicals), see, for example, John McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996); Andrew S. Moore, *The South's Tolerable Alien: Roman Catholics in Alabama and Georgia, 1945-1970* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007); Amy Koehlinger, *The New Nuns: Racial Justice and Religious Reform in the 1960s* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007).

Bred to avoid confrontation with civil authorities, evangelicals did not instinctively gravitate toward challenges of social mores, let alone civil disobedience. Most never put it so starkly, but the response of a church elder to Jim Wallis's newfound sensitivity to civil rights in the early 1960s—"Christianity has nothing to do with racism. That's political. Our faith is personal"—was typical of most lay evangelicals.³ When pressed, new evangelicals took a gradualist approach toward integration, but most simply wished that the racial tumult would go away. Civil rights, they maintained, distracted from the larger mission of evangelism.⁴ Billy Graham, for example, despite appearing publicly with King and integrating athletic stadiums in the South nonetheless called for a "period of quietness in which moderation prevails," urged King to "put on the brakes a little bit," and asked not to be called "a thoroughgoing integrationist."⁵ The conspicuous absence of evangelicals on freedom rides characterizes the encounter between the evangelical establishment and the civil rights movement.

Yet numbers of younger evangelicals, missing from the burgeoning historiography on religion and the civil rights movement, extended Graham's

³ Jim Wallis interview with Terri Gross on *Fresh Air*, National Public Radio, January 20, 2005.

⁴ *Christianity Today*, for example, printed on average less than two articles a year on race relations between 1957 and 1965. See Michael O. Emerson and Christian Smith, *Divided by Faith: Evangelical Religion and the Problem of Race in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 46.

⁵ "Billy Graham Urges Restraint in Sit-Ins," *New York Times*, April 18, 1963, p. 21. For more on Billy Graham and civil rights, see Steven P. Miller, "The Politics of Decency: Billy Graham, Evangelicalism, and the End of the Solid South, 1950-1980," (Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 2006); Richard V. Pierard, "From Evangelical Exclusivism to Ecumenical Openness: Billy Graham and Sociopolitical Issues," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 20, No. 3 (Summer 1983), 429-432. Pierard describes Graham's social pessimism and discomfort with sit-ins and protest marches led by King in Alabama. "Only when Christ comes again will little white children of Alabama walk hand in hand with little black children," responded Graham to King's "I Have a Dream" speech.

tentative activism.⁶ Mostly students who would go on to comprise the core of the evangelical left in the 1970s, these evangelicals more actively supported Martin Luther King, Jr. and sounded a more pronounced rhetoric of integration and racial justice. “To many of us,” wrote Donald Dayton, “the civil rights movement and its principles of fundamental human equality seemed not only more right, but more biblical and Christian than positions taken by our elders.”⁷ Readers of *InterVarsity’s* magazine, for example, favored federal intervention in southern states by an overwhelming majority and cheered on an *InterVarsity* leader Ruth Lewis as she attempted to integrate the University of Alabama-Birmingham campus.⁸ The chair of Wheaton College’s Bible department served on the city’s civil rights commission and helped minorities move into town.⁹ The college hired several black faculty members in early 1960s, and the college’s anthropologist wrote an influential book condemning segregation.¹⁰ Several evangelical student newspapers faithfully covered the civil rights movement, sympathetically tracking desegregation attempts in the South throughout the early 1960s. The *Wheaton Record* and the *Calvin Chimes*, for example, editorialized in favor of the Civil Rights Amendment and in opposition to

⁶ Charles Marsh, *God’s Long Summer: Faith and Civil Rights* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999) and David L. Chappell, *A Stone of Hope: Prophetic Religion and the Death of Jim Crow* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

⁷ Donald W. Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 4.

⁸ Russell Maatman, “Report from Ole Miss,” *HIS* 23, No. 8 (May 1963), 1-3; “Feedback: A Debate on Integration,” *HIS* 24, No. 6 (May 1963), 26-27; Ruth Lewis, “New Face at Alabama,” *HIS* 28, No. 9 (May 1964), 11-13.

⁹ Bill Larkin, “Racial Progress in Suburbia,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 13 (December 16, 1965), 2.

¹⁰ James O. Buswell, III, *Slavery, Segregation, and Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964). This was a direct response to the pro-segregation pamphlet by Carlton Putnam, *Race and Reason* (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1961).

Barry Goldwater's states-rights stance.¹¹ A very few evangelical students and ministers, seeking to bring recalcitrant southern states into line, even marched in the South. Frank Gaebelein, an evangelical pastor and future editor of *Christianity Today*, joined Martin Luther King, Jr., on marches and voter-registration drives in Selma in 1965.¹² More than one dozen other northern evangelicals marched with 2,500 demonstrators and Martin Luther King, Jr., from Selma to Montgomery in March 1965.¹³ Inspired by civil rights speeches and shocked by the confrontation with state police at the Alabama River during the day, two Wheaton students were physically assaulted by white segregationists later in the evening. They breathlessly told a *Record* reporter, "The scum who carry out these activities are supported by the

¹¹ On Calvin, see Robert VanDellen, "Just How, Senator?" *Chimes* 59, No. 3 (October 2, 1964), 2; Mark Wagenveld, "Neighborhood Association Copes with Area Racial Problems," *Chimes* 59, No. 3 (October 2, 1964), 1; and Marlin VanElderen, "The Anti-Social Gospel" *Chimes* 60, No. 3 (October 1, 1965), 3. On Wheaton see Paul Henry, "De Jure," *Wheaton Record* 85, No. 5 (October 4, 1962), 2; "Mississippi Profs Leave University as a Result of Integration Dispute," *Wheaton Record* 85, No. 19 (February 7, 1963), 5; and "Midwest Students Critically Discuss Civil Rights Acts," *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 11 (December 3, 1964), 4.

¹² Michael Cromartie, "Fixing the World: From Nonplayers to Radicals to New Right Conservatives: The Saga of Evangelicals and Social Action," *Christianity Today* 36, No. 5 (April 27, 1992), 24.

¹³ On the Church of the Savior's Gordon Cosby, see Elizabeth O'Connor, *Journey Inward, Journey Outward* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 138-141. Calling the march a "transcendent" experience in the next week's sermon, Cosby preached "that to be in Selma was to touch a spirit and go away changed. 'What I saw there was a people being wounded for our transgressions, who were being bruised for our iniquities.'" On Gene Brack of Elm-LaSalle Bible Church, see James and Marti Hefley, *The Church That Takes on Trouble* (Elgin, Ill.: David C. Cook Publishing, 1976), 56. Fellow parishioners at LaSalle saw his white face bobbing in the front lines near King on the television news. On two carloads from Christian Reformed churches in New York City, see Edson Lewis, Jr., "We Went to Alabama," *Reformed Journal* (April 1965), 3-5. On Fuller students, see David Allan Hubbard, "Lecture Two: An Academic Adventure," delivered at Drew University, October 23, 1979, in "Marsden Notes" folder, Fuller Theological Seminary Archives, Pasadena, California. Fuller also sent a faculty and student representative to Martin Luther King, Jr.'s funeral in Memphis in 1968. On a Houghton student's work with the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party in the election of 1964, see Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage*, 4.

system which presently exists—and this system must be smashed by a bold show of Christian love.”¹⁴

Increasing numbers of evangelical students attempted to bring this “bold show” back to the North. In Grand Rapids in 1963, nearly 300 Calvin students marched to protest the bombings of black churches in Birmingham. In 1965 over 200 students braved a bitterly cold day in Grand Rapids to protest the death of Boston minister James Reeb, who had been beaten to death in Selma, Alabama.¹⁵ At Wheaton a civil rights committee of the student council, formed in 1962 in response to the discrimination of black Wheaton students at local barbershops, lobbied local newspapers and the Chamber of Commerce. Students threatened to picket and boycott the barbershops if they did not offer their services to blacks.¹⁶ Students also picketed a 1964 Barry Goldwater rally at the college’s football stadium, a campaign event replete with racial overtones. As Goldwater intoned states-rights rhetoric—“Enforcement of the law is a state and local responsibility. There is no room in this country for a federal police force”—fifty students protested Goldwater’s denunciation of forced integration in the South and held aloft “LBJ-USA” banners to a chorus of catcalls and boos from Goldwater supporters. A group of black children, dressed in black-and-white dresses and suits, from Chicago’s south side marched alongside the Wheaton students. Together they sang “Freedom Song” and “Jesus Loves Me” and chanted, “God loves us, why don’t you, Mr. Goldwater?”; “Wheaton Christians—do

¹⁴ “Seniors Travel to Alabama, Engage in Peaceful Protest,” *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 23 (March 18, 1965), 1, 5.

¹⁵ Lois Short, “Students Join March to Protest Civil Rights Death,” *Calvin Chimes* 59, No. 20 (March 19, 1965), 3.

¹⁶ “S.C. Civil Rights Committee Views Local Discrimination,” *Wheaton Record* 85, No. 9 (November 1, 1962), 1.

you really care?"; and "You preach to us, you pray for us, you say you love us, but you vote for Mr. Goldwater." The confrontation grew ugly. A Goldwater supporter struck a journalist interviewing a Johnson supporter over the head with a sign, local youths kicked, pushed, and jeered black and white protesters.¹⁷

The incident, which occurred in the wake of Wheaton's 1964 fall evangelistic services in which evangelist Leighton Ford stressed that God "is real, relevant, and contemporaneous," set off a contentious debate on campus about the nature of social obligation, civic dissent, and faith. Many, dissatisfied with the college's politically conservative stance, criticized Hudson Armerding, the college's president, at a student council forum for allowing a candidate with conservative views on civil rights to speak. The student newspaper printed a flurry of letters and articles about the incident, some condemning the demonstrators' use of black children as pawns in an inflammatory demonstration.¹⁸ Most students, however, conceded that the demonstration was appropriate, even laudable. One called it "an act of courageous conviction, an impassioned expression of feeling growing out of oppressed perspectives, and a forthright challenge to comfortable Christian conservatism."¹⁹ Another pronounced the demonstration necessary because conservatism "had failed to provide any meaningful solutions to the Negro's predicaments."²⁰ The church failed to exercise "its role of prophetic judgment," accused the *Record's* editor. "The

¹⁷ Dan Kuhn, "Kuhn Explains Convictions Behind Civil Rights Picketing," *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 3 (October 8, 1964), 4.

¹⁸ Mark Hanchett, "Calls Civil Rights Protest 'Out of Place,'" *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 3 (October 8, 1964), 2.

¹⁹ Kuhn, "Kuhn Explains Convictions," 4.

²⁰ Steve Mott, "Grad Student Replies to Colleague's Letter," *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 6 (October 29, 1964), 2.

inaction of several of the major evangelical churches in town has been conspicuous,” he wrote, after hearing complaints about blacks moving into the town of Wheaton. The editor denounced the hypocrisy of evangelicals who asserted that civil rights should not be legislated as a “matter of the heart,” yet called for stricter legal controls on pornography and urban violence. How could they sing about blacks being precious in God’s sight, yet fail to condemn outrages perpetrated by police against southern blacks on the *CBS Evening News*? How could they say that communism was implicit in Martin Luther King, Jr.’s integrationist theology, decry the March on Washington as a “mob spectacle,” and condemn interracial marriage?²¹

To be sure, many evangelical students in the early 1960s did not echo the editor’s outspoken support for civil rights legislation. Many Wheaton students agreed with their parents, supporting the ideal of integration, yet rejecting activism. The college’s active NAACP chapter lacked substantial support on campus.²² Some students criticized a chapel service on the race issue as overblown.²³ On the whole, however, students—and evangelicals generally—gradually awoke to racial concerns in the last two-thirds of the decade. While the presence of latent racism continued to be felt palpably by minorities on northern evangelical campuses, the use of states rights rhetoric to stave off an end to segregation came to be uniformly opposed in

²¹ Fred Smith and Jay Hakes, “Evangelical Pulpits Silent on Civil Rights,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 12 (January 6, 1966), 2; Donald W. Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage*, 3.

²² Paul M. Bechtel, *Wheaton College: A Heritage Remembered, 1860-1984* (Wheaton, Ill.: H. Shaw Publishers, 1984), 285; “Campus NAACP Wins Charter Approval,” *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 23 (March 18, 1965), 4.

²³ Dave Rockness and Bill Dyrness, “Hurt Minority Means Missed Goal?” *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 32 (May 27, 1965), 2.

campus discourse by the mid-1960s.²⁴ By the late 1960s a movement of activist evangelicals devoted to racial justice had gained momentum.

Four key elements helped spark this belated activism. First, evangelicals felt international pressure to end southern segregation, much of it relayed by evangelical missionaries and converts. Kenyan student John Okite, for example, told classmates at Wheaton's NAACP meeting in 1966 that "the people in the Church must take a more radical part in the civil rights movement."²⁵ Ernest Fowler, a missionary with Latin American Mission, told InterVarsity students that he was berated about southern segregation while on a bus in Cartenega, Columbia, and felt unable to "defend what shames all of us as U.S. citizens when we are questioned about such things."²⁶ Warren and Shirley Webster, missionaries in Pakistan, explained in *The Other Side* that newspapers in Africa and Asia carried daily reports of racial struggles in the United States. "What happens today in Little Rock or Birmingham," wrote the Websters, "is on the front page of tomorrow's paper in Cairo, Karachi and Djakarta—

²⁴ Black students into the 1970s regularly complained about discrimination and discomfort on Wheaton's lily-white campus. See Ted Ryan, "Schoenherr Denies Charges of Discriminatory Practices," *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 11 (December 3, 1964), 4; So Yan Pul, "Senior Deprecates Racial Attitudes," *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 18 (February 10, 1966), 4; Steve Aulie, "Worse Riots This Summer, Civil Rights Leader Predicts," *Wheaton Record* 90, No. 20 (March 22, 1968), 4; Ron Thomas, "We Discuss Racism as a Problem, Ignore Blatant Practice," *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 17 (February 13, 1970), 4; Ron Potter, "The 'Black Problem' Is Your Problem," *Wheaton Record* 82, No. 19 (February 27, 1970), 3. See especially the weekly 1972 *Record* column called "Black Light." On the failure of a minority recruitment program designed to bring in black and Puerto Rican students from Chicago and New York City, see Bechtel, *A Heritage Remembered*, 286. On conflict between black youths and Wheaton students at LaSalle church in Chicago, see Hefley, *Church That Takes on Trouble*, 83. On racial conflict at Gordon College, see Ted Moran, "ECUMB," *The Other Side* 7, No. 2 (March-April 1971), 12-15. Moran describes how interracial dating couples got threatening calls and notes. One even had a cross burned outside the dormitory. Another black student described his time at Gordon as the most "humiliating, traumatic, disillusioning months in my life." See Michael E. Haynes, "Three Minutes to Midnight," *Freedom Now* 5, No. 4 (July-August 1969), 8-12.

²⁵ "Okite Relates African Strides to Us Civil Rights Movement," *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 19 (February 17, 1966), 4.

²⁶ David Howard, "Cartenega: Mirror for Missions," *HIS* 28, No. 4 (January 1968), 3.

complete with photographs of police dogs, fire hoses, bombings and burning crosses.”²⁷ A missionary explained to a Fuller Seminary student that ‘There is nothing that has hindered the Christian message abroad so much as our un-Christian attitudes and actions on the race question.’²⁸ Evangelicals, often deeply engaged in missionary support, took seriously the admonitions of missionaries and foreign students.

Second, academicians and denominational leaders encouraged evangelical activism. In the early 1960s, contributors to the *Reformed Journal* backed federal intervention in the South, praised King’s March on Washington, and encouraged Christian Reformed Church efforts to aid integration efforts in the South.²⁹ One of those contributors, Lewis Smedes, served as the president of the Grand Rapids Urban League. Other Calvin faculty, such as Richard Mouw, an active member of the Grand Rapids NAACP, brought civil rights activists James Farmer and Fr. James Groppi to campus in the late 1960s.³⁰ At state universities evangelical professors advised InterVarsity chapters to promote racial justice. One of them, Kansas State history professor Robert D. Linder, argued for the morality of civil rights protests, writing that “peacefully demonstrating for a good cause is in the best American tradition.”³¹

²⁷ Warren and Shirley Webster, “Segregation and World Missions,” *Freedom Now* 3, No. 1 (January-February 1967), 11-13.

²⁸ John Seamands, quoted in Carol Reiss, “Relationship Is Action,” *The Opinion* 7, No. 2 (November 1967), 13-17. Copy in Folder, “Opinion,” Fuller Theological Seminary Archives.

²⁹ On Meredith, see Lester DeKoster in *Reformed Journal* 13, No. 1 (January 1963), 3. On the March on Washington, see “The Answer Is Blowing in the Wind,” *Reformed Journal* 13, No. 7 (September 1963), 3-4; Peter Huiner, “Shall We March?” *Reformed Journal* 15, No. 4 (April 1965), 6-9.

³⁰ “Smedes, Urban League Sparks Integration Drive,” *Calvin Chimes* 57, No. 1 (September 12, 1962), 1.

³¹ Robert D. Linder, “A Christian Approach to the Contemporary Civil Rights Movement,” 141, in Robert G. Clouse, Robert D. Linder, and Richard V. Pierard, eds., *Protest and Politics: Christianity and Contemporary Affairs* (Greenwood, S.C.: Attic Press, 1968).

Ron Sider, a graduate student at Yale, joined the New Haven NAACP, helped organize voter registration drives, and encouraged the InterVarsity chapter there to become more active in civil rights work.³²

InterVarsity's leadership encouraged Sider's racial activism. The organization's president John W. Alexander carefully clipped hundreds of articles addressing black issues and campus riots, wrote position papers, and then instructed students on how they might best respond to racial unrest on campus. A series of meetings of the Staff Advisory Committee in early 1965 reflected the long shadow that contemporary American culture was casting on InterVarsity. Long discussions were held about "the social problems which have burst into flame in recent days in diverse parts of our country"—the free speech movement, the university, and civil rights. They agreed, for instance, about "our Christian responsibility to engage in much-needed social action."³³ To help in that goal, Alexander encouraged staff to "keep an eye out for a potential Negro staff member."³⁴ Letters to donors in 1970 revealed his new concerns—racial prejudice in rental properties, the Vietnam conflict, and poverty.³⁵ Two unusual sources—SDS and liberal mainliners—catalyzed Alexander's concerns. At a 1965 meeting of the National Conference on Religion and Higher Education, InterVarsity administrators were stunned by the myriad student projects launched by mainliners to rebuild burned-out black churches in the South and

³² Ron Sider interview, August 9, 2005, Philadelphia, Pa.

³³ "Minutes of the Meeting of the Staff Advisory Committee of the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship Held at Elburn, Illinois, March 22-25, 1965," Folder 34:1: "Senior Staff Council, 1951-1965," InterVarsity Collection, BGC Archives.

³⁴ "Minutes of the Staff Advisory Committee: Elburn, IL, Jan. 25-30, 1965," Folder 34:1: "Senior Staff Council, 1951-1965," InterVarsity Collection, BGC Archives.

³⁵ John Alexander, "Campus Unrest: Some Characteristics, Causes and Cures," June 1970, Folder 21:2: "Student Unrest/Dissent (1960s)," InterVarsity Collection, BGC Archives.

to serve poverty-stricken residents of the inner city. Despite his instinctive suspicion of mainline theology, he was impressed with the “sense of reality and honesty” on the part of the chaplains and the “earnestness and depth” of student presenters, especially from Paul Potter, the current president of SDS. “I must confess,” reported Troutman, “that face to face with these students, as they were talking about their identification in the slums of various cities, made our summer program of camp activities seem rather superficial.”³⁶

John Alexander, a young professor of philosophy and co-editor of *Freedom Now*, introduced a fierier brand of racial activism to evangelicalism.³⁷ After a short and strident career at Wheaton agitating for civil rights—in a 1968 chapel service Alexander told students to quit “thinking white” and demanded that blacks compose 20% of the student body—Alexander left, frustrated by the college’s unwillingness to mobilize.³⁸ He moved to Philadelphia where he, along with several other Wheaton graduates, founded The Other Side community and became a critical voice for racial justice in the larger evangelical community.

A small minority of Southern Baptists—the most prominent of them Clarence Jordan and Foy Valentine—also challenged southern segregation.³⁹ Jordan, a divinity

³⁶ Charles Troutman to John Alexander, May 4, 1965, in Box 41, Folder 13, “Association for the Coordination of University Religious Affairs, 1965-1975,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA. For other examples of evangelical chagrin over mainline liberal critiques of their lack of social action, particularly in Chicago, see Hefley, *The Church That Takes on Trouble*, 71, 102-103.

³⁷ A second important advocate for racial justice at Wheaton was Ka Tong Gaw, a professor of sociology and native of the Philippines.

³⁸ “Alexander Edits Civil Rights Magazine, ‘Freedom Now!’” *Wheaton Record* 91, No. 10 (November 22, 1968), 4. Dozens of Wheaton students subscribed and many of Alexander’s colleagues wrote articles in *Freedom Now*.

³⁹ Others included T. B. Maston and J. B. Weatherspoon. See Maston, *Of One* (Atlanta: Home Mission Board, 1946); Maston, *The Christian in the Modern World* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1952); Maston, *Bible and Race* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1955); and Maston, *Christianity and*

student at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Ky., returned to his native Georgia to launch an integrated intentional community. Koinonia Farm near Americus, Georgia, espoused ecological farming and economic sharing, but it was most notorious for its interracialism. As Jordan worked alongside black sharecroppers and harbored civil rights activists in the 1960s, some in the white community attacked Koinonia with bombings and boycotts. Many evangelicals, among them Southern Baptist churchman Foy Valentine, visited the farm to learn from the veteran crusader.⁴⁰ Valentine and Jordan spent a summer farming together, reading the New Testament in its original Greek, and talking with local blacks. Valentine proceeded to write a doctoral dissertation entitled “A Historical Study of Southern Baptists and Race Relations, 1917-1947” and to improve race relations as a denominational bureaucrat. As executive director of the Christian Life Commission (which after the conservative takeover of the Southern Baptist Convention in the 1980s became the Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission led by conservative pundit Richard Land), Valentine organized conferences on race featuring speakers such as civil rights leader Bayard Rustin and wrote sharply worded articles condemning segregation. While ecclesiastical ties between Southern Baptists and northern evangelicals in that era were not tight—Valentine told *Newsweek* that he wasn’t even an “evangelical”

World Issues (New York: Macmillan, 1957); Weatherspoon, “The Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention: A Critical Evaluation,” (Th.D. dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1970). Northern evangelical tracts against segregation included James O. Buswell, III, *Slavery, Segregation, and Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964). Also see writings by William Stringfellow, who published with Eerdmans.

⁴⁰ Wallis cited Jordan as one of his mentors. See Jim Wallis, *Agenda for Biblical People* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), xi.

because he didn't like "theological witch hunts"—Southern Baptist activism inspired young evangelicals.⁴¹

Third, several evangelical politicians outraged their party leadership and surprised their constituents with votes for civil rights legislation. John Anderson, a conservative Republican congressman who in 1980 ran for president as an independent, voted for the 1965 Civil Rights Act. Then in 1968 on the eve of King's funeral, he cast the deciding vote in the Rules Committee for an open housing bill. Anderson gained a reputation as "a thinking man's conservative" for defying his party and the wishes of his Rockford, Ill., constituents whose mail to the representative ran 25-1 against open housing.⁴² Republican governor of Oregon Mark Hatfield also pushed for civil rights legislation at governors meetings in the 1960s.⁴³ At the Republican National Convention in 1964, Hatfield called for equal opportunity for minorities in education, employment, and housing. On the Democratic side, Governor Harold Hughes of Iowa, a celebrated evangelical convert recovering from bouts of suicidal alcoholism, earned substantial attention for his civil rights work.⁴⁴

While third-world pressure, evangelical politicians, and professors helped sensitize evangelicals to racial justice, direct contact with evangelical African-American activists—particularly John Perkins, Tom Skinner, and Bill Pannell—most

⁴¹ Foy Valentine, "Engagement—the Christian's Agenda," *Reformed Journal* (February 1974), 16-17.

⁴² John H. Averill, "Ill. Conservative Emerges as Civil Rights Hero in House," *Washington Post*, April 15, 1968, p. A5; Aldo Beckman, "Anderson Explains Open Housing Vote," *Chicago Tribune*, April 14, 1968, p. 12; James C. Hefley and Edward E. Plowman, *Washington: Christians in the Corridors of Power* (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House Publishing, 1975), 119.

⁴³ Robert Eels and Bartell Nyberg, *Lonely Walk: The Life of Senator Mark Hatfield* (Portland: Multnomah Press, 1979), 52-53.

⁴⁴ Harold E. Hughes, *The Man from Ida Grove* (Waco: Word Books, 1979), 341.

decisively shaped the racial attitudes of young evangelicals.⁴⁵ Perkins, a Mississippian by birth, left for California when his brother was beaten to death by the police. Disillusioned with the South, he vowed to never return. After a conversion to evangelical Christianity in a black holiness church and then growing prominence in the mushrooming evangelical subculture of southern California, however, Perkins felt an irresistible call to return to the rural areas surrounding Jackson, Mississippi, to evangelize poor blacks. When he returned, Perkins, concentrating on building a new congregation, at first dismissed the emerging civil rights movement. He had come, after all, to save souls, not stamp out Jim Crow. But as he toured poor black areas like “Baptist Bottom,” “Sullivan’s Holler,” and “Rabbit Road” wearing ragged blue jeans, faded sports shirt, and dusty black shoes, Perkins noticed the “desperate physical needs of many of our people.” He discovered that “real evangelism brings a person face to face with all the needs of a person. We had to see people not just as souls but as whole people.” Perkins adjusted his approach, and within five years he built a thriving mission which included a day-care center, a gym, a playground, and a cooperative farming store in addition to a church.

As Perkins addressed the spiritual and social needs of his parishioners, he could not escape the obvious link between economic degradation and the southern

⁴⁵ Other key black evangelical sources of young evangelical activism included Michael Haynes, minister of a Baptist church in Boston and representative in the Massachusetts legislature; James Earl Massey, campus pastor and professor at Anderson College; Samuel Hines, son of a Jamaican fundamentalist preacher; William Bentley; Ruth Lewis Bentley; Columbus Salley; and Ron Potter. Many of them were personal friends of Martin Luther King, Jr. On black evangelicals and King, see Emerson and Smith, *Divided by Faith*, 54. Not all black evangelicals encouraged civil rights activism, especially those associated with fundamentalist institutions. William Banks of Moody Bible Institute regularly wrote in *The Other Side* to urge patience and moderation. He wrote, “The social gospeler who thinks that changing the environment and raising the standards of living is the answer is badly mistaken. ... He must not prostitute his calling by dabbling in politics and stressing the physical aspects of life.” See “The Social Gospel and the Black Preacher,” *The Other Side* 8, No. 2 (March-April 1972), 41.

caste system. His view of the civil rights movement accordingly softened, and Perkins allowed activists to stay at his Voice of Calvary mission during the 1964 Summer Project. Though his reputation among activists was mixed in the mid-1960s, by 1971 Perkins was an active participant in matters of racial justice. Young evangelicals chronicled his exploits, and he eventually became a minor evangelical celebrity, befriended by evangelical luminaries such as Carl F.H. Henry, Frank Gabelein, Charles Colson, Tony Campolo and Mark Hatfield, who called Perkins “a modern saint.” He spoke at Billy Graham crusades, political prayer breakfasts, and Urbana conferences. He wrote in the pages of *Sojourners*, *Christianity Today*, *Decision*, *Campus Life*, and *Moody Monthly*. His autobiography *Let Justice Roll Down* became a bestseller, ranking fourth for a time in the 1970s in the sale of religious paperbacks. All the while, whites in his home town treated him with hostility and indifference.⁴⁶

Several northern urban voices added to Perkins’ southern rural perspective. Tom Skinner, a former Harlem Lords gang leader, launched a vibrant career at the age of twenty. At a sensational 1962 crusade at the Apollo Theater, Skinner converted 2,200 people with sermons entitled “The White Man Did It” and “A White Man’s Religion.” Skinner catapulted to prominence among white evangelicals with an unusual blend of conversionist piety and increasingly sharp racial rhetoric. In his 1970 book *How Black Is the Gospel?* Skinner urged a return to “that masculine, contemporary, revolutionary Jesus.” Skinner’s Jesus spit out, “You brood of vipers!”

⁴⁶ Charles Marsh, *Beloved Community: How Faith Shapes Social Justice* (New York: Basic Books, 2005), 183-184; John Perkins, *Let Justice Roll Down: John Perkins Tells His Own Story* (Glendale, Calif.: G/L Regal Books, 1976); Oral interview, transcript in John M. Perkins Collection, BGCA.

to racists.⁴⁷ As young evangelicals warmed to New Leftist thought and activism in the late 1960s, contentious language propelled Skinner as a rising star and an important voice in sensitizing evangelicals to racial issues.

Bill Pannell, a young man from suburban Detroit, joined Skinner's crusade staff after a childhood as a "colored stranger" in the heart of white evangelicalism. Brought up by white Plymouth Brethren, then educated at Fort Wayne Bible College, Pannell learned the warm piety and enjoyed the close friendships of evangelical culture. He also suffered the limits of being "a colored stranger" in a white church. Pannell, who complained of the "anxiety and agony of being an alien in one's own land" only reluctantly called evangelicalism racist. Yet in his immensely popular book *My Friend, the Enemy*, he asserted that "this conservative brand of Christianity perpetuates the myth of white supremacy. It tends also to associate Christianity with American patriotism, free enterprise, and the Republican party."⁴⁸ The white evangelical was "my friend, the enemy." He worshiped the same God, Pannell maintained, opposed the KKK, decried violence, supported the Constitution, and encouraged black voting rights. At the same time white evangelicals were likely to denounce racial agitators and maybe even "agree it is best that I not live in his city's limits."⁴⁹ Pannell nonetheless remained within evangelical boundaries, encouraging action toward racial justice.

⁴⁷ Tom Skinner, *How Black Is the Gospel?* (Philadelphia: Lippincott Publishing, 1970), 69, 90; Edward Gilbreath, "A Prophet out of Harlem: Willing to Tell the Hard Truth, Evangelist Tom Skinner Inspired a Generation of Leaders," *Christianity Today* 40, No. 16 (September 16, 1996), 36-43.

⁴⁸ William Pannell, *My Friend, the Enemy* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1968), 1-53.

⁴⁹ Pannell, *My Friend, the Enemy*, 62.

Tempests within InterVarsity in the late 1960s captured the inevitable clash between young evangelicals and those who defended evangelical civil rights inaction. Racially charged conflict suddenly plagued InterVarsity's triennial missions convention in 1967, previously characterized by a singular focus on evangelism. Clearly attuned to broader cultural disruptions, many of the 9,200 students seemed to resent speakers simply because they were white and male. One resolution was read from the floor complained that "there are no black men in leadership positions on the national staff." For the first time at an Urbana convention, InterVarsity staffers guarded the stage to prevent students from trying to commandeer the microphone.⁵⁰ Following Urbana 67, *HIS* magazine wrote that very little "escaped criticism at the convention. ... Anything that seemed to show intolerance came under their indictment, with impatience toward racism leading the list."⁵¹

InterVarsity leadership heard more full-throated complaints after the convention. Attendees of the first Black Christian Literature Conference in 1969 in New Jersey introduced InterVarsity representative Gladys Hunt to a disturbing picture of her organization's image among blacks. "IVCF is simply not seen as saying anything relevant," she wrote in her report to InterVarsity leadership, noting that only one article in *HIS* magazine "really spoke to the Black problem."⁵² New York City-area chapters also complained of discrimination when they ventured outside their own

⁵⁰ "Student Resolution, African Students," December 30, 1967, in Box 52, Folder 3, "Pannell, William: 1967-1970," InterVarsity Collection, BGCA; See Keith Hunt and Gladys M. Hunt, *For Christ and the University: The Story of InterVarsity Christian Fellowship of the U.S.A., 1940-1990* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1991), 252-53.

⁵¹ Marvin Mayers, "An Anthropologist Looks at Urbana," *HIS* 28, No. 9 (June 1968), 8.

⁵² Gladys Hunt to IVCF Cabinet, May 13, 1969, in Box 52, Folder 3, "Pannell, William; 1967-1970," InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

chapters to conventions or regional meetings.⁵³ These students encouraged InterVarsity administrators to nurture racially integrated, socially aware chapters of the very sort they enjoyed. The Brooklyn College chapter, for example, integrated Hispanic, Chinese, white middle-class, African-American, Caribbean black, African, and Puerto Rican evangelicals. The chapter held regular, substantive discussions about war, sex, abortion, and racial injustice. It launched a literacy program for children and conducted regular evangelistic rallies. InterVarsity administrators agreed and sought to model the Brooklyn chapter's combination of social awareness, evangelical piety, and racial integration at the next Urbana convention in 1970.⁵⁴

InterVarsity enlisted Urbana 67 dissenters to help them address the racial problems. One of them, Carl Ellis, a sophomore at Hampton Institute in Virginia and president of the school's InterVarsity chapter, had come expectantly to Urbana in 1967. "I went there bright-eyed and naïve," he explained. "But it didn't take long for me to realize something wasn't right. I didn't see anybody from my neighborhood there. I didn't see anyone talking about missions to the cities or about the concerns of the black population. And I said to myself, 'I hope these people aren't deliberately doing this.'"⁵⁵ An all-night session of fervent prayer with other African-American attendees convinced Ellis that he should remain involved with InterVarsity to urge the

⁵³ Ron Mitchell of the New York City InterVarsity chapter, for example, heard widespread reports circulated of African-Americans being ignored when they showed up at local chapter meetings. See Ron Mitchell, *Organic Faith: A Call to Authentic Christianity* (Chicago, Ill.: Cornerstone Press Chicago, 1998), 107-108.

⁵⁴ See Barbara Benjamin, *The Impossible Community: A Story of Hardship & Hope at Brooklyn College in New York* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1978).

⁵⁵ Gilbreath, "Prophet out of Harlem," 36.

racially “inept” organization toward greater racial sensitivity.⁵⁶ After being named to the national advisory committee for Urbana 70, Ellis recruited over 500 black students to attend and Tom Skinner to speak at the next convention. News of Skinner’s recruitment spread quickly among young black evangelicals, who felt at home neither at evangelical colleges and the many lily white InterVarsity chapters, nor in their black traditionalist churches. When the African-American contingent finally converged on the University of Illinois campus, they hoped to find a religious home that would nurture their progressive racial politics and evangelical theology.

The funky strains of Soul Liberation, a band of African-American musicians wearing afros, colorful outfits, and African symbols, welcomed attendees of Urbana 70. The mostly white audience hesitated at first, unsure of what to make of “Power to the People,” a song full of idioms from the emerging Black Power movement. A swell soon rose to its feet to sing and clap along, delighted by the radical departure from the usual hymns. Tom Skinner then rose to deliver the evening sermon, a searing critique of racial prejudice in American society. Cheered on by the hundreds of black students who had arrived early to secure seats right in front of the podium, Skinner preached, “You soon learn that the police in the black communities become nothing more than the occupational force in the black community for the purpose of maintaining the interests of white society. ... You soon learn that what they mean by law and order is all the order for us and all the law for them.” Skinner got laughs when, referring to interracial marriage, he said, “I don’t know where white people get the idea that they are so utterly attractive that black people are just dying to marry

⁵⁶ Ken Ripley, “I-V ‘Umbrella’ for Blacks?” *The Branch* 1, No. 9 (May 21, 1973), 6.

them.” He received thunderous applause when he denounced the injustices of the economic and political system in which the top 5% wealthiest Americans sat in “smoke-filled rooms at political conventions” to determine our fate. “As a black Christian,” he said, “I have to renounce Americanism. I have to renounce any attempt to wed Jesus Christ off to the American system. I disassociate myself from any argument that says a vote for America is a vote for God.”

Skinner also indicted white evangelicalism. He denounced dispensationalists who argued that Canaan was a descendant of Ham and taught that “God has cursed all black people and relegated them to conditions of servitude.” Skinner told the transfixed students that he could name at least five evangelical colleges and twelve Bible institutes that still taught this. Such views helped institutionalize slavery and segregation. The evangelical church had failed on nearly every crucial point. “In general,” Skinner declared, “the evangelical, bible-believing, fundamental, orthodox, conservative church in this country was strangely silent. ... Christians supported the status quo, supported slavery, supported segregation.” Even today, evangelicals “go back to their suburban communities and vote for their law-and-order candidates who will keep the system the way it is.” Ending his sermon with a rhetorical flourish—“Go into the world that's enslaved, a world that's filled with hunger and poverty, racism and all those things that are the work of the devil. Proclaim liberation to the captives, preach sight to the blind, set at liberty them that are bruised. Go into the world and tell them who are bound mentally, spiritually, physically. The liberator has come!”—Skinner received a standing ovation.⁵⁷ Pannell described the response as

⁵⁷ Copy of audio tape in author's possession.

deafening and electric, “the most powerful moment that I’ve ever experienced at the conclusion of a sermon.”⁵⁸ For many students, Skinner’s speech portrayed all that was wrong, and suddenly hopeful, about evangelicalism. The convention “seemed like a glorified Sunday-school,” said one student, until Skinner spoke.⁵⁹

Other prominent African-American evangelicals concurred in a flurry of speeches, articles, and books. Bill Pannell looked for “evidence that this thing called Christianity as viewed by us evangelicals has made a difference in the lives of the oppressed of the world. Black students wanted that information—they have visited our churches, interpreted our guilty silence in the face of monstrous social outrages, and have concluded that social concern and evangelicals were mutually incompatible.”⁶⁰ Wyn Potter complained that “Christians were telling me that Christ was not concerned with the struggle of black people, and this was during the civil rights struggle of the 60’s.” Ron Potter lamented that he had “adopted white American evangelicalism hook, line, and sinker just a few months after my conversion.” “Ever since that time,” Potter continued, “I have been trying to find the gospel” amidst “white American middle class culture.”⁶¹ Such rhetoric left little room for continued ambivalence by young evangelicals concerned about evangelism and social justice.

⁵⁸ Gilbreath, “A Prophet out of Harlem,” 42.

⁵⁹ See Mildred Mellors, “Reactions to Urbana,” *Vanguard* (December 31, 1970) in Box 68, Folder 7, “Urbana 1961-1974,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

⁶⁰ William Pannell, “Evangelicals and the Social Crisis,” *Post-American* 3, No. 7 (October, 1974), 9.

⁶¹ “A Conversation with Young Evangelicals,” *Post-American* 4, No. 1 (January 1975), 9. Many black evangelicals had a difficult time navigating the complex racial landscape. To the white evangelical community, they defended the Black Power movement. To the black community, some of whom asserted that Christianity was “merely a tool of oppression,” they defended evangelical faith. For a fuller discussion of this, see Mitchell, *Organic Faith*, xii.

If the African-American evangelicals who emerged in the late 1960s harshly criticized white evangelicals, they equally faulted certain black voices. Skinner for instance made it clear that the black church held little promise for him. A pastor's son, Skinner grew up unimpressed with his father or his church. "Like so many churches across America, in my church there was no real worship. Sunday morning was a time for the people to gather and be stirred by the emotional clichés. . . . So long as the service was liberally sprinkled with those time worn phrases, the people felt good."⁶² Skinner longed for the warm piety, if not the cultural accretions, of white evangelicalism. Other black evangelicals criticized a lack of intellectual rigor in black churches. Black evangelicals felt most dismayed, however, by the separatist impulse of the emerging Black Power movement, which captured the attention of many black evangelical college students disillusioned by the inability of the civil rights movement to sustain black equality.⁶³ Skinner likened advocates of Black Power to Barrabbas, the character in the Gospel narrative condemned to death for insurrection. In his 1970 book *How Black Is the Gospel?* Skinner wrote, "So Jesus would have said to Barrabbas, Barrabbas, you're right, the Roman system stinks. It's corrupt to the core. But you are going to tear it down with your own corrupt nature; and in the name of getting rid of corruption, you are being corrupt, and you are going to replace the Roman system with your own messed-up kind of system."⁶⁴ The Black Panthers, like Barabbas, had correctly diagnosed the disease, but used the wrong treatment. "Few

⁶² Tom Skinner, *Black and Free* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1968), 39.

⁶³ Malcolm X, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* (New York: Grove Press, 1965); H. Cruse, *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual* (New York: William Morrow, 1967); W. L. Van Deburg, *New Day in Babylon: The Black Culture Movement and American Culture, 1965-1975* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

⁶⁴ Skinner, *How Black Is the Gospel?* 95-96.

black evangelicals in the late sixties,” remembers Potter, “were able to take on the charismatic evangelists of the secular Black Power movement. But Tom was able to help us address the attacks made upon us.”⁶⁵

Black evangelicals in the late 1960s thus resisted growing pressure to establish an array of black institutions. Perkins, Skinner, and Pannell contended that too many separate institutions would deviate from the example of the interracial New Testament church—and from the early civil rights movement, which disavowed black separatism. Skinner urged black and white evangelicals to follow the example of Martin Luther King, Jr., who in 1967 warned that “there is no separate black path to power and fulfillment that does not intersect white paths, and there is no separate white path to power and fulfillment, short of social disaster, that does not share that power with black aspirations of freedom and human dignity.”⁶⁶ Skinner criss-crossed the country as an evangelist and “minister of reconciliation” preaching that Christ “has made the two one and has destroyed the barrier, the dividing wall of hostility ... to reconcile both of them to God through the cross, by which he put to death their hostility.”⁶⁷ He urged disgruntled black evangelicals suffering under subtle forms of discrimination at white colleges and InterVarsity chapters to stay the course. When a

⁶⁵ Quoted in Gilbreath, “A Prophet out of Harlem,” 40.

⁶⁶ Martin Luther King, Jr., *Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community?* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1967), 52.

⁶⁷ Skinner also preached, “It is only at the cross of Jesus Christ, it is only through Jesus Christ, that the Stokely Carmichaels, the Eldridge Cleavers and the Rap Browns can hold hands with the Whitney Youngs and the Roy Wilkinses.... It is only at the cross of Jesus Christ that a black man and a white man can stand together.” See Skinner, *How Black Is the Gospel?* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1970), 97. Columbus Salley and Ronald Behm similarly argued, “On the basis of the universal redemption in Jesus Christ, any group that calls itself Christian and discriminates against a race or class is simply rejecting the biblical, Christian pattern. The New Testament church was not composed of nice, ticky-tacky, middle-class people. Rather, unity of faith overcame the potential divisions of social and racial barriers which were everywhere present.” See Salley and Behm, *Your God Is Too White* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1970), 98.

group of black students at Wheaton complained of racial insensitivity, Skinner came to offer guidance and interpret white evangelicalism for them. Student Ron Potter explained that “Tom was able to articulate for us what we had been feeling. He helped us to differentiate between biblical Christianity and the Christ of the white evangelical culture.”⁶⁸ Skinner also reconciled racial divides during Urbana 70. After a black caucus voted to exclude whites from a chaotic meeting, Skinner calmed frayed nerves as indignant students told stories of white discrimination. He also smoothed the ruffled feathers of the dismissed whites, many of whom were furious, complaining that the caucus was a black separatist group “practicing reverse discrimination.”⁶⁹ Skinner, the most prominent African-American in the young evangelical orbit, sought to convince evangelicals of all colors that the true path to racial justice was the creation of a beloved community that together worshipped God.

II.

While the evangelical attempt at beloved community would ultimately collapse in the face of identity politics, the lively debate over Black Power and the encounter with civil rights activism contributed to the creation of the evangelical left.⁷⁰ Specifically, it heightened young evangelicals’ sensitivity to social structures, a characteristic which would come to define the movement. In the early 1960s young evangelicals, like their parents, typically understood racism solely in terms of willful oppression by an individual toward an individual. “My parents,” remembers Jim

⁶⁸ Quoted in Gilbreath, “A Prophet out of Harlem,” 40.

⁶⁹ Mitchell, *Organic Faith*, 112.

⁷⁰ On identity politics within the evangelical left, see chapter nine.

Wallis, “rebuked the ‘colored jokes’ we kids brought home from our friends and their parents. . . . But their response to institutional racism was very different. When their country or its system was accused of being racist, they became defensive. They had a personal view of everything, which left them virtually unaware of the social, economic, and political injustices of America.”⁷¹ This individualistic conception of racism typified the evangelical response to civil rights.

Horrific images of lynchings and southern policemen turning water hoses on black protesters initially converted young Wallis and other young evangelicals to the civil rights movement.⁷² As he worked in Detroit during the summer of 1967, Wallis sensed not the economic inequity built into the system, but instead noticed “the terror of a city at war, saw the devastation, and listened to the anger and despair of black friends and co-workers. . . . The response of the police was unrestrained brutality that knew no bounds.”⁷³ Like their parents, young evangelicals at first posited an individualized solution, echoing the new evangelical mantra that changing hearts, not laws, could best transform society. Converting white racists would lead to better treatment of blacks. Similarly, the conversion of blacks would lead to more disciplined behavior, which would lift them out of the ghetto. The accumulation of millions of “saved” citizens would result in more humane laws and a more just society. On the other hand, forcing the hands of lawmakers through protest might hamper the success of evangelistic efforts among racist whites, in turn hurting the

⁷¹ Jim Wallis, *Revive Us Again: A Sojourner’s Story* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1983), 24.

⁷² Even black evangelicals in the early civil rights movement emphasized the inequities of individual more than structural racism. See C. Herbert Oliver, *No Flesh Shall Glory* (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1959).

⁷³ Wallis, *The Call to Conversion*, 40; Wallis, *Revive Us Again*.

black cause. For this reason, the Alexanders of *Freedom Now*, though they ultimately welcomed the removal of Jim Crow laws and the passage of the Civil Rights Act, initially worried that protest might detract from the racial justice brought about by transformed souls.⁷⁴ The Alexanders thus focused on treating individual blacks with courtesy and generosity.⁷⁵ The evangelical preoccupation with salvation, repentance, and regeneration left little room for structural solutions to social problems.

Yet many young evangelicals began to doubt the efficacy of evangelism to spark social change. Too many of the converted evangelicals they knew best—Baptists in the South, people in their own congregations, even their parents—had remained flagrantly racist in their opposition to King.⁷⁶ Some wondered if evangelicalism had the equation backward. Perhaps a focus on social justice might spark more effective evangelism. After all, their efforts to convert blacks were failing miserably as they encountered despair and rage in their evangelistic targets.⁷⁷ For

⁷⁴ June-July 1967 issue of *Freedom Now*; “Books in Review,” *Freedom Now* 3, No. 5 (September-October 1967), 19; William Pannell, “Memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr.” *Freedom Now* 4, No. 3 (May-June 1968), 4-5.

⁷⁵ See, for example, the *Freedom Now* campaign to support interracial couples. Dan Orme, “The Bible and Interracial Marriage,” *Freedom Now* 3, No. 2 (March-April 1967), 10-13.

⁷⁶ Young evangelicals increasingly resonated with King through the 1960s. While in graduate school in Canada, Richard Mouw began to realize that “the same God who worked through Graham was working through King.” See Mouw interview, July 12, 2006, Pasadena, Cal. Also see Leif Torjesen, “King Preaches Balanced Human Fulfillment,” *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 23 (March 18, 1965), 5. Many would come to oppose the Vietnam War in part because of King. See Jay Hakes, “It’s About Time Christians Joined War Protests,” *Wheaton Record* 82, No. 3 (May 11, 1967), 3. King’s death sparked a chorus of young evangelical support. *Freedom Now* stated, “Dr. King, you have won my heart to your cause. I am in this war with you. I am at war with any man, white or black, who is practicing injustice. I am at war with any man, Christian or non-Christian, who is not showing by his deeds that he is concerned.” See Bill Pannell, Fred Alexander, and Vern Miller, “Memorial to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.,” *Freedom Now* 4, No. 3 (May-June 1968), 4-7; Wesley Pippert, *Memo for 1976: Some Political Options* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1974), 28.

⁷⁷ Joseph Grabill of Normal, Illinois, wrote, “A year ago I did not quite understand when a black person with whom I had spent a lot of time said to me right after Martin Luther King, Jr.’s death. ‘I hate all white people.’ There was an embarrassing silence. Finally I hazarded a painful question, ‘Even me?’ ‘Yes, you.’” See Grabill, “Black and Jesus: A Personal Reflection,” *Freedom Now* 5, No. 4 (July-August 1969), 22-25.

years after the assassination of King, CWLF, InterVarsity, the Post-Americans, and The Other Side community all encountered “suspicion of the Christian faith as Whitey’s religion to oppress the Blacks.”⁷⁸ “The door to Negro evangelism, while it is by no means completely closed, is slowly swinging shut,” wrote Don Orme. Evangelicals remained too preoccupied with “personal sins, but not racial injustice or economic exploitation.”⁷⁹ At a Baptist conference on race and religion in 1968, Pannell told attendees that “old style evangelism is inadequate to meet the needs of the ghetto; we must meet human needs if we are to genuinely meet religious needs.”⁸⁰ By the late 1960s most young evangelicals had surveyed the racial landscape and decided that converting souls would not sufficiently level the terrain.

Meanwhile, young evangelicals saw progress in the flurry of activism and civil rights legislation in the mid-1960s. Though many states remained recalcitrant in integrating public schools, others integrated quickly and peacefully.⁸¹ At Wheaton, students incensed by discrimination against black students integrated the city’s barbershops by lobbying the local chamber of commerce and publicizing the injustice in local newspapers.⁸² These successes convinced young evangelicals, however

⁷⁸ See “Dear Brothers and Sisters,” a typed, untitled, undated update of summer activities at CWLF. In Box 2, “Jill Shook, Jack Sparks’ letters,” CWLF collection, GTU Archives.

⁷⁹ For a statement *Freedom Now’s* ambivalence toward the evangelism-social concern dilemma in the late 1960s, see “Statement of Purpose,” *Freedom Now* 4, No. 3 (May-June 1968), 28. “Many people believe that complete integration would provide freedom for the Negro. This is a serious mistake. ... Complete integration, removal of all forms of discrimination, improved education ... would not provide freedom now.”; “Many other people believe that a simple salvation message would provide freedom now. This is also a serious mistake.”

⁸⁰ John F. Alexander, “Communications Conference,” *Freedom Now* 4, No. 3 (May-June 1968), 11.

⁸¹ Jim Wallis, “America’s Original Sin: The Legacy of White Racism,” *Sojourners* 16 (November 1987), 14-17.

⁸² “S.C. Civil Rights Committee Views Local Discrimination,” *Wheaton Record* 85, No. 9 (November 1, 1962), 1.

belatedly, to bring political power to bear on racial injustices. The jarring assassination of King in 1968 prompted one young evangelical to mourn that “we had been fiddling while Rome burned.”⁸³

A chorus of black evangelicals helped extend this critique of individual racist acts. Newly attentive to white economic and cultural hegemony, young evangelicals objected to the “Wordless Book” of Child Evangelism because it portrayed sin as black.⁸⁴ Michael Haynes, relating his experience as a black student at an evangelical college, explained that the overwhelming whiteness of evangelicalism concerned him more than the occasional racist gesture. “The evangelical, so-called Christian colleges—Gordon, Eastern Nazarene, Barrington, Berkshire, and all of the rest, including Wheaton, Bob Jones, Kings College, Moody—need to get some black faces on their faculties and staffs and get more black students in their schools,” wrote the Baptist minister and representative to the Massachusetts legislature.⁸⁵ Columbus Salley, a black textbook representative for Harcourt, worried that the educational system contributed to the “whitening” of black children.⁸⁶ Black America, wrote Skinner, would not follow a “white Christ,” by which he meant a “defender of the American system, president of the New York Stock Exchange, head of the Pentagon, chairman of the National Republican Committee, a flag-waving patriotic American—and against everything else.” “If Christ takes on the image of an Anglo-Saxon

⁸³ Alexander, “Communications Conference,” 12.

⁸⁴ Neta Jackson, “You’ve Read in Black and White,” *Freedom Now* 5, No. 3 (May-June 1969), 16-22.

⁸⁵ Michael E. Haynes, “Three Minutes to Midnight,” *Freedom Now* 5, No. 4 (July-Aug 1969), 8-12.

⁸⁶ Columbus Salley, “Blackening Education,” *Freedom Now* 5, No. 2 (March-April 1969), 5-7.

Protestant suburbanite,” Skinner concluded, “He’s obviously not for black men.”⁸⁷ John Perkins, whose focus on evangelism in his early ministry in Mendenhall, Mississippi, precluded structural considerations, began to link racial justice to economic redistribution in the late 1960s. Frustrated with lack of progress since the passage of the Civil Rights Acts—segregation persisted and more than half of black families in Simpson County lived under the poverty line—Perkins issued a document entitled “Demands of the Black Community.” The document demanded 30% black employment in all Mendenhall businesses, desegregation of public spaces, a minimum-wage campaign for domestic workers, paved streets in black neighborhoods, removal of the police chief and his cohorts, and a thorough overhaul of arrest procedures.⁸⁸ Though the demands were not met, Perkins’ document signaled an important shift in young black evangelical thought: true reconciliation could come only through cultural equity and the redistribution of economic resources.

A broadening of evangelical vocation added to the insistent chorus of black evangelicals urging attention to structural inequities. The young evangelical inclination toward the social sciences—nearly every contributor to *Freedom Now* held a job in education or social services—drove them to connect racial issues to broader social concerns.⁸⁹ Armed with dog-eared copies of the literature of the progressive and New Left movements such as the Kerner report, Cleaver’s *Soul on Ice*, Harrington’s *The Other America*, and *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*, young evangelicals began to speak of “cultures of poverty,” the psychological damage of

⁸⁷ Skinner, *How Black Is the Gospel?* 13, 69, 108-109, 120.

⁸⁸ Marsh, *Beloved Community*, 153-154.

⁸⁹ For a sample of young evangelical vocations, see “The Writers,” *The Other Side* 5, No.3 (May-June 1969), 30.

institutional racism, and the inequities of economic structures leading to urban rioting.⁹⁰ Taking social scientific studies seriously inevitably led young evangelicals away from the traditional evangelical notion of evangelism as the engine of social change. Instead of understanding racism as a long series of personal white-on-black abuse (and that one-on-one friendships and soul-winning could ameliorate racism), young evangelicals increasingly thought of racism as built into economic, social, and cultural systems.

They extended their moral claims accordingly. Young evangelical rhetoric, like King's, began to reflect the new conviction that structural racism was conspiring against black social advancement. William Stringfellow, who published books with the evangelical Eerdmans Press, decried the evangelical tendency to separate politics and faith, asserting that refusing to participate in social reform reflected the evangelical desire to protect economic and political self-interest.⁹¹ His next book, *My People Is the Enemy*, detailed the poor conditions—the burden of waiting in lines, population density, erratic work histories—of slum living. In short, he argued, “in

⁹⁰ Of the Kerner Report, Jim Wallis wrote, “I must have read that report at least five times, studying its more than six-hundred pages with a thorough intensity. It completely confirmed my experience of the black community. The causes of urban violence were poverty and its accompanying miseries: bad housing and inadequate education, lack of medical care, high unemployment. And the most commonly mentioned grievance by all the black people surveyed was police brutality.” See Wallis, *Revive Us Again*, 49. For other examples of young evangelicals reading social scientific literature, see the Post-American bibliography in Box VII7, Folder “People’s Christian Coalition, Trinity,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC; Don and Madelyn Powell, “We Stayed in the Inner City,” *HIS* 30, No. 2 (November 1969), 18-19. The Powells read Benjamin Quarles’ *The Negro in the Making of America*, Harrington’s *The Other America*, and the Kerner Report. At Wheaton College, *The Other America* was used in 1965 as the “Book of the Semester.” Other key texts and citations included Charles Silberman’s *Crisis in Black and White*, the Moynihan Report, and the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. On Eldridge Cleaver, see Sharon Gallagher interview, July 7, 2006, Berkeley, Cal.; “An Interview with Eldridge Cleaver,” *Right On* 8, No. 3 (November-December 1976), 3-6. A number of young evangelicals—including John Perkins, John Howard Yoder, and many members of CWLF—struck up friendships with Cleaver himself during their periodic visits to CWLF in Berkeley.

⁹¹ William Stringfellow, *A Private and Public Faith* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962).

virtually every sector of the city's life—housing, education and medical care, in business, politics, and employment, in the welfare administration and the enforcement of the law—Negroes still suffer discrimination and segregation, despite the legislative disclaimers of discrimination and public promises of the politicians.”⁹² Ka Tong Gaw, a Wheaton sociology professor and associate pastor of Circle Church in Chicago, addressed his students and parishioners about the connection between racism and economic injustice.⁹³ The 1971 bibliography of the Post-Americans featured 25 books in a category labeled “Race and Poverty.” Charles Furness, a social worker in Newark, New Jersey, asserted that race riots were rooted in intolerable economic conditions.⁹⁴ *Freedom Now* complained about the lack of federal funds for Upward Bound, Head Start, the rural South, and the inner city. By 1970, the Alexanders were devoting entire issues of their journal (renamed *The Other Side* from *Freedom Now*) to poverty and other topics previously considered peripheral to racial justice.⁹⁵ InterVarsity’s *HIS* magazine condemned the tendency of “thinking white.”⁹⁶ The Christian World Liberation Front virulently criticized white flight, spoke of racism as “embedded” in American society and religion, gave a report from a conference on

⁹² William Stringfellow, *My People is the Enemy* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964), 7-22, 111. A writer in *National Review* called the book “an early and influential effort to rouse evangelicals to social and political activism.”

⁹³ Ka Tong Gaw, “Wheaton No Utopia,” *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 19 (February 27, 1970), 4.

⁹⁴ Charles Furness, *The Christian and Social Action* (Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1972), 35-44.

⁹⁵ On poverty, see the May-June 1970 and January-February 1971 issues of *The Other Side*.

⁹⁶ John F. Alexander, “Thinking White,” *HIS* 30, No. 4 (January 1970), 9. (9)

Institutional Racism, and quoted Perkins as saying that the nation's economic system was "not equitable or humane."⁹⁷

Given the culpability of structures in American racism, young evangelicals increasingly saw social engineering, protest, and politicking as live options. Donald Oden reported on his participation in the Poor People's Campaign, a march by a "multiracial army of the poor" from Mississippi to Washington, D.C.⁹⁸ Sixty Wheaton students, led by Alexander and the college's Social Action Forum, marched in the Chicago's western suburbs in solidarity with the Campaign. Bill Leslie of the LaSalle congregation in uptown Chicago argued that blacks needed to build their own power bases in government, commerce, schools, housing, and in other areas in which whites had so long held control. He urged the construction of systems within which blacks could "become masters of their own destiny."⁹⁹ Mark Hatfield as governor of Oregon protected public welfare in the midst of a tax revolt. "I will not be a party to moving aged and infirm people out into the streets," he told a reporter.¹⁰⁰ Many young evangelicals urged the busing of white and black children to ensure integrated

⁹⁷ On white flight, see David Gill, "More on School Busing," *Right On* 8, No. 4 (January-February 1977), 16. On racism as "embedded," see Ron Mitchell, "Christianity and American Racism," *Right On* 5, No. 9 (March 1974), 9-10. On the Evangelicals for Social Action conference on institutional racism, see "Notes from the Catacomb," *Right On* 8, No. 2 (September-October 1976), 2. On Perkins, see "The Church and Economics," *Right On* 8, No. 2 (September-October 1976), 6-7. On the structural sources of poverty, see Ron Sider, "Mischief by Statute: How We Oppress the Poor," *Christianity Today* (July 16, 1976), 14. On "social sin," see David O. Moberg, *The Great Reversal: Evangelism versus Social Concern* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1972), 120-149.

⁹⁸ Donald Oden, "On the Bus Back to Akron," *The Other Side* 4, No. 6 (November-December 1968), 21-22. Led by King, who was assassinated before the months-long march was completed, protestors demanded economic aid to the poorest of America's communities.

⁹⁹ Hefley, *The Church That Takes on Trouble*, 103.

¹⁰⁰ Eels and Nyberg, *Lonely Walk*, 56.

schools.¹⁰¹ If, as Wallis contended, “racism goes deeper than mere prejudice and personal attitudes,” political solutions were necessary.¹⁰²

As concern for racial civil rights expanded to structural justice, many young evangelicals switched political affiliation to the Democratic Party. Leslie, bred in his rural Ohio fundamentalist home and at Bob Jones University to be a political conservative, underwent a dramatic political transformation as a new pastor of the LaSalle congregation in Chicago. In 1964, “distressed over the agonies of the poor and dispossessed,” he registered independent. In 1968, Leslie strenuously opposed the Republican ticket, concerned that Nixon would cut off federally funded programs for the poor minorities. Heading up the Chicago-Orleans Housing Corporation and the Near North Area Council, Leslie immersed himself in local politics.¹⁰³ LaSalle members, most of whom were political conservatives before joining the church, described themselves in the early 1970s as “more politically liberal.”¹⁰⁴ Member Chuck Hogren, contending that conservatives sounding the cry for law and order do not “fully understand the problems of impoverished minorities,” urged the

¹⁰¹ See, for instance, Loy, “Busing: The Real Issue,” *The Other Side* 8, No. 4 (July-August 1972), 14; Steve Mott, “Busing and Racism in Boston,” *Right On* 8, No. 2 (September-October 1976), 13.

¹⁰² Jim Wallis, *Faith Works*, 127.

¹⁰³ Hefley, *Church That Takes on Trouble*, 60, 85-86, 159. The church’s involvement in social and political affairs—“why can’t we work with other churches, even Catholic, on nontheological issues?” asked Leslie—was criticized by many at Moody, who felt that Leslie and Elm-LaSalle were “unequally yoked.” Elm-LaSalle worked with mainline churches in its efforts to provide affordable housing on the North Side of Chicago. Church of the Savior’s constitution, for example, pledged cooperation with the National and World Council of Churches. See Elizabeth O’Connor, *Call to Commitment: The Story of the Church of the Savior* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 18. Many urban evangelical churches took ecumenicity to a level far beyond their new evangelical heritage. Overall, many were eager to work with government bureaucracies on issues of human welfare.

¹⁰⁴ More members classified themselves in one of these categories—independent liberal, moderate Republican, independent conservative, or liberal Republican—than as “conservative Republican.” See Hefley, *Church That Takes on Trouble*, 137.

development of more government programs.¹⁰⁵ Hostility toward Richard Nixon and his racially tinged campaign for “law and order” thrived in young evangelical quarters.

While the tardy evangelical contribution to the civil rights and poverty movements failed to shape the national debate, it did contribute in important ways to the formation of the emerging evangelical left. First, as the first important social issue of the postwar era, civil rights mobilized a growing web of individuals associated with InterVarsity, Wheaton, The Other Side, Tom Skinner Associates, and many other groups.¹⁰⁶ Second, the evangelical encounter with civil rights added a structural component to the movement’s rather undeveloped social theory. By the early 1970s evangelical debates over race inevitably veered into discussions about crime, housing, and economic structures. From an emphasis on individual actions to help disenfranchised southern blacks emerged a holistic effort to raise the psychological, economic, and political health of a race. And from structural considerations about race emerged debates over capitalism, gender, simple living, and participatory democracy. Horrified by the failure of evangelicalism in the civil rights movement, many young evangelicals vowed not to repeat such a social failure.¹⁰⁷ “While I was

¹⁰⁵ Hefley, *Church That Takes on Trouble*, 166.

¹⁰⁶ Bill Pannell interview, July 13, 2006, Pasadena, Cal. Pannell contends that the civil rights movement was the most dramatic source of the young evangelical movement.

¹⁰⁷ *The Other Side*’s John Alexander wrote, “If we look at the order of events, things don’t look too good. Evangelicals criticizing middle America began appearing in significant numbers well after such criticism was stylish. Only after Martin Luther King had pioneered the civil rights movement did we ‘radical’ evangelicals begin lining up. And it took a while for us to swallow Stokely Carmichael’s black power, but most of us managed after a year or two.” See John F. Alexander, “The Authority of Scripture,” *The Other Side* 9, No. 1 (January-February 1973), 45. (1-2, 45-48). Also see Gerald Postema, “Why We Can’t Wait,” *Chimes* 63, No. 6 (October 25, 1968), 2. Pleading with the Christian

sitting comfortably in my living room,” wrote InterVarsity’s John Alexander, “King laid down his life for garbage collectors. Nothing but the blood of Christ can atone for this sin of mine.”¹⁰⁸ This lament would inspire young evangelicals toward more substantial dissent against American imperialism in Southeast Asia.¹⁰⁹

Reformed synod to recognize “the atrocities” of Vietnam and the legitimacy of conscientious objection, Postema hearkened back to the civil rights movement: “Nor can we students sit back and wait for our famously tardy church to act. This church has an embarrassing reputation of issuing definitive statements on social issues long after any such position is significant. A case in point is the church’s statement on race relations which did not appear until 1963, years after other churches had spoken significantly to the situation.” Also see Marlin VanElderen, “Anyone Here for Sit-Ins?” *Chimes* 60, No. 6 (October 22, 1965). VanElderen wrote, “The matter that really touches Calvin is the claim of the organizers of these demonstrations that the whole question of the war in Vietnam is a moral issue, for it is at this point that Christians should have answers. It is on moral issues that the world has often looked to Christianity for answers; and it is on moral issues that the answers of Christianity have so often been lacking or deficient. One need only look to the current mess in civil rights for substantiation of that claim. Christianity has chosen for a long time to remain silent, or to speak only equivocally, careful not to step on anyone’s toes. War, too, is a moral issue.”

¹⁰⁸ See John F. Alexander and Fred A. Alexander, “Repent and Revolt,” *HIS* 29, No. 3 (December 1968), 1-2.

¹⁰⁹ On civil rights as a continuing inspiration for the evangelical left on issues of race and poverty, see Danny Collum, “A Day for Beginnings,” *Sojourners* 12, No. 8 (Sept 1983), 4-6; Danny Collum, “What Kind of Country?” *Sojourners* 12, No. 1 (January 1983), 3-4; Vincent Harding, “Struggle and Transformation: The Challenge of Martin Luther King, Jr.” *Sojourners* 13, No. 9 (October 1984), 18-21; and the entire January 1986 issue of *Sojourners*.

CHAPTER FIVE

VIETNAM AND EVANGELICAL ANIMUS AGAINST CIVIL RELIGION

If civil rights sparked evangelical social protest, antipathy toward the Vietnam War followed close behind. In the late 1960s, just as young evangelicals finally cast—half a decade late, they realized—their support for black activists, war in Southeast Asia seemed to offer them a second chance to prove their nascent activist credentials. Like the drive for racial justice, the initial young evangelical animus against the war initially reflected existing political perspectives less than the instinctive sense that dropping napalm onto civilian villages was evil. Young evangelical antipathy toward the Vietnam War, however, would mature into consistent activism and a structural critique of American society and civil religion. Judging that “America was wrong—wrong in the ghettos and in the jungles of Southeast Asia,” young evangelicals saw civil rights and antiwar protest as God’s instruments of justice.¹ Even as they joined civil rights activism in the late 1960s and early 1970s, students and professors at several of the most evangelical institutions wrote treatises against the war, picketed ROTC, joined national

¹ Jim Wallis, *Revive Us Again* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1983), 53. There was something fundamentally wrong, echoed evangelical students, with a society that takes “young black men to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia they have not yet found in Southwest Georgia.” See Martin Luther King, Jr., quoted in *Calvin Chimes* (September 8, 1965), 3.

Moratorium Day protests, and supported peace senator Mark Hatfield. Indeed, the “sixties” came in a belated, but accelerated rush to evangelical backwaters.

I.

Jim Wallis exemplified the path from civil rights to antiwar activism. Outraged by racism in his home church and in urban Detroit, yet too young to participate in the heyday of the civil rights movement, Wallis encountered another mammoth protest movement as a student at Michigan State University.² Wallis and his classmates watched as the advisory role of the American military transitioned to more active fighting in Vietnam. Troop levels rapidly escalated from 16,000 in 1964 to 553,000 in 1969. These developments appalled college students, many at risk of being drafted. Students for a Democratic Society, previously occupied with attempts to racially integrate the South, led student protest. The SDS chapter at the University of Michigan held the first antiwar teach-in. Thousands followed nationwide, among them teach-ins coordinated by Wallis, one of East Lansing’s top protest organizers in 1969.

Wallis’s own religious tradition took a far different stance toward the war. Most Protestant leaders supported intervention in Vietnam, particularly before 1965. Even mainliners, stridently anticommunist in the 1940s and 1950s, tended to support American intervention to halt the advance of the Russian and Chinese communists. Not until 1965 did a group of prominent mainline spokesmen—among them William Sloane Coffin, Jr.,

² Jim Wallis, *Faith Works* (New York: Random House, 2000), 3-11.

Robert McAfee Brown, Reinhold Niebuhr, Peter Berger, and Martin Luther King, Jr.—begin to speak out against the war.³

Fundamentalists fulminated against the emerging mainline dissent. Convinced that the United States was the bulwark against communism, John Rice declared that American troops “would be carrying out the command of God.” Most prominent new evangelicals, similarly unimpressed with mainline critiques of American foreign policy, maintained a moderate pro-war stance, even after the disillusionment of the Tet Offensive and despite troop escalations. “What special wisdom do clergymen have on the military and international intricacies of the United States government’s involvement in Viet Nam?” “None,” declared Carl F. H. Henry. The mainliners might “speak piously about our difficulties in Viet Nam, but a vocal and uninformed piety is worse than silence.”⁴ Misgivings grew in the late 1960s, but the most prominent new evangelicals followed Henry’s lead. Billy Graham, *Christianity Today*, and the National Association of Evangelicals, three exemplars of the mid-century new evangelicalism, refused to speak out against the Vietnam War. Through the late 1960s evangelicals, convinced of long-held theories of dominos and containment, conceded that intervention was justified and worthy of support.⁵

Yet evangelicalism, charting a middle course of staunch support for the war between mainline dissent and fundamentalist superpatriotism, soon faced dissent from within. As early as 1966, contributors to the *Reformed Journal* questioned whether

³ On the mainline response, see Anne C. Loveland, *American Evangelicals and the U.S. Military, 1942-1993* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Press, 1996), 119-120.

⁴ Carl F. H. Henry, “Ignorance Often Has a Loud Voice,” *Christianity Today* (February 12, 1965), 511.

⁵ Citing the domino theory, David Breese wrote that “the future of freedom is at stake in the proving or disproving of ... Communist inevitability.” See “Highway to Viet Nam,” *United Evangelical Action* 24 (December 1965), 12-15.

Vietnam fulfilled the criteria of a just war. InterVarsity offered John Howard Yoder dozens of pages in its magazine, where the Mennonite pacifist questioned the morality of Christian involvement in the military in general and in Vietnam specifically.⁶ An InterVarsity student at Portland State College, worried about the souls of Vietnamese innocents, wondered, “How can one witness with a bullet and a bomb?”⁷ The Post-Americans explained that Vietnam was their defining issue, one that engaged them on “a basic, deep, personal emotional level.”⁸ Wallis, for example, anguished over the helicopter gunships that spread machine gun fire, explosives, and napalm in the Vietnamese countryside, defoliating forests and jungles and rice paddies.⁹ Excepting evangelical scholars who debated just war theory, most young evangelicals dissented primarily out of visceral revulsion over the images of spilled blood in Vietnam that splashed over their 13-inch television sets.

While some evangelical students joined in the antiwar protests that engulfed state universities in the late 1960s, the most concentrated evangelical protests took place at politically conservative evangelical colleges.¹⁰ Students at Wheaton, for example, rallied against the college’s Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (ROTC) unit. The college’s president Hudson Armerding, a naval commander in World War II, who supported ROTC as an incubator for submission to authority, leadership training and spiritual

⁶ John Howard Yoder, “Vietnam: A Just War?” *HIS* 28, No. 7 (April 1968), 1-3; “Vietnam: Another Option” *HIS* 28, No. 8 (May 1968), 8-11. Also see antiwar letters to the editor in the December 1964, February 1965, April 1968, and January-December 1969 issues of *HIS*.

⁷ Ancil K. Nance, Letter to the Editor, *HIS* 29, No. 6 (February 1965), 31.

⁸ See notes from a diary of on a discussion on peacemaking led by Jim Wallis, April 12, 1979, in Box VI8, Folder 6, “Elders’ Group, 1971-1979,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

⁹ Wallis, *Revive Us Again*, 62.

¹⁰ For an example of evangelical students protesting at state universities, see David Maraniss, *They Marched into Sunlight* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004).

ministry, mandated that all freshmen and sophomore male students participate.¹¹ Support for mandatory ROTC weakened in the mid-1960s, as did support for the elaborately staged annual Veterans Day chapel services, regular features in *The Record* on the exploits of the “Crusader Battalion.”¹² After one Veterans Day chapel service in which 550 cadets marched into Edman Chapel in full military dress, a student wrote that it was “an example of this continual attempt to condition our decision—so that it is hardly a decision at all. God and country are whispered to us in the same breath. We march, guns in hand, to ‘Onward Christian Soldiers.’”¹³ Another student provocatively asked, “You know where else they have May-day military exhibitions?”¹⁴ By 1965 72% of Wheaton male students opposed compulsory ROTC.¹⁵

Though the escalation of the Vietnam War contributed to the lack of support for ROTC, most students continued to support the U.S. intervention in the region in the mid-1960s. In late 1965, 937 Wheaton students, just over one-half the student body, sent a petition in support of U.S. foreign policy to Lyndon Johnson.¹⁶ Sentiment against the

¹¹ On Wheaton’s rationale for administering an ROTC unit, see Enock C. Dyrness, “Report to the Board of Trustees Concerning the Army ROTC at Wheaton College,” March 20, 1964, in “ROTC,” Vertical File, WCA. Also see H.C. Chrouser to Dr. Dyrness, February 5, 1964, in Folder “ROTC,” Vertical File, WCA.

¹² See, for example, the large spread in the student newspaper devoted to the award won by the Wheaton battalion. “Wheaton ROTC Represents Colleges in Fifth Army Area Inspection This Fall,” *Wheaton Record* 90, No. 6 (October 20, 1967), 4. On Armerding’s military career, see Dennis Ginosi, “Resists Bid to End ROTC at Wheaton,” *Chicago Tribune*, Northwest edition, May 26, 1971, p. 3.

¹³ Kent Walker, “Conditioned Patriotism,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 9 (November 18, 1965), 3. For a description of a typical Veterans Day chapel service, see “ROTC Conducts Gold Star Service to Honor Veterans,” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 8 (November 10, 1966), 1, 8.

¹⁴ Art Wassmer, “Does Traditional Review Leave ROTC Red-Faced?” *Wheaton Record* 80, No. 29 (May 4, 1967), 3.

¹⁵ Jay Hakes, “Needed: Soph Action on Compulsory ROTC,” *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 29 (May 6, 1965), 2; “Poll Exposes Student Views on ROTC Program Efficacy,” *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 28 (April 29, 1965), 8.

¹⁶ “Petition, Panel Stimulate Student Awareness of Vietnam,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 9 (November 18, 1965), 1.

war, however, grew increasingly sharp in the late 1960s. From 1966 on, battles between protestors and conservative stalwarts enveloped the campus. President Armerding annually made his case in favor of intervention in Vietnam during Veterans Day chapels, while dissenters held forth in dorm discussions, classes, forums, Student Government-led “Vietnam Nights,” and in a running weekly debate on the editorial page of *The Record*, where some called the war “Yankee imperialism.”¹⁷ Dissenting voices both against the war and against mandatory ROTC merged in the late 1960s to form a potent movement.¹⁸

Antiwar dissenters dominated several key student organizations. The *Record*, edited by the outspoken antiwar advocate Jay Hakes, while printing some student letters and columns calling for patriotic support for the struggle against communism, inundated readers with hundreds of antiwar letters, articles, and editorials.¹⁹ Against the wishes of President Armerding, Dan Reigle, president of Student Government, invited antiwar senator Mark Hatfield to speak to students.²⁰ As the decade wore on, several clubs—Students Concerned about Vietnam and Americans for Democratic Action—formed and

¹⁷ “Student Poll on Vietnam, Domingo,” *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 34 (May 27, 1965), 4. Another example of the debate on campus was a lively and substantive debate between the antiwar Dan Reigle, founder of Students Concerned about Vietnam, and Bob Riedel about whether the National Liberation Front was primarily communistic or nationalistic. See “Reigle, Riedel Debate Vietnam as Communism-Nationalism Issue,” *Wheaton Record* 90, No. 15 (March 1, 1968), 1.

¹⁸ John Currie, a freshman in 1969, remembers, “I had multiple motives for proposing a boycott of the ROTC review day. One motive was the war in Vietnam. The second was the general notion that Wheaton should not have been in the business of requiring all male students to participate in compulsory ROTC.” See John Currie interview, November 22, 2006.

¹⁹ For examples of antiwar sentiments in the *Record*, see “Moffett Assumes Viet Nam Press Post,” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 9 (November 17, 1966), 5; “Student Body President Ric Craig Signs Nationally Publicized Letter on Vietnam,” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 16 (January 12, 1967), 1; “Wheaton Grads Join Clerics in Questioning Vietnam Acts,” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 19 (February 9, 1967), 4; Stan Shank, “Students Express Concern in Vietnam Demonstration,” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 29 (May 4, 1967), 5; Jay Hakes, “It’s About Time Christians Joined War Protest,” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 30 (May 11, 1967), 3; Sue Graim, “Students Demonstrate to Protest War, Stimulate Greater Campus Discussion,” *Wheaton Record* 90, No. 8 (November 17, 1967), 6. Critics on campus accused antiwar advocates for “a deliberate concentration of New Left types in key publications positions.” See “Looking Back: The Year in Review,” *Wheaton Record* 94, No. 9 (December 3, 1971), 12.

²⁰ John Sheffer interview, December 19, 2006.

rallied students on behalf of peace candidate Eugene McCarthy in the 1968 presidential election.²¹ Fed by these student organizations, dissent grew and created a tense atmosphere on campus in the late 1960s. In a November 1967 demonstration, forty antiwar students prayed for one hour before a Veterans Day chapel, formed two lines outside the chapel doors as ROTC cadets marched in, and held signs that read “Form an educated opinion”; “Send rice, not bullets”; “JC loves VC”; “Save a Commie for Christ”; and “God Does Not Wear a Green Beret.” In an interview with the *Record*, organizer Steve Aulie demanded an “immediate de-escalation of the war effort through cessation of bombing and reduction of ground effort” and “implementation of all possible steps toward negotiation with the National Liberation Front and the Viet Cong.”²² At the Veterans Day chapel in 1967, only 330 students (a drop of 600 from two years before) signed a petition in support of the war effort. In 1968 students at both Wheaton and Calvin held conscientious objection drives, manning tables in student unions filled with antiwar literature and offering counseling for students considering filing for C.O. status.

The polarizing atmosphere transformed some incoming students, many of whom came from quiet Republican suburbs. Steve Clemens, for instance, a typically conservative student upon arrival at college in 1968, soon registered for C.O. status.

Though the college’s registrar lectured Clemens on why “a Christian should kill ‘Communists’ to protect the Christian missionaries and their converts in Vietnam” and

²¹ Rich Bard, “Campus Political Climate—a Radical Change?” *Wheaton Record* 90, No. 22 (April 5, 1968), 3. On support for Eugene McCarthy at Calvin, see “Undoing Absolute Power,” *Chimes* 62, No. 11 (December 8, 1967), 2; “Michigan Conference of Concerned Democrats Endorses Gene McCarthy,” *Chimes* 62, No. 11 (December 8, 1967), 4.

²² Graim, “Students Demonstrate to Protest War,” 6. Not all protestors, however, called for a unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam. Bob Watson, leader of the demonstration at the spring 1967 annual ROTC review, told a *Record* reporter that “The United States made a mistake to get involved originally, and since then we have taken steps gradually to where it is now our war. However, to withdraw unilaterally now would leave a power vacuum, making it impossible.”

college administrators forbade him from identifying himself as a Wheaton student during draft protests in the town of Wheaton, Clemens persisted after a strong contingent of antiwar classmates befriended him. “Were it not for those people here who helped liberate me from my past and project a hopeful present, I would have thrown out all of Christianity as totally irrelevant to today’s society. I owe it to Ron, Bill, John, and the others who drained themselves to revive me.”²³ Dissent culminated in the spring of 1968 with the formation of Students Concerned about Vietnam (SCAV). Reigle boldly announced the new organization from the chapel podium and immediately came under attack from fellow students who complained that he was leveraging his position as student government president to oppose the war. Reigle and twenty other campus leaders forged ahead, giving an impassioned, closely argued speech before 130 students on a cold Friday night in February.²⁴ Blaming the U.S. government for succeeding France as the “hated colonial power,” Reigle accused the U.S. of suppressing dissent and called for an end to bombing.²⁵ Dissent raged for the rest of the school year as SCAV sponsored debates and “Vietnam Night” protests, added names to Negotiation Now! petitions, campaigned for the antiwar Eugene McCarthy, and joined the 1969 nationwide Moratorium Day protests.²⁶

²³ Steve Clemens, “Wheaton Moving toward Otherworldly Perspective,” *Wheaton Record* 94, No. 9 (December 3, 1971), 5. For a similar story, see Daniel J. Buttry, “My Journey to Peacemaking,” *ESA Update* 10, No. 5 (July-August 1988), 6.

²⁴ On pro-war students who opposed Reigle, see Bill Craig, “Reigle Misuses Column for Vietnam Criticism,” *Wheaton Record* 90, No. 17 (February 23, 1968), 3. “I’ve had it,” wrote Craig, “I am really fed up with this constant waving of ‘the bloody shirt’ by Reigle and his little band of dissenters. . . . I am so sick and tired of hearing these guys like Reigle bellyache about all the civilians we are killing in Vietnam.”

²⁵ Notes of Dan Reigle’s February 16, 1968, speech in Folder “Vietnam,” Vertical File, WCA.

²⁶ “23 Students Aid Victorious McCarthy,” *Wheaton Record* 90, No. 23 (April 5, 1968), 6.

Vietnam protests occurred at other evangelical colleges, though with less intensity and scale. Nearly forty Seattle Pacific students and several professors joined antiwar marches in Seattle after the invasion of Cambodia in the spring of 1970. Marching from campus, they joined a larger mass of protestors from the University of Washington as they headed downtown. An equally energetic group of student patriots and a conservative administration that kept antiwar faculty in check, however, kept the antiwar contingent at SPU small.²⁷ At Calvin, students formed the Calvin Vietnam Committee, and the progressive student newspaper *The Chimes* took a hard antiwar stance by 1967. Editors regularly denounced the Vietnam War and counseled Calvin students to dodge the draft.²⁸ sixteen *Chimes* staffers traveled to the October 21, 1967, peace march at the Pentagon.²⁹ Student Gerald Postema demanded that the college and its sponsoring denomination acknowledge “the current atrocities in Viet Nam and the legitimacy of conscientious objection to this war.”³⁰ In 1967 a student newspaper editor at another evangelical college even praised the gains of the Viet Cong against U.S. “imperialistic slaughter.” In *InterVarsity’s HIS* magazine, Richard Ostling lauded editors of evangelical student newspapers, quite a few of whom had been critical of the U.S. policy in Vietnam during

²⁷ Michael Havens interview, March 12, 2007, and April 3, 2007. Also see Lee Quiring interview, February 21, 2007, and February 22, 2007.

²⁸ See, for example, VanElderen, “Anyone Here for Sit-Ins?” *Chimes* 60, No. 6 (October 22, 1965), 2; Jeannine Oppewall, “Voices,” *Chimes* 62, No. 4 (October 6, 1967), 3; “The Right to Protest: A Fair Compromise,” *Chimes* 62, No. 9 (November 10, 1967), 2.

²⁹ Joel Brouwer and Dan DeVries, “*Chimes* Remonstrates War at Massive Peace Rally,” *Chimes* 62, No. 7 (October 27, 1967), 5.

³⁰ Gerald Postema, “Why We Can’t Wait,” *Chimes* 63, No. 6 (October 25, 1968), 2. At Calvin, the education program enjoyed a dramatic increase in enrollment because teachers were exempt from the draft. See “Draft Provokes Unusual Calvin Male Teaching Interest,” *Chimes* 63, No. 14 (February 14, 1969), 10. On similar calls for conscientious objection counseling at Wheaton, see Douglas Olsen, “Sees ROTC as Wrong at Wheaton,” *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 28 (May 8, 1970): 2. At Wheaton, only twenty freshmen out of a class of just under 600 registered for CO status, but the number was certainly higher for older male students. See Bill Mistele, “The Road to Conscientious Objection,” *The Crucible* 91, No. 21 (March 28, 1969).

the last year. “It probably took as much courage for these editors to criticize U.S. policy,” he told them, “as it did for me to contend that Jesus is indeed the long-promised Messiah, as I did in a Christmas column at a secular university.”³¹

At each of these schools, students received important assistance from faculty. Emery Cummins, the associate dean of students at Wheaton, publicly opposed U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam, calling it a “blunder” and calling for a cessation of bombing of the North.³² Several professors helped pay for a full-page advertisement in *The Record* urging the Wheaton constituency to “Help Make ROTC Voluntary at Wheaton.”³³ Douglas Olsen, an assistant professor of English, opposed ROTC on campus, finding it incredulous that “evangelical parents are more horrified at the thought of their sons smoking a cigarette or playing cards than of their going to war and killing someone.”³⁴ John Alexander, expanding his concerns from civil rights to Vietnam, mentored antiwar students at Wheaton even after he moved to Philadelphia.³⁵ Howard Claassen, faculty advisor to the Jonathan Blanchard Society, a haven for conscientious objectors, harshly criticized Nixon’s Vietnam policy.³⁶ English professor Joyce Erickson, among half a dozen others at SPU, supported Vietnam dissenters.³⁷ At Malone College in Ohio, history

³¹ Richard Ostling, “Gutty Journalism,” *HIS* 29, No. 3 (December 1968), 39.

³² “Vietnam Panel Investigates Opposing Views of U.S. Duty,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 10 (November 26, 1965), 5.

³³ “Help Us Make ROTC Voluntary at Wheaton,” *Wheaton Record* 9, No. 29 (May 24, 1968), 7.

³⁴ Olsen, “Sees ROTC as Wrong at Wheaton,” 2.

³⁵ Steve Brodie, “Time for U.S. To Leave,” *Wheaton Record* 93, No. 26 (May 7, 1971), 4.

³⁶ H. H. Claassen, “Emphasis Shift to Civil Crises Needed,” *Wheaton Record* 95, No. 3 (October 20, 1972), 6; Nelda Mahady, “Morality of War or Don’t Cross This Line,” *Wheaton Record* 96, No. 6 (November 9, 1973), 2.

³⁷ Larry Quanbeck got help securing conscientious objection status from classics professor Winifred Weter at Seattle Pacific University. See Diane Brooks, “A Classy Woman Who Loved the Classics,” *Seattle Times*, January 14, 2006.

professor John W. Oliver broke with his Republican roots to support Democratic antiwar candidates Eugene McCarthy and George McGovern.³⁸ Richard Mouw, a former member of SDS, actively supported Calvin students in their antiwar efforts.³⁹ In 1968, 47 Calvin faculty members signed a petition calling for a cessation to the bombing of North Vietnam.⁴⁰

Other sources—alumni, missionaries, and government workers—also helped foment antiwar dissent at evangelical colleges.⁴¹ Foremost among them was Mark Hatfield, the Republican senator from Oregon voted the best-dressed man in government by the Fashion Foundation of America. As the first evangelical to emerge in the early 1960s with a progressive politics and a conservative theology, Hatfield confounded both the press and his constituents. He “works both sides of the street,” one critic of the then-governor told the *Portland Oregonian*. “One Sunday he will give us as liberal a speech as you will want and the next Sunday will come out with a fundamentalist talk.”⁴² Hatfield’s unconventional politics had confused people for years. At his childhood congregation, an

³⁸ John W. Oliver, “From Reason to Truth to Mystery: An Odyssey to Orthodoxy,” *Quaker Theology* 7 (Autumn 2002). “Vietnam,” he wrote, “was the first time I began to think about the nature and importance of human life.”

³⁹ Richard Mouw interview, July 12, 2006, Pasadena, Cal.

⁴⁰ “Forty-Seven Calvin Professors Place Anti-War Ad in GR ‘Press’,” *Chimes* 62, No. 20 (March 15, 1968), 1. Among the Calvin faculty who condemned the war were Lewis Smedes, Richard Mouw, Edwin Van Kley, and Tony Brouwer. Calvin faculty often urged students to moderate the methods of protest. In 1969, several professors convinced students to hold a protest after campus convocation instead of during it. See “Report to the President,” September 30, 1969, in William Spoelhof Collection, Calvin College Archives. Also see interview with Richard Mouw, July 12, 2006, Pasadena, Cal.

⁴¹ On support of dissent from alumni, see “Wheaton Grads Join Clerics in Questioning Vietnam Acts,” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 19 (February 9, 1967), 4. As it was for civil rights, international influence was also important: A former ambassador, for example, told Wheaton students to register for conscientious objection status. Quit “condemning the draft-card burning pacifists as cowards or irresponsible anarchists or communist sympathizers,” he wrote. “Certainly we as Christians should be the last to yield to the shrill nationalistic cries for suppression of protestors, and for vindication of American pride. . . . Let us never justify it merely on the grounds that America is fighting it.” See “Ex-Ambassador Depicts Viet Situation,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 8 (November 11, 1965), 1.

⁴² July 5, 1974, edition of the *Portland Oregonian*, quoted in Robert Eels and Bartell Nyberg, *Lonely Walk: The Life of Senator Mark Hatfield* (Portland, Ore.: Multnomah Press, 1979), 16.

apolitical Baptist fellowship in rural Willamette Valley, church fathers met his youthful pleas for a socially relevant faith with resistance. His church's rebuff soured him on institutional Christianity. Not until at the age of 31 did Hatfield, by this time a precocious politician in the Oregon state legislature and an adjunct professor at nearby Willamette University, return to church, declaring that he "wanted to live the rest of my life only for Jesus Christ."⁴³

Hatfield's evangelical experience led him neither directly to the right nor toward apoliticism. "Oh, Brother Mark," several church members told him, "we're so glad to see you squared away with the Lord. Now you'll get out of that horrible slime of politics. ... God has called you to preach, Brother Mark. We want you to go to seminary."⁴⁴ Hatfield instead pursued a meteoric rise in progressive Republican politics as a two-term governor and senator and embraced several causes—for civil rights, against the Vietnam War, and against capital punishment—that moved him into alignment with many leftist students. It also pulled many evangelical Oregonians, approving of news reports that Hatfield regularly stopped his state vehicle to kneel on the roadside to pray, toward progressive politics along with him.⁴⁵

Hatfield rose to national prominence after a fiery attack on Barry Goldwater in 1963, a year before Goldwater would win the Republican nomination for the presidency. In Goldwater's hometown of Phoenix, Hatfield said, "I have no doubt there are men

⁴³ Eels, *Lonely Walk*, 29.

⁴⁴ Eels, *Lonely Walk*, 29.

⁴⁵ Megan Rosenfeld, "Born Again Political Forces Not Singing the Same Hymn," *Washington Post*, August 24, 1980, p. H1; Gleason Archer, "Minutes of the Fuller Faculty Meeting," circa 1964. In folder "Faculty Minutes," Fuller Theological Seminary Archives. The presiding faculty secretary Gleason Archer wrote, "The President reported on investigations he had made concerning Governor Hatfield's standing among evangelicals in Oregon, and indicated that neither his statement concerning Governor Rockefeller's suitability for the presidency nor his advocacy of the abolition of the death penalty seems to have hurt his reputation particularly in Christian circles."

engaged in the fantasies of sitting in the White House ... and engaging in a blood bath in carrying out their hate campaigns. [This] would mean the literal destruction of the minorities—Jews, Catholics, and Negroes. I have no time for the extremists' or fanatics' right-wing infiltration of the Republican Party. ... The right wing frequently comes under the guise of patriotism and [catches] up unthinking adherents.” Hatfield’s keynote address a year later at the Republican National Convention, in which he called for increased funding of social programs to help the hungry and the elderly; equal opportunity for minorities in education, employment, and housing; and a stop to the still-small American intervention in Southeast Asia, earned the governor more national headlines. “Why, why do they fear telling the American people what our foreign policy is?” asked Hatfield. “Even when American boys are dying in a war without a name. Tragic as is a tomb for an unknown soldier, still more tragic is the fate of their unknowing soldier, whose life may be lost in a battle the purpose of which he has not been told and which he is not allowed to either win or conclude.” The speech received only lukewarm applause from delegates, a generous response compared with the telegrams received the next day at Republican headquarters. Some of the notes called Hatfield “a traitor to Republicanism” and “a Communist sympathizer.”⁴⁶

Hatfield went on to voice more specific and bold denunciations of the Vietnam War, triggered, close friends thought, by his “maturing religious perspective.” At the 1965 National Governor’s Conference in Minneapolis, Hatfield cast the lone opposing vote against a resolution supporting U.S. military presence in Vietnam, arguing that “the U.S. must exhaust all avenues toward peace. We have no moral right to commit the world

⁴⁶ Eells, *Lonely Walk*, 49-51.

and especially our people to WWII unilaterally or by the decision of a few ‘experts.’”⁴⁷ When Hatfield announced his candidacy for the United States Senate six months later, Vietnam became the key issue of the race. The immensely popular governor managed to squeak out only a 24,000-vote win against the hawkish Robert Duncan in the 1966 election. Hatfield’s dovish stance inspired many evangelicals, most impressively Iowa governor Harold Hughes, who went on to nominate the antiwar Eugene McCarthy at the 1968 Democratic National Convention.⁴⁸

In one of his first moves as a senator, Hatfield introduced a bill to abolish the draft and create an all-volunteer military. Throughout 1967 he traveled the nation pitching a three-point plan—de-Americanize the war, stage an all-Asian peace conference, and establish a “Southeast Asia common market”—to resolve the conflict. He appeared with William Sloane Coffin, the liberal Yale chaplain-activist, at antiwar rallies.⁴⁹ In a speech at Harvard, Hatfield explained that the United States had confused nationalism with communism and that to keep the war going, the Johnson administration had begun lying to the nation. Hatfield stepped up his rhetoric when Nixon took office. Hatfield increasingly used a tone of moral condemnation in addition to diplomatic arguments about a “political concern,” as he termed the war in *InterVarsity’s* magazine *HIS*.⁵⁰ He also voted to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and sponsored the Hatfield-

⁴⁷ Quoted in Eells, *Lonely Walk*, 57.

⁴⁸ The truth was—I had become a pacifist. . . . Though I was living and working in the world, my home was not here. Jesus had called me to live in another world. The earth was Satan’s world. I would live in it, but I could not participate in its hate and destruction and still love the Lord.” See Hughes, *The Man from Ida Grove: A Senator’s Story* (Waco: Word Books, 1979), 214, 234, 256-257, 307.

⁴⁹ Rosenfeld, “Born Again Political Forces,” H5.

⁵⁰ T. E. Koshy interview of Hatfield, “Can a Christian Be a Politician?” *HIS* 28, No. 1 (October 1967), 1-5. Hatfield also called Vietnam a “war of miscalculation.” See Mark O. Hatfield, *Not Quite So Simple* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 185, 217. By the late 1960s and 1970s, Hatfield was calling the war “a

McGovern “amendment to end the war,” which proposed to withdraw from Cambodia in 30 days, to remove troops from Vietnam by June 30, 1971, and to limit tax monies to the systematic withdrawal of troops.⁵¹ The Nixon administration, already livid after Hatfield nearly crossed party lines to endorse Eugene McCarthy’s campaign against Nixon in 1968, began to ostracize the senator.⁵² Impressed with Hatfield’s antiwar stance, George McGovern astonishingly almost asked Hatfield to join him on the Democratic ticket in 1972.⁵³

In the 1960s Hatfield suffered uniformly hostile responses from evangelicals because of his antiwar activities. After a speech at the U.S. Congress on Evangelism in which he criticized evangelicals for not being peacemakers and for supporting military intervention in what was essentially a civil war, Hatfield received a letter that read, “I heard you speak at the Men's Fellowship at my church a year ago and at that time you believed in Jesus Christ as your personal Lord and Savior. Now because you won't support the boys in Vietnam and you're fighting President Nixon who has been placed there by God, I know that you're not.”⁵⁴ Even into the 1970s, conservative evangelicals struggled to get rid of “those so-called liberal Christians like [Oregon Senator] Mark

singular moral catastrophe.” See Mark Hatfield, “The Lessons of Indochina,” *Church & Society* (September-October 1975), 75-77.

⁵¹ On Hatfield’s relationship with McCarthy, see Eells, *Lonely Walk*, 55-56. For Hatfield’s explanation to his evangelical constituents about his antiwar stance, see Hatfield, *Not Quite So Simple*.

⁵² The Nixon administration nearly offered Hatfield the vice-presidency itself. Billy Graham advised Nixon that Hatfield “was a great Christian leader. He’s almost a clergyman.” Moreover, Graham argued that Hatfield “has taken a more liberal stance on most issues than you, and I think the ticket needs that kind of a balance.” A Miami newspaper predicted a Nixon-Hatfield ticket on its front page during the 1968 Republican National Convention. See Lowell D. Streiker and Gerald S. Strober, *Religion and the New Majority: Billy Graham, Middle America, and the Politics of the 70s* (New York: Association Press, 1972), 66-67; Eells, *Lonely Walk*, 59-60.

⁵³ James C. Hefley and Edward E. Plowman, *Washington: Christians in the Corridors of Power* (Wheaton : Tyndale House Publishers, 1975), 113.

⁵⁴ Eells, *Lonely Walk*, 73.

Hatfield.” Bill Bright of Campus Crusade discontinued his advisory board, which Hatfield served on, partly because of complaints about the senator’s politics.⁵⁵ The hostility from his own spiritual tradition sent Hatfield into a personal tailspin, wondering if his spiritual and political lives could somehow be squared. In despair, he nearly resigned from the Senate.

In 1970, at his most disquieted, Hatfield discovered two sources of evangelical sustenance—Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, Cal., and the Post-American community near Chicago—that gave him hope for the future of evangelicalism and persuaded him to carry on his political career. Fuller Theological Seminary, founded in the 1950s, epitomized the new evangelicalism’s drive to become socially and intellectually relevant. In its first years Fuller’s social relevancy showed itself in the form of conservative politics and support for U.S. policy on Vietnam, which is why its invitation to Hatfield to be its commencement speaker, postponed at least once due to concern about Hatfield’s antiwar stance, surprised the senator.⁵⁶ His warm reception at Fuller shocked him even more. Expecting a tepid welcome, the graduating class treated Hatfield to a parade of antiwar gestures. In a short talk before the ceremony in the library, Hatfield discovered that one-third of the graduating class, which cheered as he walked into the room, wore black bands on their gowns that signified opposition to the war. A more public show of solidarity followed during the ceremony itself as students in the

⁵⁵ Richard DeVos quoted in John Turner, “Sharing God with Modern America: A History of Campus Crusade for Christ” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2005), 318-320.

⁵⁶ On the postponed invitation, see “Minutes of Meeting of Fuller Faculty,” January 5, 1965, Fuller Theological Seminary Archives.

balcony unfurled a banner that read, “Blessed are the peacemakers. We’re with you, Mark.”⁵⁷

The speech that followed—“American Democracy and American Evangelicalism—New Perspectives”—affirmed the students, many of whom would soon join the emerging evangelical left. Hatfield began his speech, which distilled the senator’s socio-religious thought, by reading excerpts of his hate mail. His critics, the senator continued, represented “a theological ‘silent majority’ in our land who wrap their Bibles in the American flag; who believe that conservative politics is the necessary by-product of orthodox Christianity; who equate patriotism with the belief in national self-righteousness; and who regard political dissent as a mark of infidelity to the faith.” Fuller’s mandate, Hatfield admonished, was to provide leadership in providing social and ethical leadership for the evangelical community in shaping an alternative to the “Biblical Nationalists.” Such leadership would revolve around three pressing issues—war, race, and the distribution of wealth—all moral, even spiritual, obligations that could return evangelicalism to the “entirety of the gospel.”⁵⁸

For Fuller students, the Hatfield visit marked the culmination of growing debate over social issues that exceeded even the travails on Wheaton’s campus. After a several-decades-long preoccupation with theology and spiritual disciplines, the Vietnam War and civil rights began to dominate campus discussion in the mid-1960s.⁵⁹ Whether as a hawk or dove, urged student Thomas Johnson, “the Christian has a responsibility to be involved

⁵⁷ Eells, *Lonely Walk*, 75-76.

⁵⁸ Mark O. Hatfield, “American Democracy and American Evangelicalism—New Perspectives,” *Theology, News and Notes* (November 1970), 8.

⁵⁹ For a sense of this trajectory toward social and political awareness, see Fuller’s student newspaper *The Opinion* in the 1960s and early 1970s.

in the dialogue on the war in Vietnam.”⁶⁰ Fuller had both. The antiwar faction, made up largely of students and faculty from the School of Theology, squared off against the School of World Mission, which tended to view the Vietnam War as an opportunity to spread the gospel in Southeast Asia. Dozens of Fuller students participated in antiwar protests at the Pasadena post office, and theologians Fred Bush, Jaymes Morgan, and Paul Jewett wrote articles condemning American military intervention. All this provoked evangelism expert Ralph Winter, whose article “On Not Being a One-Eyed Eagle” took antiwar activists to task for protesting the war. “How useful is an orgy of confession?” he wrote. “An ascetic self-abuse can all too easily substitute for constructive action.”⁶¹ Winter’s salvo generated a stiff backlash from students and faculty in the School of Theology and a lively exchange of missives posted on the campus bulletin board.

Hatfield’s visit, coming in the middle of this exchange, elicited both a storm of protest and support. The antiwar faction, led by students Jay Bartow, Randy Roth, and Robert Johnston, wrote a petition expressing “their deep distress over the War in Indochina.” “Our understanding of God’s Word and its bearing on this question,” the statement read, “compels us to speak in support of the Hatfield-McGovern amendment.” About a third of the student body and fifteen prominent faculty members signed the petition, which the students posted around campus the week before Hatfield came to

⁶⁰ Thomas Johnson, “Hawks, Doves, and Ostriches,” *The Opinion* 7, No. 4 (January, 1968), 8.

⁶¹ Ralph Winter, “On Not Being a One-Eyed Eagle,” *The Opinion* 7, No. 8 (May, 1968).

speak.⁶² The surprisingly encouraging response, Hatfield explained later, helped reverse his waning desire to remain in politics.⁶³

Just months after Hatfield's visit to Fuller, the senator also learned of a radical evangelical student group at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School led by Jim Wallis, one of several SDS members disillusioned by the growing militancy of the New Left in the late 1960s. The *Post-Americans'* antiwar stance, however, remained strong. Their tabloid depicted Nixon drinking out of a martini glass as bombs dropped on Vietnamese women and children.⁶⁴ Opposition to the Vietnam War, a stance clearly evident in the first issues of the *Post-American* and in the many demonstrations they led, in fact remained their "all-embracing concern."⁶⁵ When the first issue of the *Post-American* landed on Hatfield's desk in Washington, he called Wallis on the telephone. "Is it true," the senator excitedly asked in a subsequent phone conversation with Wallis, "that there are other evangelical Christians against the war?" Hatfield asked if the group would consider

⁶² Copy of petition in my possession, from Robert Johnston, Pasadena, California. Other details from Robert Johnston interviews, July 14, 2006, and September 12, 2006.

⁶³ "More than once, Hatfield has told me that that episode thwarted his temptation to retire from politics," said David Hubbard. See "Destined to Boldness: A Biography of an Evangelical Institution—Lecture Two: An Academic Adventure," October 23, 1979, delivered at Drew University. Text in folder "Marsden Notes," Fuller Theological Seminary Archives, Pasadena, Cal.

⁶⁴ See the cover of the January-February 1972 *Post-American*.

⁶⁵ Glenn Melnik, "Awake Thou That Sleepest or Who Are You Sleeping With," *Post American* 1, No. 1 (Fall 1971), 7; Jim Wallis, "The Movemental Church," *Post American* 1, No. 2 (Winter 1972), 2-3; Jim Wallis, "Airwar," *Post American* 1, No. 3 (Spring, 1972), 4; "Crucible of Community," *Sojourners* 6, No. 1 (January 1977), 16. Wallis called Vietnam "an automated air war—a product of modern technology gone mad. . . . Nixon has dropped more tons of bombs on Indochina in three years of "winding down the war" than Johnson did in five years of escalation." Also see "A Joint Treaty of Peace Between the People of the United States South Vietnam and North Vietnam," *Post-American* 1, No. 1 (Fall 1971), 15.

Wallis would later contend that "The question of war/peace was the question around which we began as a community—our place of origin—P.A. published in Fall 1971—became 1st public expression in opposition to Vietnam War from evangelical constituency, except for the personal witness of Mark Hatfield." See notes from a talk given internally to the Sojourners community. In Box IV1, Folder "Articles and Critiques about Sojourners," Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

moving their operations to Washington, a step that would come four years later.⁶⁶ Even before the Post-Americans moved, Hatfield began to serve as a critical ally, a figure of authority who gave the young evangelicals a measure of credibility.⁶⁷ To conservative evangelicals who urged respect for the authority of government officials, Wallis and other young evangelicals could cite the evangelical senator. Wheaton students, for example, as they tried to rally support within the student ranks, marshaled Hatfield as key authority in planning the Vietnam Moratorium.⁶⁸ Wallis's father, in a letter to a critic of his son, wrote, "Is not Mark Hatfield, for instance, who is a U.S. Senator, an authority in this land? He, as you know, is a real Evangelical."⁶⁹ Robert Linder likewise explained that Hatfield "provided the spark of leadership" and "had the voice of authority" to "put into words what we were thinking."⁷⁰

Even with solid theologically evangelical credentials, both Hatfield and Wallis remained polarizing figures on evangelical campuses. Wheaton's president Hudson Armerding banned Wallis as a chapel speaker after he conducted a "Post-American Day"

⁶⁶ Zach Kincaid, "Salting the Seen," *Trinity Magazine* (Summer, 2002).

⁶⁷ Hatfield, for example, sent a glowing letter of recommendation on behalf of the Post-Americans to a potential landlord. "They are among the finest young people I have ever met," wrote Hatfield, "and I can assure you of their unquestioned integrity, high character, and responsibility." See Mark Hatfield to Greenhoot, Inc., October 20, 1975, in Box IV3, Folder 6, "Post-American: Other papers and letters," Sojourners Collection, WCSC. Connections deepened later in the decade when Wes Michaelson, chief of staff for Hatfield, joined the staff of *Sojourners*. In a July 8, 1983, issue of the *Washington Inquirer*, Joan Harris claimed that Sojourners leaders "boast that Hatfield introduces bills to Congress at Sojourners' request." In Box IV3, Folder 7, "Press Clippings: Magazine," Sojourners Collection, WCSC. Though exaggerated by Harris, she is right that Sojourners did have the ear of Hatfield.

⁶⁸ See "Blanchard Association Plans Moratorium Action," *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 4 (October 10, 1969), 1. The *Record* reported, "United States senators and representatives, including Mark Hatfield of Oregon, have joined 600 student body presidents in calling for a half to 'business as usual' Wednesday."

⁶⁹ James E. Wallis to "Ralph," December 4, 1973, in Box IV3, Folder 6, "Post American: Other papers and letters," Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

⁷⁰ Interview with Robert Linder, quoted in Mary A. Wilson, "Evangelical Voices: Attitudes toward the Vietnam War" (M.A. thesis, California State University, Dominguez Hills, 1997), 32.

that featured a slide show of atrocities in Vietnam.⁷¹ Armerding similarly relegated Hatfield to an auxiliary building just days before he was scheduled to speak, barred from speaking in chapel because of his antiwar rhetoric. This infuriated hundreds of progressive Wheaton students and faculty who surmised that conservative donors had pressured Armerding.⁷² The move backfired, inflaming students to protest and to turn out in great numbers whenever Hatfield or Wallis was in town for academic convocations or seminars. Hatfield received standing ovations from students as he walked to the podium. Large numbers of students vigorously supported his antiwar speech, said the *Record*, whose report on a 1974 speech was headlined, “He Came; He Spoke; and We Were Conquered.”⁷³ Hatfield’s visit coincided with increased evangelical opposition to the war around the nation as well as hardened anti-ROTC and antiwar protests on Wheaton’s campus. Since the late 1960s, the academic calendar had taken on a regular rhythm of antiwar protests. In the fall, students protested outside Edman Chapel before and after Veterans Day services. In the spring, students picketed the annual ROTC review by

⁷¹ “Christian Life-Style, Women’s Rights Are Discussion Topic,” *Wheaton Record* 94, No. 25 (May 12, 1972), 2.

⁷² On Armerding’s refusal to allow Hatfield to speak in chapel, see Bechtel, *A Heritage Remembered*, 323. For another account of student protests against Armerding’s decision, see Hefley, *The Church That Takes on Trouble*, 144-145. For a typical assessment of Hatfield by progressive students at Wheaton, see oral interview of Dan Good, tape 7657, Wheaton College Archives. “He really impressed me more than any other speaker I have heard,” said Good. “I knew of his reputation as an evangelical legislator in Washington. With the reputation of politics in Washington, now, I sort of assumed that nothing good could come out of the capital. I was impressed with the high ideals; could synthesize Christian faith with politics; concern with Vietnam; biblical imperatives with policy overseas. I was really impressed with Senator Hatfield. “I was very irritated that he couldn’t be a chapel speaker. It seemed like if we’re trying to develop a spirit of openness and Christian community here, he shouldn’t have been denied. I was really disappointed by the administration’s stance.” Aware of his antiwar stance, Wheaton students heard about Hatfield’s controversial speech at Fuller. See Bill Kallio, “Christian Must Take Place as Peacemaker,” *Wheaton Record* 93, No. 2 (October 2, 1970), 5.

⁷³ Jim Bourgoine, “He Came, He Spoke, and We Were Conquered,” *Wheaton Record* 96, No. 15 (February 22, 1974), 3. Hatfield was the featured speaker at a presidential inauguration at Asbury College in 1967. See Joseph A. Thacker, *Vision and Miracle* (Nappanee, Ind.: Evangelical Press, 1990), 210. That Hatfield continued to be a welcome presence by many in evangelical schools spoke to the increasing moderation of evangelicalism in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

President Armerding at McCully Field. Irregularly held national protest events found resonance on some evangelical campuses. Students at both Wheaton and Calvin, for instance, participated in the October 15, 1969, Vietnam Moratorium protest.

By the early 1970s student dissent at Wheaton finally began to dent the administration's resolve. In 1969 the Faculty Senate recommended that ROTC participation become voluntary for male sophomore students. The college's trustees approved the change as long as the college met its annual commitment to the military of graduating 25 officers each year.⁷⁴ The drop in participation was dramatic, with only 36 (of over 200) male sophomores signing up in 1971. Students next pushed to rid the school of mandatory ROTC altogether. In May 1971, over 150 students staged a protest after President Armerding overrode a 12-11 Faculty Senate vote to make ROTC voluntary for all classes.⁷⁵ In an 8-2 vote condemning Armerding's veto, the Student Council planned a protest at the President's annual review of ROTC cadets. With half a dozen newspapers and the local NBC affiliate watching, protesting students simultaneously stood and walked out of the grandstands at a signal.⁷⁶ Rip Hodson, the lead protester, told a reporter that "Wheaton College has long been a symbol of militarism in DuPage County and the nation. We, as students, are seeking to show we can no longer support an immoral war or the equating of militarism and Christianity. . . . We want the generals to know that they

⁷⁴ "ROTC Now Voluntary for Sophomore Men," *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 1 (September 19, 1969), 2.

⁷⁵ Hudson T. Armerding, "Statement to Faculty Regarding Action of the Senate on ROTC," May 11, 1971, in "ROTC" Vertical File, WCA. Armerding argued that faculty members were under the mistaken assumption that Wheaton students could participate in a cooperative program with area colleges if minimum numbers could not be maintained at Wheaton alone.

⁷⁶ See handwritten note "There will be a peaceful demonstration . . ." in "ROTC" Vertical File, WCA.

can't get away with murder and come to Wheaton and be applauded.”⁷⁷ Armerding, however, made it very clear that, given his previous concession, he would not give in to faculty or student pressure on the one-year ROTC requirement. True to his word, he did not relent.

From the perspective of true antiwar dissenters, the small victory coupled with this quick defeat was the worst thing that could happen to their movement. The refusal of moderate students to mobilize against the war once sophomore ROTC was no longer compulsory left students concerned about the broader war disappointed.⁷⁸ The editor of the 1971 yearbook wrote that “gradually the exhilaration of being rebellious wore off. The radicals realized that their cry was no longer being picked up. They found that students, the mainstream of their support, were loath to peel the scab off America again.”⁷⁹ Skip Sheffer, an antiwar student government president in the early 1970s, resigned “broken-hearted” when it became clear that the administration was tying his hands, leaving him able to do little more than “setting up hot chocolate stands.”⁸⁰ Student activism was dead.

⁷⁷ Carol Anne Galvin, “Students Launch Peaceful Protest of Wheaton College ROTC Image,” *Courier News*, May 14, 1971.

⁷⁸ John Currie remembers that antiwar protests softened after the sophomore requirement was lifted. After threatening to boycott the annual review, “The powers that be, whoever they were, got back to me/us and said that the forced requirement for the male student body would be reduced to just the 1st year students for future years if we would continue to participate in the ROTC program/review in the spring of 1969. We agreed—participated—then turned in our guns and uniforms. We had solved our problems and left the entering next year freshman class to figure out how they would deal with their forced servitude.” See John Currie interview, November 21, 2006.

⁷⁹ 1971 *Tower*, copy in WCA.

⁸⁰ Dave Madeira, “Campus Comment,” *Wheaton Record* 94, No. 10 (January 14, 1972), 5.

Though the activist mood had lifted—there were fewer protests in the early 1970s than in the 1960s⁸¹—antipathy toward the war and ROTC remained. In fact by the mid-1970s the ROTC program was in shambles. Student polls in 1975 again revealed an overwhelming desire to make ROTC completely voluntary. The colonel in charge of Wheaton’s program wrote desperate letters to faculty asking for help in recruiting cadets. Despite the substantial financial benefits of ROTC enrollment, students simply were not signing up, and the Army was threatening to remove ROTC from the college. Only eight juniors had signed up for Military Science III, far from a trajectory that would produce the minimum twenty officers at graduation.⁸² In the end, the students got what they wanted, though it came from an unexpected front. In 1975 the state of Illinois threatened legal action against the college for gender discrimination on the basis of Title IX. Unwilling to enroll female students, the administration announced that ROTC would become voluntary starting in September 1976.

The case of antiwar sentiment at Wheaton illuminates the trajectory of evangelicalism more broadly. The overwhelming patriotism among evangelicals in the mid-1960s began to fade by 1968, as evangelicals began to question the war, even those in non-academic sectors of evangelicalism.⁸³ Some were returning GIs disillusioned with

⁸¹ When the occasion warranted, students could still muster strident action. In the campaign year of 1972, for example, students heckled Spiro Agnew for his Vietnam War stance on Calvin’s campus in what *Chimes* described as a “nationally-televised booing of the Vice-President’s first and only campus campaign stop.” But the consistent dissent of students seems to have gotten bogged down over time in a general weariness and apathy. See Carl Strickwerda, “Politics: Fall 1972,” *Prism* (1971).

⁸² Charles R. Wallis to David Maas, September 30, 1974, in “ROTC” Vertical File, WCA.

⁸³ Chicago’s LaSalle congregation, while praying for enlisted members of their church, also supported parishioners who dissented from the war. James Hefley and Marti Hefley, *The Church That Takes on Trouble* (Elgin, Ill.: David C. Cook Publishing, 1976), 108-109. The congregation even got classified as a historic peace church because of its connection to Moody Memorial Church, whose founder Dwight Moody was a pacifist during the Civil War.

the war.⁸⁴ Many simply grew weary of the high body counts. Others began to reassess the justifications for the war in the first place. By the late 1960s, despite early cautious support, the pages of the *Reformed Journal* contained mostly critical assessments of American involvement in Southeast Asia.⁸⁵ John Rensenbrink called the war “a foolhardy and pernicious enterprise, costly beyond imagination, militarily implausible, morally sickening, and politically a trap.”⁸⁶ Many Reformed evangelicals at Calvin, most of whom held to a selective just war theory, concluded that this particular war was unjustified. By the early 1970s, writes sociologist James Fowler, “there were few well-recognized evangelical voices who were any longer leading a charge to fight on in Vietnam.”⁸⁷

Yet growing unease with U.S. policy did not shift to a broad-based antiwar activism. Most evangelicals who harbored dissenting views refused to speak out or march.⁸⁸ Billy Graham, for example, newly distressed over the Cambodian incursion in 1970 after initially praising Johnson’s escalation a few years earlier, refused the many

⁸⁴ James Daane, a professor at Fuller, returned from Vietnam with a visceral hate of the war. He later wrote, “Eligible, examined, drafted, trained, and sent to Vietnam within eight dreadful months in 1968, I took as heroes any who confounded the maker of the war that upset my life. I savored David Levine’s vicious caricatures of LBJ in the *New York Review of Books*. I applauded Zolton Ferency and Eugene McCarthy and any other Democrat who would repudiate the President, and I despised Hubert Humphrey because he refused to.” See James Daane, “Lyndon Johnson,” *Reformed Journal* (February 1973), 3-4. Scott Oliver, a member of Chicago’s Circle Church and Vietnam veteran, turned against the war. He wrote, “My background is Fundamentalist-Evangelical as well as militaristic. God changed my view on the Vietnam War and was involved in civil disobedience and petitioning while in the Army. I led an IVCF chap. into petitioning for amnesty.” See “Oliver Personal Identification,” in Folder “1977,” ESA Archives.

⁸⁵ On The *Reformed Journal*’s soft anti-communism and its early support of the Vietnam conflict, see October 1965 issue of the *Reformed Journal*. On its increasing discomfort with Vietnam policy, see Lewis Smedes, “On Picking and Choosing Wars” and “The War Nobody Wants” in February 1967 issue of *Reformed Journal*.

⁸⁶ John Rensenbrink, “Vietnam: Time for Decision” *Reformed Journal* (March 1967), 5-9.

⁸⁷ Robert Booth Fowler, *A New Engagement: Evangelical Political Thought, 1966-1976* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1982), 223.

⁸⁸ Charles Furness wrote of irritating “oversimplifications that antiwar activities are sinful opposition to government policy.” See Furness, *The Christian and Social Action* (Old Tappan, N.J.: Revell Co., 1972), 112.

entreaties of young evangelicals to condemn the war. “What can people expect me to do?” he asked. “March in protest? Carry a sign? If I do that, then all the doors at the White House and all the avenues to people in high office in this administration are closed to me.”⁸⁹ *Christianity Today*, edited in the early 1970s by the conservative Harold Lindsell, took a harsher tone, repeatedly denouncing protestors. The political aspirations and reluctance of evangelicals to question authority stood in the way of a massive antiwar push. This conservative pressure discouraged moderates with misgivings about the war to articulate their doubts publicly. It also tamped down the edgier elements of evangelical dissent. Only later would Hatfield enjoy the “heartwarming experience” of finding that “there were many who were conservative theologically who totally agreed with my stand.”⁹⁰ “For all our pompous talk,” editorialized *Vanguard*, “we were not there to help the Hatfields who fought alone. We hid our light while Viet Nam died. Many of us even waved flags. Repent all of us.”⁹¹ Institutional structures, such as the monthly magazine of Calvin’s sponsoring denomination, which condemned conscientious objection and called opposition to the Vietnam War “treasonable propaganda” and “anarchistic action,” cowed evangelical dissent.⁹² Accordingly, the most prominent evangelicals to speak prophetically against the war did not work at evangelical institutions. Once the Post-

⁸⁹ On calls for Graham to condemn the war, see Lewis B. Smedes, “An Appeal to Billy Graham,” *Reformed Journal* 22, No. 7 (September 1972), 3. Smedes wrote, “It would be a great hour in American evangelicalism if Dr. Graham would use his entrée to the White House to press the moral urgency of the massive bombing with the same grace and power that he preaches the gospel of personal salvation.” Graham famously explained his refusal to make political arguments by saying, “God has called me to be a New Testament evangelist, not an Old Testament prophet!” Also see David Poling, *Why Billy Graham?* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1977), 81; Peter Ediger, “Explo ‘72,” *Post American* 1, No. 5 (Fall 1972), 13; Joe Roos, “American Civil Religion,” *Post-American* 1, No. 3 (Spring, 1972), 9; and Ben Patterson, “Editorial,” *Wittenburg Door* No. 12 (April-May 1973), 4-5.

⁹⁰ Mark Hatfield, “The Gray Areas of Faith and Politics,” *HIS* (November 1978), 17.

⁹¹ David T. Steen, “Epitaph for Viet Nam,” *Vanguard* (April-May 1973), 23.

⁹² See “Calvin Community Reacts to Banner’s Viet Nam Diatribe,” *Chimes* (October 18, 1968).

Americans left, Trinity could no longer threaten expulsion. Mark Hatfield's political constituency extended well beyond Oregon evangelicals.⁹³ Evangelical colleges could not deny tenure to dissenting evangelical professors at state schools. Thus Richard Pierard, a professor of history at Indiana State University; Robert Linder, an associate professor of history at Kansas State University; and Robert Clouse, a professor of history at Indiana State, were free to speak more forthrightly against the war.⁹⁴

Still, these isolated cases failed to coalesce increasing dissent within an evangelicalism still typified by conservatism and apoliticism. After 1972, evangelical activism slowed. Militant dissenters, discouraged and weary, toned down their rhetoric.⁹⁵ They waited for the war to wind down, resigned that their dissent seemed to be futile in

⁹³ Another intriguing case was Eugene Siler, a devout Baptist and Republican representative from Kentucky in Congress. Though he supported Goldwater in 1964, Siler was a vehement critic of the war in Vietnam, calling the Gulf of Tonkin resolution a "buck-passing" pretext to "seal the lips of Congress against future criticism." Siler, however, maintained a staunch social conservatism, never joining the evangelical left. See David T. Beito and Linda Royster Beito, "The Christian Conservative Who Opposed the Vietnam War," *History News Network* (August 21, 2006).

⁹⁴ These three professors, who had earned Ph.D.s in European history from the University of Iowa in the early 1960s, edited two prominent books that spoke out against conservative evangelical politics generally and the Vietnam War specifically. Linder was the earliest and most outspoken against the war. On active army duty in 1962, Linder saw soldiers returning from Vietnam bragging about money made on black market. "The immorality and corruption of the South Vietnamese government, combined with lessons from history about the futility of waging a land war in Asia," convinced Linder that the war was both wrong and an "impossible situation." While teaching at the evangelical William Jewell College in Missouri in spring 1965, Linder harshly criticized the war. The class on U.S. political thought ended in a "verbal brawl" with 30 students, all pro-war, literally moving toward the front of the classroom to confront Linder. Linder moved to Kansas State University that fall and quickly became one of the most outspoken faculty members against the war, representing the anti-war position in a major campus debate in the spring of 1967. Linder became mayor of Manhattan, Kansas, in 1970 and continued to speak against the war to community groups, even to Kansas Veterans of Foreign Wars. See Wilson, "Evangelical Voices," 32. Clouse, a minister in an historic peace denomination, worked with Jesuit priests and other antiwar Catholics during the war. At the conservative Indiana State University, Clouse was one of the first to speak against the war. In 1965 in a debate he took the antiwar position. Clouse also made many speeches and helped sponsor a teach-in against the war, which angered the administration. He rejected the domino theory and thought that evangelicals had made "a god out of America." See Robert G. Clouse, Robert D. Linder, and Richard V. Pierard, *Protest and Politics: Christianity and Contemporary Affairs* (Greenwood, S.C.: Attic Press, 1968); Robert G. Clouse, Robert D. Linder, and Richard V. Pierard, eds., *The Cross & the Flag* (Carol Stream, Ill.: Creation House, 1972); Wilson, "Evangelical Voices," 34.

⁹⁵ For a laudatory assessment of antiwar evangelical politicians such as Harold Hughes and Mark Hatfield, see Wes Pippert, "Christ and Crisis in Washington," *HIS* 34, No. 7 (April 1974), 1-4.

speeding the end of the war. “One hesitates to write about it because there’s nothing new to write,” wrote Calvin professor Nicholas Wolterstorff amid reassurances from politicians that the war would soon end. “What could possibly be the reason for such continued devastation and for the continuing persecution of those who protest the devastation?”⁹⁶ As Saigon fell, this sense of resignation pervaded the nascent evangelical left.

II.

If energetic antiwar activism failed to persist, young evangelical ambivalence toward the nation did. Sparked by disillusionment with continued intervention in Southeast Asia that suggested an American imperialistic streak, many young evangelicals began to distance themselves from their tradition’s patriotic posture. Many concluded that evangelicalism, too often unwilling to assume a prophetic posture in the face of America’s sins, had succumbed to devotion of a pernicious civil religion.

The emerging evangelical left repented for these sins on behalf of their tradition. At a 1973 speech at the annual National Prayer Breakfast in Washington, D.C. in front of 3,000 of the nation’s top power brokers, with President Nixon to his right and Billy Graham to his left, Hatfield declared, “Today, our prayers must begin with repentance. . . . We must turn in repentance from the sin that scarred our national soul.” The veiled reference to Vietnam stunned the audience. Wesley Pippert, a reporter for United Press International, explained that Hatfield had essentially done “one of the most dramatic

⁹⁶ Nicholas Wolterstorff, “The War,” *Reformed Journal* 22, No. 5 (May-June 1972), 5.

confrontations since the Prophet Nation told King David, ‘You are the man!’”⁹⁷ A year later Hatfield proposed such a process of repentance, formalized by a national day of humiliation. Modeled after Lincoln’s “Proclamation of a Day of Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer” in 1863, Hatfield’s proposal called for Americans to “confess our national sins,” citing idolatry of national security and a failure to share national prosperity with the world, among other sins. Thousands of congregations observed the day, even though the bill languished in the House after passing the Senate. Young evangelicals, nearly all of whom praised Hatfield’s proposal, kept up the penitent tone through the bicentennial.⁹⁸ “A year of sackcloth and ashes,” wrote David Gill of CWLF, “would be better than a year of Disneylike parades.”⁹⁹

The emerging evangelical left also sought to disentangle itself from evangelicalism’s long-standing identification with the nation. Growing more explicit in his denunciations of Vietnam, Hatfield wrote that “our involvement in Indochina was mistaken, got out of hand, and raised questions about our national character.” He argued that the war had laid bare American abuses of imperialism for economic gain, infringements on domestic freedoms, and the idolatry of presidential power.¹⁰⁰ Such

⁹⁷ Eels, *Lonely Walk*, 82-83. White House officials, “infuriated at his remarks,” put Hatfield on the White House “enemies list.” The *New York Times* ran a 22-paragraph story on the breakfast that devoted just two paragraphs to Nixon’s remarks and 12 to Hatfield’s. For the text of the remarks, see Hatfield, “The Sin That Scarred Our National Soul,” *Christian Century* 40, No. 8 (February 21, 1973), 221.

⁹⁸ Thomas A. Carruth, an evangelical professor at Asbury Theological Seminary, rented a “wide-area telephone line” to lobby Congress to pass the resolution. See Hefley and Plowman, *Christians in the Corridors of Power*, 114.

⁹⁹ David Gill, “198 Years Old,” *Right On* 6, No. 1 (July-August 1974), 6.

¹⁰⁰ Mark Hatfield, William A. Rusher, and Arlie Schardt, *Amnesty: The Unsettled Question of Vietnam* (Croton-on-Hudson, N.Y.: Sun River Press, 1973), 114, 123. On Hatfield and civil religion, see Hatfield, *Between a Rock and a Hard Place* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1976), 90-91; Hatfield, “Judgment and Repentance,” *Vanguard* (October 1973), 9-11; “Piety and Patriotism,” *Post-American* 2, No. 3 (May-June 1973), 1-2. This was based on a commencement address entitled “Civil Religion” given at Messiah College on May 5, 1973.

egregiousness not only required national repentance, maintained young evangelicals, but also a critical posture toward American civil religion. The Vietnam War, according to young evangelicals, in fact helped expose evangelical justification for the Vietnam War for what it was—a watered-down faith willing to baptize whatever the nation did.

Young evangelicals drew from sociologist Robert Bellah in their critique of evangelicals' tendency to conflate faith and nation.¹⁰¹ On the heels of Bellah's influential article "Civil Religion in America," evangelical literature decrying civil religion proliferated.¹⁰² Calling civil religion "a rather elaborate matrix of beliefs and practices

¹⁰¹ Robert N. Bellah, "Civil Religion in America," *Daedalus*, No. 96 (Winter 1967), 1-21. For another important discussion of civil religion in the mid-twentieth century, see Will Herberg, *Protestant, Catholic, Jew: A Study in American Religious Sociology* (Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1955). Herberg argued that America is a "triple melting pot," that to be an American is to be either a Protestant or a Jew or a Catholic. This "civil religion" is more an identity than a faith. Also see Will Herberg, "American Civil Religion: What It Is and Whence It Comes," in *American Civil Religion*, ed. Russell E. Richey and Donald G. Jones (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), 76-88. For several examples of young evangelical citations of Bellah, see Sharon Gallagher and Robert Bellah, "Emergence of the American 70s: An Interview with Robert Bellah," *Right On* 7, No. 4 (November 1975), 5, 12, 15; Robert D. Linder and Richard V. Pierard, *Twilight of the Saints: Biblical Christianity and Civil Religion in America* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1978), 21; Joe Roos, "American Civil Religion," *Post-American* 1, No. 3 (Spring 1972), 8-10.

¹⁰² Linder and Pierard, *Twilight of the Saints*, 93-98. Pierard was far less diplomatic in a book review in *HIS* magazine. Citing Bellah on civil religion, Pierard wrote, "What a portrayal of the American civil religion! It clearly bears out that the White House is no place to find prophets. The nation desperately needs more Micahs who will not tie Christianity to American nationalism and who are not afraid to proclaim the truth to her leaders. Unlike these court prophets, Christians must speak out against the truly national sins—race prejudice, poverty, social injustice, immoral business practices, environmental pollution, and warmongering. One is first a Christian and then an American." See Richard V. Pierard, review of *So Help Me God*, by Robert Alley, and *White House Sermons*, by Ben Hibbs, *HIS* 33, No. 2 (November 1972), 23-24. Also see Emery J. Cummins, "My Country Right or Wrong?" *Eternity* 18 (June 1967), 30, 38; Emery J. Cummins, "God and the U.S.A. in Vietnam," *Eternity* 19 (March 1968), 13-14; David O. Moberg, "Is the U.S.A. a Christian Nation?" *Eternity* 19 (July 1968), 16; Donald Larson, "Translating the Gospel," *HIS* 36, No. 4 (January 1976), 10-13; Rockne McCarthy, "Civil Religion and Civil Rights," *Vanguard* (March 1976), 20-22; Bill Pannell, "Moving Up," *The Other Side* 9, No. 3 (May-June 1973), 34-41; Richard V. Pierard, "The Golden Image of Nebuchadnezzar," *Post-American* 2, No. 1 (January-February 1973), 10-11; Donald Kraybill, *Our Star-Spangled Faith* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1976); Richard V. Pierard, *Unequal Yoke: Evangelical Christianity and Political Conservatism* (Philadelphia: Lippincott Co., 1970); Robert Jewett, *The Captain America Complex: The Dilemma of Zealous Nationalism* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973); Nicholas P. Wolterstorff, "Love It or Leave It," *Reformed Journal* 20 (February 1970), 3; Kenneth L. Wilson, "My Country Tis of Thee, Sweet ... and Bitter," *Christian Herald* 91 (July 1968), 24-25; Jim Wallis, "Post-American Christianity," *Post-American* 1, No. 1 (Fall 1971), 2. On the Post-American free university seminars about civil religion held in Chicago and at Taylor University, see "Signs of a New Order," *Post-American* 2, No. 3 (June 1973), 12; and "The Quest for Discipleship: A Summer Education-Action Seminar led by members of the Post-American staff," in Box XII, "Post-American—Internal," Sojourners Collection, WCSC. On a speech by Trinity's Rockne McCarthy entitled

born of the nation's historic experience and constituting the only real religion of millions of its citizens," Robert Linder and Richard Pierard wrote that the state used consensus religious sentiments "for its own political purposes." The two evangelical historians instead called for an evangelical re-evaluation of civil religion "in a critical but constructive fashion" that would recover spiritual authenticity as the Church related to the state. In their influential book *Twilight of the Saints*, Linder and Pierard tried to disabuse evangelicals of the notion that America was a chosen nation, that America as "God's new Israel" could bear "the rainbow of hope to the nations," that civil religion was any sort of authentic religion at all.¹⁰³ In a 1973 speech at Messiah College in Pennsylvania, Hatfield similarly contended that America was not Christian, but merely religious, and superficially religious at that.¹⁰⁴ Linder and Pierard agreed, arguing that deists had created America and that any sort of evangelical consensus that might have emerged in the nineteenth century had waned in vitality.

Civic religion in the postwar period, young evangelicals noted, revolved around the repudiation of "godless international communism," as Eisenhower put it. This was the golden age of civil religion. Eisenhower's 1952 campaign, explained Hatfield, featured a "moral and religion tone—a crusade against communism abroad and corruption, bureaucratic regimentation and creeping socialism at home." He bathed this geo-political

"American Civil Religion and Civil Rights: An Issue of Public Justice," see "Jubilee '78—Pittsburgh Conference," *Public Justice Newsletter* (February 1978), 8; Craig Watts, "Identity and Idolatry?" *The Other Side* 20, No. 7 (July 1984), 10; Review of *Politics, Americanism, and Christianity*, by Perry Cotham, *Eternity* (September 1976), 48; John F. Alexander, "Land of the Free?" *The Other Side* (August 1978), 12-16.

¹⁰³ Linder and Pierard, *Twilight of the Saints*, 21, 65, 70-71. Bob Goudzwaard, a professor associated with the Institute for Christian Studies in Toronto, similarly argued, "If the main interest of policy is to preserve the greatness and superiority of America, if love is equated with love for America, and if American interests determine what is 'good' and 'just,' then a nationalist ideology—a civil religion—is at work." See Goudzwaard, *Idols of our Time* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1984), 47.

¹⁰⁴ Mark O. Hatfield, "Civil Religion," *Evangelical Visitor* (August 10, 1973), 4-5, 10.

rhetoric in spiritual language and invoked this language purely to mobilize support. Hatfield denounced it as “the tendency to enshrine our law and order and national righteousness,” a very different impulse than biblical faith which rests on “the ultimate authority of Jesus Christ.”¹⁰⁵ Civil religion thus sacralized the status quo, a point that Fuller professor Jack Rogers made in 1971 in faulting evangelicals for obsessing about the struggle between communism and democracy when the “real issues” were between “rich and poor, strong and weak, and white and nonwhite.”¹⁰⁶

If young evangelicals criticized Eisenhower’s spirituality as inauthentic, bland, and preoccupied with communism, they denounced Nixon’s version of civil religion—propped up, they felt, by Billy Graham—as downright diabolical. As Vietnam wore on and the Watergate scandals emerged, young evangelicals repeatedly condemned Graham’s all-but-endorsement of Nixon in 1972.¹⁰⁷ They accused Graham of promoting a watered-down civil religion, of baptizing the Nixon administration’s every move. Graham’s 1970 sermon in Washington, D.C., based on I Peter 2:17, a scripture passage which read “Honor all men. . . . Fear God. Honor the King,” particularly horrified them. Graham preached that evangelicals should honor the nation, bemoaning that “lately our institutions have been under attack: the Supreme Court, the Congress, the Presidency, the flag, the home, the educational system, and even the church . . .!”¹⁰⁸ Young evangelicals were particularly annoyed that Graham preached this sermon on July 4 at an Honor

¹⁰⁵ Hatfield, “Civil Religion,” 4. He continued, “God is not choosing special peoples in the modern world as he chose the people of Israel, nor giving them a particular, unique covenant.”

¹⁰⁶ Jack Rogers, “Confessions of a Post-Conservative Evangelical,” *Reformed Journal* 23 (February 1971), 11.

¹⁰⁷ On criticisms of Graham, see David Kucharsky, “Billy Graham and ‘Civil Religion,’” *Christianity Today* 15, No. 3 (November 6, 1970), 56-58.

¹⁰⁸ For fuller text and discussion of Graham’s sermon, see Streiker and Strober, *Religion and the New Majority*, 77.

America Day rally, a celebration in which many evangelicals participated. “On that day,” wrote Linder and Pierard, “honoring America and God was implicitly synonymous with sustaining Nixon’s aims in Southeast Asia.”¹⁰⁹ Evangelicalism had surrendered to “the pernicious nature of this civil religion—the religion of Americanism” so that Nixon could perpetuate misguided, even evil, policies.¹¹⁰

Vietnam, according to young evangelicals, had exposed the myth of Christian America.¹¹¹ “Vietnam has highlighted the fact,” wrote Post-American contributor Bill Lane, “that the basic generating principles of citizenship in the secular society and in the citizenship in the kingdom of God are mutually exclusive. . . . Our allegiance to the country is temporal and conditional. There can be no Christian support for what we have done in Vietnam.”¹¹² That “the development of America has been a story of shameful deeds committed in the name of the nation,” wrote Linder and Pierard, ought to keep “Christian jingoism” and views of America as a “messianic policeman” who would

¹⁰⁹ Linder and Pierard, *Twilight of the Saints*, 170-171; Wallis quoted in Michael Kernan, “Spreading the Gospel of Explo ’72,” *Washington Post*, July 4, 1972, p. A20.

¹¹⁰ Pierard, “Golden Image,” 9.

¹¹¹ A rising coterie of evangelical historians also worked to debunk the notion of an America with evangelical origins. See Mark A. Noll, Nathan O. Hatch, and George M. Marsden, *The Search for Christian America* (Westchester, Ill.: Crossway Books, 1983), 22. They wrote, “The more serious hindrance to positive Christian action in the present is the distorted and over-inflated view of America as a distinctly Christian nation.” For a discussion of the evangelical-oriented Conference on Faith and History in October 1974 that centered on the dilemmas of civil religion, see George Marsden, “Christian Historians and Civil Religion,” *Reformed Journal* 24, No. 9 (November 1974), 26-28. Also see Terry Somerville, “Did America’s Founding Fathers Really Stand on the Word of God?” *Christianity Today* 27, No. 10 (June 17, 1983), 17-19. “Thomas Jefferson, for one, took apart the Bible while he built the country,” wrote Somerville. On America as not “God’s chosen nation” in contemporary times, see Miriam Adeney, *God’s Foreign Policy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 116.

¹¹¹ Tony Campolo, “Door Interview,” *Wittenburg Door*, No. 32 (August-September 1976), 17.

¹¹² Bill Lane, “Lessons from Vietnam,” *Post-American* 2, No. 2 (March-April 1973), 8-9. Sojourners advertised a 20-minute slide show with recorded music and a script on civil religion. See “Seeds,” *Sojourners* 5, No. 8 (October 1976), 26.

“remake the world in its own image” at bay.¹¹³ Most young evangelicals agreed, eyeing with suspicion the bicentennial celebrations of 1976 and the proliferation of patriotic titles issued by the new religious right in the early 1980s. David Gill suggested, “If we don’t eliminate American ‘Independence’ celebrations we should, at the very least, see them in their limited, relative, provisional, temporary context.”¹¹⁴ For the most radical evangelicals, the war sparked a particularly deep alienation from the nation. Shaped by a New Left perspective, such young evangelicals began using the term “Amerika.” The nation’s redemption would be a difficult, perhaps impossible, task, Trinity student Les Drayer cautioned InterVarsity chapters, for a nation growing “increasingly repressive and totalitarian.”¹¹⁵ The term “Post-American” particularly appealed to such students.

Other young evangelicals—those who criticized “America” instead of “Amerika”—still saw some redemptive potential in the nation. Hatfield, Linder, Pierard, most InterVarsity chapters, Wheaton College, and other voices of evangelical moderation saw a fallen, humiliated nation in need of confession, repentance, and redemption more than a nation damned by God.¹¹⁶ Linder and Pierard saw “many great and humane

¹¹³ See section entitled “The Problem of America as a ‘Christian Nation,’” in Linder and Pierard, *Twilight of the Saints*, 145, 163-164.

¹¹⁴ David Gill, “Easter and Independence,” *Right On* 7, No. 7 (April 1976), 10; Campolo, “Door Interview,” 19, 22; “No King but Caesar,” *Sojourners* 5, No. 1 (January 1976), 4-6. “More than ever, the task of the faithful church in America during 1976 will be to discern how the principalities of American power are dethroned by the victorious triumph of the cross.”

¹¹⁵ Les Drayer, Letters to the Editor, *HIS* 29, No. 5 (February 1969), 14.

¹¹⁶ CWLF put this ambivalent posture into typical Jesus Movement language: “Dear America: ... When I look at you and rap with you, it is obvious that you aren’t doing too well. You’re not mellow and peaced out like I was hoping you would be. Your physical condition is pretty bad. Some say it’s almost beyond hope! Part of you isn’t getting enough food! Part of you isn’t getting enough air and water! In other obvious ways you seem to be coming apart into many pieces, all uncoordinated and in a constant hassle rather than being harmoniously together. But America, it isn’t your broken and sick body that worries me most! It is your spirit, your soul, that worries me most! The body problems, the obvious physical and social needs, are very critical. But they won’t be solved unless your attitude and total world-view is changed. I’m really feeling bad about you America. ... With love and best wishes.” See “The Forever Family,” *Right On* 3, No. 26 (July 4, 1971), 1.

accomplishments” in American history and called for a devout and sober evangelical politics.¹¹⁷ The 1973 Chicago Declaration called for a return to “that righteousness which exalts a nation,” implying that America might be able to practice virtue. This tension between revulsion toward the nation, yet a desire to reshape it characterized the evangelical left during the 1970s. Young evangelicals found themselves condemning civil religion even as they pushed to participate in politics *as* evangelicals. The Vietnam War raised thorny issues about evangelical politics and about America’s position in the world.

In addition to nurturing ambivalence toward the nation, the Vietnam War, like civil rights, sparked evangelical attention to structural concerns. At first couched in moral repugnance, young evangelical rhetoric decried the napalm, the defoliation of forests, the fragging of officers, the damaged psyches of soldiers, and “the thousands of tiny explosives that resembled small leaves—not powerful enough to blow a truck tire but powerful enough to take off the foot of a barefoot peasant who might step on one.”¹¹⁸ An InterVarsity student mourned the “bloated corpses floating down the river somewhere in Cambodia or Vietnam.”¹¹⁹ In a 1967 *Reformed Journal* symposium, in which most participants opposed the war, Lewis Smedes called the American war effort “morally unjustifiable” because troops were indiscriminately dropping bombs, ruining land, and making a nation of refugees.¹²⁰

¹¹⁷ Linder and Pierard, *Twilight of the Saints*, 180.

¹¹⁸ Wallis, *Revive Us Again*, 62.

¹¹⁹ “Programmed for Murder,” *Manna* 1, No. 2 (October 5, 1970). Copy in Box 344, Folder 4, InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

¹²⁰ See Smedes, “Comments on Vietnam,” *Reformed Journal* 17, No. 5 (May-June 1967), 6.

By the early 1970s, however, young evangelicals were developing a more sophisticated social critique of the war. Less willing to trust the government's invocation of the domino theory, they wondered whether America was too corrupt to prosecute a just war against communism. Wolterstorff worried that corrupt defense contractors were shaping U.S. policy toward Vietnam. "The American people for about a decade now have been grossly and systematically deceived by their government leaders," he wrote.¹²¹ Many young evangelicals began to openly question American diplomatic and economic structures. It wasn't just that the Vietnam War in particular was unjust. It wasn't only that William Calley had made the wrong decision at My Lai. There was something fundamentally wrong, some young evangelicals posited, about how U.S. society and its military was constructed that had inevitably led the U.S. toward war.¹²² After many hours of study in leftist journals on Vietnamese and American history, Wallis decided that the Vietnam War was not an "aberration, but in fact only the most current example of a long and bloody record of U.S. interventionism." He blamed not principled opposition to communism, but rather a disturbing level of economic self-interest motivated by misguided commitments to unlimited growth and American imperial power.¹²³ "And then there's Uncle Sam," wrote a member of CWLF. "The only concern he has for me is where I could kill (or be killed) best that week—South Viet Nam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand ... Uncle Sam would be there waiting again, waiting to make me a first class tin

¹²¹ Nicholas Wolterstorff, "ITT: Wickedness in High Places," *Reformed Journal* 22, No. 5 (May-June 1972), 4.

¹²² Carl T. McIntire, "The American Army on Trial," *Vanguard* (May-June 1971), 4. "The Calley trial," wrote McIntire, "calls into question the whole nature and structure of the American military, the character of the military training, and the kind of soldiers formed by the training process."

¹²³ Wallis, *Revive Us Again*, 52-53. For a similar critique from CWLF, see Jill Shook, "Vietnam Today," *Right On* 6, No. 1 (July-August 1974).

soldier so I could protect the ‘Interests’ of all the money grabbers in this nation.”¹²⁴

Skinner affirmed this critique, asserting that “Jesus would probably agree with many of the radicals of today—even groups like SDS and Yippies—as they tell how corrupt the system is.”¹²⁵ This radical strain of politics, largely indebted to the New Left, deeply penetrated the young evangelical community.

While young evangelical dissent toward Vietnam paled in comparison with the forthright activism of mainline liberals and the New Left, it remains significant for several reasons. In the case of Mark Hatfield, an early voice and author of important legislation against the war, evangelical dissent could claim real political consequences. Hughes, a vocal opponent of the Vietnam War, boasted of exposing unauthorized bombing of North Vietnam and the secret bombing of Cambodia, of authoring the Hughes-Ryan Amendment forbidding covert operations by the CIA, and reducing military aid going to South Vietnam. Second, Vietnam, like civil rights, mobilized portions of the evangelical youth culture toward the left. Unmoved by the Cold War insistence on resisting communist advances in faraway places, young evangelicals mobilized politically after watching friends leave for Vietnam and then return in body bags. “Finally,” wrote Wallis, “the alienation from the church that my confrontation with racism had begun was completed by Vietnam.”¹²⁶

Third, the collective weight of civil rights, Vietnam, and third-world voices spurred the addition of a structural element to the already strong individualistic

¹²⁴ “Reach Me,” *Right On* 1, No. 14 (April 24, 1970), 2.

¹²⁵ Tom Skinner, “Jesus or Barabbas?” *Right On* 2, No. 21 (February 3, 1971), 1-2.

¹²⁶ Wallis, *Revive Us Again*, 51.

component of evangelical politics. The nature of the young evangelical outrage—rooted in an instinctive sense that segregation and Vietnam were wrong—matured into a more substantial structural critique and political approach to the nation. The problem with America, they began to argue, wasn't that a particular general made a wrong decision to bomb an innocent Vietnamese village or that a southern racist had called someone a nigger. Truly to blame was a society "committed to the rightness of whiteness" and a church complicit in systemic evil. Evangelicalism "was a church," the Post-Americans insisted, "whose god is American, white, capitalist, and violent; whose silent religion and imagined neutrality goes hand in hand with 'nigger' and 'napalm.'"¹²⁷ A contributor to *Right On* denied that "those in power are in any sense inherently evil—it is the System which has ravaged their souls and even now threatens the entire world. ... It is the System that supports the war machine in Southeast Asia. It is the System that has carefully nurtured the most disastrous program of economic and military imperialism this planet has ever witnessed. It is this ugly System that strictly maintains class distinctions and treats minority groups as something less than human. ... This System must come to an end!"¹²⁸ The more irenic voice of InterVarsity's Joe Bayly similarly intoned that "the way our two most serious and divisive problems have been handled (Negro rights and the war in Vietnam) is an indication of problems in government that go far deeper."¹²⁹ Many young evangelicals, concerned about the economic priorities and structure of the nation,

¹²⁷ Jim Wallis, "The Movemental Church," *Post-American* 1, No. 2 (Winter 1972), 2-3.

¹²⁸ "Echo from a Politico," *Right On* 1, No. 14 (May 1, 1970).

¹²⁹ Joseph Bayly, "Thoughts on the Election," *HIS* 30, No. 2 (November 1969), 5.

complained that money spent on military expenditures would be better spent fighting poverty.¹³⁰

These voices signified the break-up of the conservative postwar new evangelical consensus. Young evangelicals, although late joining social dissent, became willing to oppose systems and structures, to change laws to end segregation, to mandate busing to integrate schools, and to link issues of race to poverty. They would grow willing to join protests to force Nixon's hand and to mobilize politically on behalf of peace candidate Eugene McCarthy. Not since the emergence of the social gospel in the late nineteenth century and prohibition in the 1920s had evangelicals been willing to flex political muscle or think in such structural terms. Given this legacy, Vietnam remained "the war that never ends" long after troops evacuated Saigon.¹³¹

¹³⁰ Hughes, *Man from Ida Grove*, 234; Robert G. Clouse, "America's National Priorities: Welfare or Warfare?" *The Other Side* 8, No. 5 (September-October 1972), 38.

¹³¹ See Gene Stoltzfus with Lois Barrett Janzen, "Vietnam Revisited: A Personal Report on the War That Never Ends," *Post-American* 4, No. 4 (April 1975), 18; Earl and Pat Martin, "A Family's Account of Revolution and the Church in Post War Vietnam," *Sojourners* 5, No. 1 (January 1976), 29-35; "Vietnam: Rebuilding in the Ruins," *Sojourners* 5, No. 9 (November 1976), 20-29; Paul McCleary, "Healing the Wounds of War: Reflections on a Trip to Vietnam," *Sojourners* 6, No. 10 (October 1977), 10; "Vietnam: Five Years Later," *Sojourners* 9, No. 4 (April 1980), 11-16; Danny Collum, "Vietnam: Ten Years After," *Sojourners* 14, No. 4 (April 1985), 5-6.

CHAPTER SIX

THE NEW LEFT AND EVANGELICAL RADICALISM

In 1968 Bill Milliken, a Young Life youth worker in the gang-infested Lower East Side of New York City, met a fiery proponent of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). “Santos” condemned Christianity for failing to address social problems. A particularly pointed conversation, in which Santos told Milliken that his “sweet, smiling Jesus” was trying to make “house niggers out of us,” prompted the young evangelical to pace a Manhattan bridge in the middle of the night and ponder a technocratic, “death-producing” America:

The silhouettes of gray buildings lost their beauty. Outwardly, the buildings had an aura of beauty—majestic, a picture of strength. ... But their beauty was only steel-and-concrete deep. Inside those buildings, a death-producing machine had been created. A machine that was run on the gears of a value system that put progress before people. Power-hungry, dog-eat-dog executives reaped the real harvest. The middle masses who worked for the kings had been shaped into robots, pushing their assigned buttons so that the monarchs could grab the kingdom and the power and the glory.¹

Despite his new misgivings about American society and the social convulsions that surrounded him in 1968—grating poverty, race riots, the violent Democratic convention in Chicago, the assassinations of Robert Kennedy and

¹ Bill Milliken, *So Long, Sweet Jesus* (Buffalo: Prometheus Press, 1973), 37. “Santos” is a pseudonym. Milliken still declines to reveal his identity. See Bill Milliken interview, May 23, 2007.

Martin Luther King, Jr.—Milliken remained a mainstream evangelical by day. He volunteered in the public school system and tried to repair frayed racial tensions between rival gangs. But at night, he increasingly drifted to meetings of SDS in the East Village, where he “rapped” with Santos and other leftists who spoke of “the beast that must be slain.” Milliken began to agree that “the power structure with all of its technocracy and weaponry has too tight a grip on the people’s lives.” “The cancer seemed to have spread everywhere,” he lamented. “Only major surgery” could cure a failing state ill-served by the ineffective ministrations of liberal politics. He wondered whether “the only way to deal with this kind of violence is with the violence of the whip. If Jesus were here today, I wondered, how would he deal with the money-changers of our time? With a whip? Maybe. Or a machine gun?”²

That theologically conservative evangelicals might in fact harbor leftist sympathies was incomprehensible to New Leftists, whose roots in political liberalism took a very different trajectory than Milliken’s journey out of a tradition that was equal parts apolitical and politically conservative.³ The prominent evangelical journal *Christianity Today* had editorially endorsed Barry Goldwater for President in 1964, condemned civil rights leader Martin Luther King, Jr. as a disrupter of societal order, and

² Milliken, *So Long, Sweet Jesus*, 95, 107, 111.

³ On the liberal Protestant roots of the New Left in Austin, Tex., see Douglas C. Rossinow, *The Politics of Authenticity: Liberalism, Christianity, and the New Left in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 113. There was no equivalent to the “Old Left” among evangelicals (the closest being in the mainline, with whom evangelicals had little contact). To understand the politics of the young evangelicals, it is important to distinguish between the various strains of the evangelical non-right. Robert Wuthnow, for example, has mistakenly positioned Jim Wallis within liberal civil religion, when in fact Wallis drew much more from the New Left. See Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since World War II* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988), 241-268.

consistently supported the Vietnam War.⁴ Even countercultural evangelical “Jesus Freaks,” lacking a hard rightist edge, failed to offer aid to the left, instead flaunting an apolitical impulse.⁵ Berkeley’s Christian World Liberation Front, a lapsed rightist Campus Crusade chapter with close ties to the Jesus Movement, seemed to epitomize the hostility of evangelicalism toward the New Left. From 1969 to 1971 CWLF engaged in pitched battle with SDS. CWLF took over several SDS meetings and competed with SDS for rally sites.⁶ A July 1971 article in *Ramparts*, the brash muckraking monthly from the San Francisco Bay, portrayed the faith of the Christian World Liberation Front as only for “the fearful, the guilt-ridden and the childish, for those unprepared to dive, to make their faith leap into a political reality or mystical depth.” Calling articles in CWLF’s tabloid *Right On* “nothing but half-baked and awkward attempts at political relevancy,” *Ramparts* argued that they were instead a front for the right, that “a takeover by right-wing sugar-daddies” was impending.⁷

⁴ See Robert Booth Fowler, *A New Engagement: Evangelical Political Thought, 1966-1976* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1982), 170-177, 221-224.

⁵ On the apoliticism of the Jesus People, see Ronald M. Enroth, C. Breckinridge Peters, and Edward E. Ericson, *The Jesus People: Old-Time Religion in the Age of Aquarius* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1972); Larry Eskridge, “God’s Forever Family: The Jesus People Movement in America, 1966-1977” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Stirling, 2005); Plowman, *The Jesus Movement in America: Accounts of Christian Revolutionaries in Action* (Elgin, Ill.: David C. Cook Publishing, 1971).

⁶ Until around 1971 CWLF worked hard to undercut radical leftist rallies, regularly applying for rally permits ahead of leftist organizers. In one particularly aggressive action, CWLF arrived at Cal-Berkeley’s administration building before dawn to apply for a permit to hold a rally on May 1, 1971, a particularly important date for the furious Maoist radicals who arrived an hour later, too late to secure the already-taken permit. See telephone interview with Bill Squires, September 5, 2006, Oakland, Cal.; see account in Plowman, *Jesus Movement in America*, 70-72. For other accounts of CWLF and secular leftist rivalry and competition, see Jack N. Sparks, *God’s Forever Family* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub. House, 1974), 15-18, 117-119.

⁷ James Nolan, “Jesus Now: Hogwash and Holy Water,” *Ramparts* 10, No. 2 (August, 1971), 20-26. The leftist tabloid *Free Aquarian* made similar claims: “If the loss of former radicals to straight society didn’t deal a death blow to the movement, then the pacification diversions did. The people who refused to join the mainstream have too often been caught up lately in more inwardly-directed activities that have little or nothing to do with changing the social order and are basically counter-constructive, counter-revolutionary, selfish diversions of the white middle class. ...” Quoted in Stephen A. Kent, *From Slogans*

Evangelicals' reputation as "law and order" Republicans, however, hid a growing cadre of left-leaning evangelicals in their ranks. Around 1971 members of CWLF began to unionize farm workers and advocate for African-Americans. Members of evangelical communes such as the Post-Americans in Chicago and The Other Side in Philadelphia protested the Vietnam War and nuclear power plants. Students in leading evangelical colleges such as Wheaton and in InterVarsity chapters expressed resonance with the social critiques of SDS. Even if the New Left was unwilling to claim them, some evangelicals willingly drew from the New Left. Galvanized by a continued racial caste system in the South, by growing military action in Southeast Asia, and by disillusionment with America and its technocracy, an emerging evangelical left denounced the evangelical establishment for its inaction against structural injustice. As a minority even within progressive evangelicalism, the numbers of evangelicals sympathetic to New Left social critiques were not large. Yet their activism and rhetoric point to a new evangelical political style and suggest the inadequacy of existing boundaries of New Left historiography.

I.

Student radicals of the 1960s attacked liberalism for being soft, compromising, and morally and spiritually vacuous. The persistence of the racial caste system among southern conservatives—and the ponderous pace of American liberals in ending segregation—particularly distressed the embryonic New Left.⁸ SDS, the seminal

to Mantras: Social Protest and Religious Conversion in the Late Vietnam Era (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 2001), 37.

⁸ A small but loud movement, the New Left boasted only 150,000 loosely connected, mostly student members at its peak. While SDS, the seminal organization in the New Left, has its roots in the National

organization of the New Left, in fact found its first cause in the indigenous black challenge of racial segregation in the South. In the early 1960s SDS, in joining extralegal black activism, sought to force the hands of white liberal elites in Washington, who held to a passive optimism that education, America's essentialist creed of equality, and gradual political and social efforts would gradually end segregation.⁹ Growing military conflict in Southeast Asia, which anti-communist liberalism also failed to confront, energized the New Left in the mid-1960s. SDS took "democracy to the streets," contending that obvious social ills such as the southern racial caste system and the Vietnam War indicated a deeper problem. The New Left increasingly blamed the liberal consensus itself, made up of an unholy alliance of big business, the media, and government bureaucracy. Radicals derisively spoke of the American power structure as "The System," "The Establishment" or "the technocracy."

Some young evangelicals, in addition to condemning the conservative politics of their parents, similarly lambasted liberalism. A 1975 series in the *Post-American*

Student Association, scholars generally peg the spiritual launch of the New Left with a meeting in rural eastern Michigan that produced the Port Huron Statement. This statement spoke of the alienation of middle-class university students and the importance of "values" in mobilizing the poor and disenfranchised minorities under the structure of "participatory democracy." Interpretations of the New Left vary according to what sections of the Port Huron Statement are emphasized. Jim Miller finds the soul of the movement in its innovation of "participatory democracy." Doug Rossinow takes issue with what he sees as Miller's infatuation with participatory democracy and his story of declension in which participatory democracy loses out to existentialism and despair. Instead, Rossinow rebuts, existentialism and the "search for authenticity" should be seen as central to the New Left from its origins. Rossinow makes his case in a close study of the Austin, Texas, chapter of SDS, which features large doses of liberal Protestant existentialist literature and rhetoric. See Jim Miller, *Democracy Is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987); Douglas C. Rossinow, *The Politics of Authenticity: Liberalism, Christianity, and the New Left in America* (New York: Columbia University Press), 1998.

⁹ New Leftists particularly objected to the mid-century liberalism of John Dewey, Arthur Schlessinger, and Gunnar Myrdal. For one of the clearest examples of the optimistic argument that America's creed of equality would end discrimination, see Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1944). Even Reinhold Niebuhr, the Christian realist who often interjected himself into politics, betrayed, in the eyes of New Leftists and young evangelicals, himself as a liberal conspirator, particularly in his staunch anti-communist efforts and in his initial hesitance to support Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Montgomery Bus Boycott. See Taylor Branch, *At Canaan's Edge: America in the King Years, 1965-1968* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006).

retrospectively charted the political position the young evangelicals had staked in the late 1960s. The first article, by a professor at the evangelical Malone College, critiqued the conservative evangelical journal *Christianity Today* for its anti-civil rights and pro-war positions.¹⁰ Its companion piece chastised the liberal mainline journal *Christian Century* for never understanding “the depth of rage and anguish involved in those who broke with the mainstream of American politics because of Vietnam. The protests of the New Left were never taken seriously. ... ‘America is sick, it [the *Christian Century*] editorialized in 1967, but it never recognized that the end of the war might not restore its health.” Even after the war, the *Post-American* observed, the *Century* remained “subdued but unchanged in its support of the American covenant.”¹¹ These two *Post-American* articles revealed the essential distrust that some young evangelicals felt toward established sensibilities and structures—conservative or liberal. Both political approaches perpetuated “The System.” The writer of a particularly evocative riff in CWLF’s *Right On* explained it this way:

Not that those in power are in any sense inherently evil—it is the System which has ravaged their souls and even now threatens the

¹⁰ John Oliver, “A Failure of Evangelical Conscience,” *Post-American* 4, No. 4 (May 1975), 26-30.

¹¹ Dale Suderman, “A Failure of Liberalism,” *Post-American* 4, No. 8 (October-November, 1975), 24. A treatise that appeared in the *Post-American* regularly during its first several years articulated the group’s antipathy toward liberalism. “We fault theological liberalism which neglects man’s need of personal transformation, and while holding to a Pollyanna view of humanity, distorts the historic content of the Christian faith. We fault political liberalism for its hollow rhetoric, sellout to the corporate state and implication in racism, poverty, Third World exploitation, and a materialist, technocratic value system.” See “What Is the People’s Christian Coalition?” *Post-American* 1, No. 2 (Spring 1972), 14. A similar assessment was reached by a group of 150 students from Midwest colleges who met in 1971. The National Association for Christian Political Action stated that “the Republican/Democrat, liberal/conservative distinctions given to American politics is virtually meaningless for them, that the labels only distinguish two sides of the same faith—namely, that pragmatic, American common-sense will solve all our public concerns.” See “The Illinois State Organization Newsletter of NACPA,” (February 1972), 2, in Box IV3, Folder 2, “News Releases and Post-American,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC. For more on evangelical disillusionment with Protestant liberalism, see Leonard J. Sweet, “The 1960s: The Crises of Liberal Christianity and the Public Emergence of Evangelicalism,” 29-45, in George Marsden, ed., *Evangelicalism and Modern America* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1984).

entire world. ... It is the System that supports the war machine in Southeast Asia. It is the system that has carefully nurtured the most disastrous program of economic and military imperialism this planet as ever witnessed. It is this ugly System that strictly maintains class distinctions and treats minority groups as something less than human; that frustrated the valiant efforts of King and other humanitarians who sought to work within the establishment to change it and who failed to see that, by its very nature, it would deny all dedicated attempts toward significant change. It is this System that cannot tolerate the liberated lifestyles of a new generation which seeks to escape the stifling oppressive process of assimilation into the American Way of life. ... How can we hope to build a society based on human values when our System demands a motivation based upon making a profit—based upon the exploitation of your brother? This System must come to an end!¹²

A contributor to the *Post-American* similarly wrote, “The prophetic voices in the sixties were not the liberals but those who broke with the politics of realism by stepping outside the national covenant.”¹³ Young evangelicals and the New Left alike objected to the “national covenant,” which included commitments to unlimited economic growth, technology, and American global dominance perpetuated by the “technocracy,” each characteristics of this national covenant.¹⁴

Unlimited economic growth, an important marker of the liberal consensus, came under sharp attack from young evangelicals. An idea rooted in early twentieth-century economic thought, British economist John Maynard Keynes suggested that the government could regulate economic structures through managing the supply of currency

¹² “Echo from a Politico,” *Right On* 1, No. 14 (May 1, 1970).

¹³ Suderman, “Failure of Liberalism,” 24.

¹⁴ James Burnham’s *Managerial Revolution* in the 1940s popularized the term “technocracy” to refer to a class of bureaucratic elites. Not used pejoratively in the 1940s and 1950s, it came to be a term of derision for many in the 1960s.

and the flow of government spending.¹⁵ If done correctly, American policymakers hoped, a permanent and unlimited pattern of economic growth could prevail over the cyclical patterns of boom and bust that had characterized much of American history. Most intriguingly, Keynes's theory called for vast amounts of spending by the government and consumers. Excessive savings, he argued, resulted in economic recessions, even depressions. Keynes's economic thought, though never wholly implemented, became orthodoxy for most liberals in the mid-twentieth century.¹⁶

New Left condemnation of Keynesian consumerism fused with third-world evangelical objections to American prosperity to spark a strident young evangelical critique of unlimited economic growth. The Institute for Christian Studies in Toronto, for example, vehemently voiced skepticism over the prospects of a perpetual boom economy. "Our enslavement to technological and economic progress," wrote Bob Goudzwaard, "is leading us down a path to slow death." Pointing out the limits of fresh air and energy sources, he argued, "Such consumption cannot go on indefinitely."¹⁷ Other young evangelicals likewise prophesied a dire economic future, citing scarcity of resources, energy dependence on other nations, the staying power of poverty, and environmental degradation.¹⁸

¹⁵ John Maynard Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1936).

¹⁶ Alan Brinkley, *The End of Reform: New Deal Liberalism in Recession and War* (New York: Vintage, 1995), 66.

¹⁷ Bob Goudzwaard, "From Death to Shalom," *Vanguard* (November-December 1974), 15. In the late 1970s, when the case for environmentalism and against unlimited economic growth enjoyed a more receptive audience, Goudzwaard continued his theme of how Western people must "give up their blind faith in progress through economic and technological growth alone." See Bob Goudzwaard, "Aid for the Over-Developed West," *Vanguard* (November-December 1976), 3. For a fuller development of these themes, see Bob Goudzwaard, *Idols of our Time* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1981).

¹⁸ See Jack Sparks, "The End of Affluence," *Right On* 6, No. 8 (April, 1975), 7.

Evangelical radicals also worried about the moral deficiencies of economic growth. In the Post-Americans' first newsletter, Jim Wallis wrote, "We protest the materialistic profit culture and technocratic society which threaten basic human values."¹⁹ At its base, unlimited growth (and capitalism in general) merely justified corporate greed, they maintained.²⁰ The American profit culture elevated corporations to a too-powerful role in economic structures. Paul Marshall, graduate student in the Institute for Christian Studies and founding member of the Evangelical Committee for Social Action, wrote, "Unrestrained agrcorporations, armed with government support and approval, the latest technology, tax breaks, and the ideology of economic progress and efficiency, are killing off the family farms of Canada, creating a massive social upheaval with massive social costs that must be paid by us all."²¹ CWLF's Jack Sparks echoed Marshall's concern about the controlling nature of big business: "We are controlled ... by an economic bureaucracy which has been a long time building and which rolls inexorably along,

¹⁹ "Peoples Christian Coalition—Newsletter No. 1," July 1971 in Box VII7, Folder "People's Christian Coalition—Trinity," Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

²⁰ The Post-American bibliography included lists of books written by New Left hero Herbert Marcuse. One of those books—*An Essay on Liberation*—argued that corporate capitalism was sparking human desire (even biologically) and for modern consumerism. Marcuse wrote, "The so-called consumer economy and the politics of corporate capitalism have created a second nature of man which ties him libidinally and aggressively to the commodity form. The need for possessing, consuming, handling, and constantly renewing the gadgets, devices, instruments, engines, offered to and imposed upon the people ... has become a 'biological' need." See Herbert Marcuse, *An Essay on Liberation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), 11. The Post-Americans also regularly cited Charles Reich's *Greening of America*, which included an implicit argument against economic growth. In a later interview Reich asserted, "The second mistake of the liberals concerns what constitutes growth and well-being. Liberals did not look critically at the idea of growth. They thought that as long as the country had more goods, more sales, and more profits, it would be better off. But growth is accompanied by ever-increasing social costs: the gross national product rises, but the environment deteriorates, people lose their jobs, plants abandon towns and jobs go overseas." From "The Liberals' Mistake," A paper presented at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, reprinted in *The Center Magazine*, July-August 1987. For an early denunciation of the materialism inherent in capitalism, see George Monsma, "Christian Anti-Communism," *Chimes* 57, No. 9 (November 9, 1962), 2.

²¹ See Paul Marshall, "In the Economic Tower of Babel: The Rise of Vertical Integration and the Fall of the Canadian Family Farm," *Vanguard* (February, 1972), 23-26; Alan Lewis, "The Oil Companies Have Us over a Barrel," *Right On* 5, No. 11 (May 1974), A1, A4.

constantly increasing our alienation from ourselves, from freedom and from each other.”²² In a 1972 issue of the *Post-American* focused entirely on the injustice of American economic growth, Art Gish wrote, “Overconsumption is theft. We privileged people are the major source of the world’s problems and they will not be solved before we give up our privileged position. . . . All those who talk of increasing production are irresponsible.”²³ A companion article in *The Post-American* targeted the government and corporations as guilty of perpetrating this “liberal-industrial scheme,” specifically the United States military, Proctor and Gamble, Ford, AT&T, Westinghouse, Howard Pew’s companies, and *Reader’s Digest*.²⁴ *Vanguard’s* Bonnie Greene mourned that “people who advocate environmental protection are rapidly turning into scapegoats, while those who “buy now” are the true patriots.”²⁵ The iconoclastic *The Wittenburg Door* featured the biblical Mary holding a baby Santa Claus.²⁶ The liberal-industrial scheme of high spending to stimulate the economy in many ways became the symbol of prosperity gone awry for a generation of young evangelicals. The ideal of unlimited growth had subsumed the average consumer under the vast bureaucracy of corporate power.

Anger toward wealthy corporations drove young evangelicals, like those in the New Left, toward identification with the poor and disenfranchised. In a letter to Mark Hatfield, Wallis quoted the social theorist Jacques Ellul: “The place of the Nazarene’s followers is not with the oppressor but with the oppressed, not with the mighty but with

²² Jack Sparks, “The American Condition” in Box 2, CWLF Collection, GTU Archives, Berkeley, California.

²³ Arthur G. Gish, “Simplicity,” *Post-American* 1, No. 2 (Winter 1972).

²⁴ McMullan, “Man and Technocracy.”

²⁵ Bonnie Greene, “Under Pagan Shafts of Light,” *Vanguard* (May-June 1972), 31.

²⁶ *Wittenburg Door* (December 1971-January 1972).

the weak, not with the overfed but with the hungry, not with the free but the enslaved, not with the opulent but the poverty-stricken, not with the well but with the sick, not with the successful but with the defeated, not with the comfortable majority but with the miserable minorities.”²⁷ Over one hundred articles on the disenfranchised (which included the poor, oppressed, blacks, women, and the tortured) appeared in the *Post-American* from 1973 to 1978, many of them explicitly blaming consumptive culture and big business for their economic plight.²⁸

While never organizing on a large scale, young evangelical leftists, such as those affiliated with CWLF, did take tentative steps to confront the economic bureaucracy. Jill Shook, incredulous at the \$14 million grossed each year by Sears in the early 1970s, helped employees picket during a 1973 strike in San Francisco. “To me,” Shook wrote supporters, “and to many conscientious Christians, it’s a question of true justice, and true caring for people’s needs. . . . It’s so saddening to realize that some people could have anything against other people receiving health benefits.”²⁹ Carolyn Hudson worked with migrant farm workers, helping them unionize.³⁰ CWLF as a whole boycotted a long list of products made by Nestle Corporation in response to the company’s baby formula campaign. “Many people have been led to believe that world hunger is caused by overpopulation,” the group wrote in *Right On*, “but in the case of baby formula, hunger is caused by corporate greed.” Nestle, CWLF charged, was perpetrating economic

²⁷ Jim Wallis to Mark Hatfield, n.d., in Box XII, Folder “Post-American: Letters/Memos/Info from the Office,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

²⁸ See James Davison Hunter, “The New Class and the Young Evangelicals,” *Review of Religious Research* 22, No. 2 (December, 1980), 163; Michael Foley, “The Poverty of Enough,” *Sojourners* 12, No. 8 (September 1983), 20-22.

²⁹ Jill Shook to “Hedie and Fred,” circa February 1974, in Box 2, CWLF Collection, GTU Archives.

³⁰ See Box 2, CWLF Collection, GTU Archives for more on farm worker solidarity. Also see Sharon Gallagher interview, July 7, 2006.

imperialism in their marketing of infant formula. With its need for clean water, sterilization, and the formula itself, offering classes on techniques of breastfeeding would be simpler and less disruptive to cultural norms.³¹

While too small to significantly coerce corporations themselves, radical evangelicals nonetheless allied with secular leftist groups both in rhetoric and activism.³² Gerald Vandezande, mocking Nixon's economic policies in 1971, wrote, "Never mind whether mankind needs still more cars. Never mind the pollution. Never mind the spirit-deadening assembly-line routine. Never mind the starving millions. Never mind God's man, our neighbour. We've got to produce. So, get with it!"³³ Many others echoed New Left economic analyses in their disillusionment with the consumptive culture of twentieth-century America, the Keynesian push for unlimited economic growth, and the power of corporations.

Objections to faith in science and to the "spirit-deadening assembly-line routine" of technology pervaded their skepticism of unlimited growth. "The spiritual revolutionary is not enamored with either social or physical sciences," stated CWLF's "Revolutionary Catechism." "He knows only one true science: the science of the application of God's love to people."³⁴ In contrast, technology—new ideas, materials, machines, and

³¹ Robin Jurs, "Bottle Babies," *Right On* 9, No. 1 (July-August, 1977), 7; James Huber, "The Deadly Formula: The Marketing of Baby Formula in the Third World," *Sojourners* 7, No. 9 (September 1978), 27-29; "Crunch Nestle Quik! How to Help Children in the Third World," *The Other Side* 14, No. 2 (February 1978), 16. On Nestle boycott buttons in the Evangelical Women's Caucus meetings, see Nancy A. Hardesty, "Power in the Dove," *The Other Side* 83 (August 1978), 45; Yvonne Dilling, *In Search of Refuge* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1984), 126.

³² At Wheaton College, for instance, students formed a Campus Americans for Democratic Action (CADA) chapter to help promote economic reform, and student Rob Baptista organized a boycott of grapes in the college cafeteria, an act in solidarity with growers and migrant workers in California. See "CADA to Penetrate Campus Groups to Promote Reforms," *Wheaton Record* 91, No. 16 (February 14, 1969), 2.

³³ Gerald Vandezande, "Blazing the Trail toward the New Prosperity," *Vanguard* (December, 1971), 6.

³⁴ "The Revolutionary Catechism," *Right On* 1, No. 17 (October 27, 1970), 2.

products—gave the “powers and principalities,” as Wallis called governments, corporations, and other brokers of power, an even more insidious means of wielding control over “the people” than traditional uses of power.³⁵ Infant formula, from all appearances, seemed like a technology that could help dry mothers or orphaned babies. Instead, it led to costly dependence on American companies, which remained intent on increasing their consumer base. Young evangelicals also criticized the freeway system as an example of technology run amok. Bill Pannell wrote, “We don’t particularly care for the poor in our own ranks, and technology and affluence have made it possible for us to avoid them. Technology has produced the freeways, and affluence (with the complicity of the Federal Housing Authority) has produced the suburbs.”³⁶ Linking technology to economic growth, Bill Kallio, antiwar leader at Wheaton College and later a staffer for Evangelicals for Social Action, wrote that “technology has taken control, and man has become its servant. ... The American myth, that consumption brings happiness, has produced a society that has enslaved itself to the demands of a technological system.”³⁷ The ties between technology and big business led many New Leftists and young

³⁵ In many ways, the young evangelicals were nicely positioned to find this critique plausible, given their roots in anti-modernist fundamentalism. They retained many of these distinctives: distrust of big government; skepticism of science and rationality; and faith in the efficacy of prayer, healing, and other divine interventions. Young evangelicals easily combined these perspectives with New Leftist thought they encountered as students in state universities. Jason Bivins sees this anti-liberalism in a variety of political strains—in Catholic social justice activists, right-wing homeschoolers, and the Sojourners community. See Jason Bivins, *The Fracture of Good Order: Christian Antiliberalism and the Challenge to American Politics* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003).

³⁶ William Pannell, “Evangelicals and the Social Crisis,” *Post-American* 3, No. 7 (October, 1974), 11.

³⁷ Bill Kallio, “Price of Progress Too High; No Need for SST,” *Wheaton Record* 93, No. 14 (January 29, 1971), 4.

evangelicals to despair about “the technocracy,” a term used with regularity on several evangelical campuses and in the Post-American and The Other Side communities.³⁸

While young evangelicals often objected to technological innovations in specific—the artificiality of baby formula, nuclear weapons, and “chemical feasts prepared by corporate food technologists”—their primary concern rested with the managerial implications of new technology.³⁹ Paul Henry credited the New Left for awakening evangelicalism to the reality that “the dignity of men as individuals created in the image of God was being buried under layers of bureaucratic structures by government, industry, and the ‘great’ universities.”⁴⁰ Boyd Reese, inspired by C. Wright Mills and William Domhoff’s notion of a “power elite,” despaired about the wealth and power of an oligarchy of corporate, government, and military elites whose decisions trickled down through the middle levels of bureaucracy with the help of a few technological experts.⁴¹ Young evangelicals, like generations of skilled workers before them, worried about these technological experts and new machines taking creative, fulfilling jobs. In the new technocratic structure, they despaired, only “spirit-deadening assembly-line” positions or bureaucratic jobs would remain.⁴² Industrialism, social critic

³⁸ The Post-Americans, for example, held a workshop on “the technocracy” at Wheaton in 1972. Also see “Christian Life-Style, Women’s Rights Are Discussion Topic,” *Wheaton Record* 94, No. 25 (May 12, 1972), 2. For a discussion of the technocracy in *The Other Side*, see Dennis Lane, “The Counterculture,” *The Other Side* 6, No. 6 (November-December 1970), 15-19, 36-37; Lane, *A Reason for Hope* (Old Tappan, N.J.: Revell Co., 1976), 126-153.

³⁹ See Dave Campbell, “Breaking the Food Chains of the Technological Society,” *Vanguard* (March, 1973), 3.

⁴⁰ Paul Henry, “Evangelical Christianity and the New Left,” 95, in Robert G. Clouse, Robert D. Linder, and Richard V. Pierard, eds., *The Cross and the Flag* (Carol Stream, Ill.: Creation House, 1972).

⁴¹ Boyd Reese, “Structure of Power,” *Post-American* 3, No. 1 (January, 1974), 8.

⁴² John Hesselink, “The Church in a Technological Society,” *Reformed Journal* 23, No. 1 (January, 1973), 10. Hesselink worried about “the creation of a wholly artificial environment,” that “sociotechnics is coming to be the dominant method of social control.” Also see Bonnie M. Greene, “On Leaving It to the Technocrats,” *Vanguard* (September-October, 1975), 27. Greene wrote that “One of the problems plaguing

Charles Reich maintained, produced “a new man ... one adapted to the demands of the machine.”⁴³ Kallio, citing Reich, feared that “a rampant technology” threatened to turn life into a “structured, sterile, concrete existence.”⁴⁴ Wheaton student Scott Monaghan also worried the loss of freedom. In a 1968 book review of the humanist Erich Fromm, Monaghan wrote against “the method itself” being the final authority in the decision-making process” and of “the machine and technological concepts becoming an impersonal god to which we entrust ourselves.”⁴⁵ Trusting “experimental scientific reasoning as the source of meaning,” Monaghan explained, “reduces a man to an experimentable, machine-like object or operator ... and dehumanizes humans.”⁴⁶ The bureaucratic maze, buttressed by science and technology, threatened to extinguish human autonomy and creativity.

French philosopher Jacques Ellul’s meditations on “technological tyranny” mediated New Left social thought for young evangelicals still concerned about faith. Ellul, noted for his personal piety and resistance to the Nazi regime in France, offered young evangelicals a faith-friendly translation of secular leftists such as Charles Reich and C. Wright Mills.⁴⁷ Ellul most centrally contended that science and technology

the people and organizations devoted to responsible consumption and care of the earth is the almost unassailable position of the technocrats, whose scientific credentials give their pronouncements such weight that anyone who introduces anything but technical data into a public debate is likely to be treated as interesting but finally irrelevant.”

⁴³ Charles A. Reich, *The Greening of America: How the Youth Revolution Is Trying to Make America Livable* (New York: Random House, 1970).

⁴⁴ Bill Kallio, “Price of Progress Too High,” 4.

⁴⁵ Scott Monaghan, “Fromm Decries Mechanization,” *Wheaton Record* 91, No. 8 (November 8, 1968), 3.

⁴⁶ Calvin Seerveld, “Christian Faith for Today,” *Vanguard* (January February 1972), 8.

⁴⁷ Ellul seemed both pleased and amused by his sudden popularity among evangelicals. In a letter to *Right On*, he praised them for their accurate portrayal of his writings and for generally being “excellent and full of Christian humor.” He showed, however, his distance at the University of Bordeaux from the evangelical community upon revealing he had never heard of his fellow European icon Francis Schaeffer or

desacralized and replaced Scripture. He asserted that science had been elevated to the position of the sacred amidst the world's economic systems, all of which relied on "the totality of methods rationally arrived at, and having absolute efficiency (for a given stage of development) in every field of human activity."⁴⁸ The media, perhaps the most insidious form of technology, continued Ellul, spreads a hollow and efficient Western culture. "Mass media," he concluded, "provides the essential link between the individual and the demands of the technological society."⁴⁹ The technocrats use media to "determine our lives without our being able to intervene or, as yet, control it."⁵⁰

Ellul enjoyed a cult following among key young evangelicals, who admired his intellectual fortitude in urging Christian social involvement to resist the "scientism of the military, corporate and educational elites."⁵¹ Many evangelicals echoed his concerns. A

evangelical apologist John Warwick Montgomery. See Jacques Ellul, "Letters to the Editor," *Right On* 4, No. 4 (October, 1972), 2

⁴⁸ Jacques Ellul, *The Technological Society* (New York: Knopf, 1964), 25.

⁴⁹ Ellul, *Technological Society*, 22. Ellul contended that media was so insidious that even the radical Left was susceptible to co-option. Seerveld writes that the radicals are likely to foment "a burlesque instead of a revolution, as Ellul suggests, co-opted by the mass media and liberal reformers if it wants to get anything positive done." See Seerveld, "Christian Faith for Today," 10.

⁵⁰ Jacques Ellul, *Perspectives on Our Age* (New York: Seabury Press, 1981). *Vanguard* affirmed Ellul's critique of the media: because the scientism of commercial psychology was so sophisticated, the advertising, block walls, and ingenious displays of "the ad-men mould us into the image they want for us—the suburban 'lady of leisure,' the 'fun' family, the sophisticated follower of Consciousness III, or the successful businessman, perhaps." See Bonnie M. Greene, "Standing in Front of the Wrong Mirror," *Vanguard* (November 1972), 6. For a less critical perspective than Ellul and Greene, but equally concerned, see Egbert Schuurman, *Reflections on the Technological Society* (Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1977).

⁵¹ David Gill, editor of CWLF's *Right On*, cited Ellul in nearly every issue, repeatedly telling readers of Ellul's "brilliant Christian critique of political realities." See David Gill, "The Cross and the Flag," *Right On* 4, No. 7 (February 1973), 17. Gill's Ph.D. dissertation from UCLA was on Ellul. Also see Sharon Gallagher and David Gill, "Notes from the Catacombs," *Right On* 3, No. 12 (June 1972), 3. "For Ellul (and for *Right On*)," wrote the Gill and Gallagher, "the reality of God and a relationship to Jesus as Lord cannot be divorced from the reality of the political and socio-economic conditions around us." *Vanguard*, for example, advertised Ellul's books. See page 2 of the January 1971 issue of *Vanguard*. Also see Michael Woodruff, "Under Cover," *HIS* 32, No. 2 (November 1971); Vernard Eller, "A Look at Jacques Ellul," *Wittenburg Door*, No. 22 (December-January 1974-1975), 8-12; and Vernon Grounds, "Undercover," *HIS* 33, No. 4 (January 1973), 22-23. Grounds writes, "More technologized, rationalized, centralized, depersonalized and dehumanized statism. This—not imperialism, communism, colonialism, capitalism or

Westmont student, for example, marshaled Ellul's writings in a scathing indictment of Watergate, arguing that technology in the form of computer files and wiretapping technology had aided the immorality of the Nixon administration.⁵² A campus pastor in Illinois worried about the "self-perpetuating technocracy to which man is becoming enslaved. What man makes is no longer his tool but his master. The idols of bigger, more, and faster must be demolished before we sacrifice ourselves on their altars."⁵³ A reader of *The Other Side* from southern Oregon mocked technology in "The 23rd Psalm of Scientism."⁵⁴ Ladon Sheets, a former IBM executive turned young evangelical, lamented:

"It is unlikely that the men and women who weld or operate a machine tool or keypunch payroll data at Pratt and Whitney think of the connection between their job and the tens of thousands of persons killed by bombs dropped by B-52's powered by P&W jet engines. I see this as the crux of the problem. In today's technocratic society, tasks are broken down to such minute detail that almost no one feels responsible for the final events ... not the design engineer, the board of directors, nor Congress people, nor those who willingly permit tax dollars (a symbol of their labor) to be sent to the Pentagon, by way of IRS, each pay period. To put it simply, the US has evolved the most complex societal system in human history ... and no one is in charge."⁵⁵

neo-fascism—is the enemy of authentic freedom and fulfillment." Ellul also had a following in Germany among a youth organization called Youth Christians in the Offense. See John Rafferty, "Letters to the Editor," *Right On* 5, No. 10 (April 1974), 2. Evangelical apologist Os Guinness hoped that Ellul would "emerge as the critical voice for the seventies. See Guinness quoted in David Gill, "Presence of the Kingdom," *Right On* 5, No. 2 (August 1973), 6. Also see Os Guinness, *The Dust of Death: A Critique of the Establishment and the Counter Culture, and the Proposal for a Third Way* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1973), 131-136.

⁵² Brendan Furnish, "The Big Brother Syndrome," *Right On* 5, No. 1 (June 1973), 1.

⁵³ Bob Ross to Ron Sider, August 25, 1973, in Folder "1973 Chicago Declaration Planning," ESA Archives.

⁵⁴ Ira Edwards, "The 23rd Psalm of Scientism," *The Other Side* 14, No. 3 (March 1978), 27. "Science is my shepherd; I shall always want more. It maketh me to lie down exhausted; It leadeth me beside the polluted waters. It discredits my soul; It driveth me in the highways of self-righteousness for progress' sake. Yea, though I ride through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil. For science refutes good and evil. Its government agencies and their staffs, they comfort me. They prepare a table before me, out of sight of the poor. They anoint my head with tranquilizers; My excesses run all over. Surely affluence and self-gratification shall entice me all the days of my life, after which nothing matters."

⁵⁵ Ladon Sheets, "Door Reports," *Wittenburg Door*, No. 31 (June-July 1976), 24.

Many evangelical students charged that the American educational system was training them to be lemmings in the bureaucratic society.⁵⁶ Young Life worker Bill Milliken explained that the New York City school system was “a dehumanizing factory.”⁵⁷ Lane Dennis, who moved to the northern woods of Michigan to escape modern technology, similarly warned readers of the *Post-American* that “the nature of our relationship with technological society,” abetted by the media and education, could be “extremely dehumanizing.”⁵⁸

Young evangelicals, then, were not immune from the anxiety felt by children of the 1950s about automation, loss of creative work, and unfeeling, intrusive corporate and government bureaucracies.⁵⁹ Nor were they impervious to the technological advances in weaponry as “the constant threat of the bomb hung over” their heads.”⁶⁰ Goudzwaard intoned, “Our gods of progress, ever-expanding GNP, technological innovation, and

⁵⁶ See, for example, Tom Malcolm, “Education and the Public Purpose,” *Vanguard* 7, No. 4 (July-August 1977), 17; Paul Fromer, “Brush Fire: The Berkeley Affair,” *HIS* 25, No. 9 (June 1965), 38-40, 44-45. CWLF held forums on the ethics of the “multiversity,” and many students within InterVarsity were co-belligerents with campus radicals in objecting to the impersonality of large universities.

⁵⁷ Milliken, *So Long, Sweet Jesus*, 128. Similarly CWLF objected to the public school system, which “is so wrapped up by the structure of bureaucracy that there is no simple way to untangle it and place it into the hands of the community of people it is supposed to serve.” See “Is There Merit in Meritt?” *Right On* 2, No. 23 (April 1, 1971), 1.

⁵⁸ Lane Dennis, quoted in “A Conversation with Young Evangelicals,” *Post-American* 4, No. 1 (January, 1975), 8. Living in smaller communities and off the land, which I discuss in the next chapter, became important ways for young evangelicals to resist the technocracy.

⁵⁹ The Harvard InterVarsity chapter wrote, “The fact is that power—political power—is gravitating surely, and not so slowly either, toward the scientists and technocrats, the high priests of the new ecumenical faith. . . . The ordinary man moves further in to the age of automation.” See undated issue of the *Cambridge Fish* in Folder 344:7, InterVarsity Collection, BGC Archives. An InterVarsity chapter at the University of Wisconsin worried about government censorship. They printed their tabloid, “just taking advantage of freedom of speech and press while they last.” See undated issue of *Manna* in Box 344, Folder 5, “*Manna* Vol.1, No. 3” in InterVarsity Collection, BGC Archives. Also see Rip Hodson, “Whose Ear Is at My Keyhole?” *The Other Side* 7, No. 5 (September-October 1971), 19-21.

⁶⁰ Milliken, *So Long, Sweet Jesus*, 46.

scientific automation have failed us.”⁶¹ Fed by New Left sociology, young evangelicals struck against what most observers have seen as elements universally supported by evangelicals and the New Right: big business and technology.

These two elements, contended evangelical leftists, necessarily resulted in a third: American imperialism. Though fortified by a booming economy and new technologies, the tremendous appetites of corporations required ever-expanding markets that spilled outside American borders. The United States, Wallis contended, nurtured an “expansionist thrust” both economically and militarily.⁶² Young evangelical leftists drew such connections between economic growth and American imperialism from the scholarship of New Left historians, especially William Appleman Williams. Some read Williams’s *Tragedy of American Diplomacy*, the primer of revisionist history, as well as other leftist interpretations of American foreign policy.⁶³ The Post-Americans, for example, assigned readings for community seminars that included Gabriel Kolko’s *The Roots of American Diplomacy*, and M. J. Purcy’s *The U.S.A. Astride the Globe*.⁶⁴ Jill Shook, whose class “U.S. Imperialism around the World” sparked her participation in leftist politics at Central Michigan University, later joined CWLF and influenced the

⁶¹ Bob Goudwaard, “Have Our Gods Failed Us?” *Vanguard* (August-September 1972), 3.

⁶² Jim Wallis, “Invisible Empire,” *Post-American* 2, No. 5 (November-December 1973), 1.

⁶³ William Appleman Williams, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1959).

⁶⁴ For young evangelical citations of Williams, see “Bibliography: People’s Christian Coalition, November 1971,” Box VII7, Folder “Peoples Christian Coalition Trinity,” in Sojourners Collection, WCSC; James R. Moore, “Mission as Subversion,” *Post-American* 2, No. 5 (December 1973), 6; Ronald A. Wells, “Watergate . . . And the American Presidency,” *Reformed Journal* 23, No. 9 (November 1973); Stanley W. Carlson, “Angola: Caught in Between,” *Vanguard* (March 1976), 6; and Reese, “Structure of Power,” 8-9. Wells did not fully endorse Williams’s *Some Presidents: Wilson to Nixon*, but he did take it seriously as a starting place for conversation about presidential and corporatist power. Reese, a former InterVarsity staff member, cited C. Wright Mills, Claude Julien, Gabriel Kolko, Carl Oglesby, Richard Barnet, and other leftist historians.

group's antagonistic views toward U.S. diplomatic policy.⁶⁵ American attempts to contain communism and spread democracy around the world, Williams and young evangelicals alike maintained, did not truly democratize the world, but rather betrayed an American attempt to solidify its imperial dominance.

If Ellul mediated New Left social thought to young evangelicals, Richard Barnet, a former government bureaucrat who attended Church of the Savior in Washington and served as a contributing editor to the *Post-American*, translated New Left critiques of American diplomacy.⁶⁶ Before life in the private sector, Barnet served in the State Department in the Kennedy administration. After a series of fruitless meetings regarding disarmament that were overly influenced by generals and weapons manufacturers, Barnet grew disillusioned. Feeling that "the major questions of government are not administrative but moral questions," Barnet, only 33, and Marcus Raskin founded the left-leaning Institute for Policy Studies and authored of *Roots of War*, both attempts to speak "truth to power" outside the corridors of power. Succeeding presidential administrations fought back. As the institute thrust itself into New Left politics, the Johnson administration planted FBI informers in the Institute. Barnet later made Nixon's infamous "enemies list."⁶⁷

Like historian William Appleman Williams, Barnet argued that the basic economic and political structures of the United States shaped the nation's scandalous

⁶⁵ Jill Shook, "My Story," *Right On* 5, No. 12 (June 1974), 7.

⁶⁶ On his close ties with Church of the Savior, see Joe Holley, "Richard J. Barnet Dies; Founder of Institute for Policy Studies," *Washington Post*, December 24 2004, B6. Barnet was cited by InterVarsity even into the 1980s. See B.B., "Before You Vote," *HIS* 43, No. 1 (October 1984), 4. For an example of Barnet's influence on the *Post-Americans*, see Jim Wallis, "The Issue of 1972," *Post-American* 1, No. 5 (Fall 1972), 2-3.

⁶⁷ Holley, "Richard J. Barnet Dies," B6.

actions abroad. American-dominated multinational corporations favored non-democratic regimes because of “the good investment climate” that strong military dictators often delivered.⁶⁸ In fact, Barnet argued, the U.S. government, when American investments were at stake, explicitly preferred authoritarian over unstable democratic governments. Brazil was a case in point. “The United States government,” he wrote, “with the strong encouragement and complicity of particular corporations, has played an important role in bringing the Brazilian government to power and in supporting it and rejuvenating it and giving it massive aid,” a result of applying putatively amoral managerial and scientific techniques.⁶⁹ Barnet charged himself and his technocratic former colleagues recruited by Kennedy with perpetrating the Vietnam War. In its efforts to expand markets overseas (hid by the ideological mask of anti-communism), the United States turned into a “homicidal menace for millions of innocent people of Indochina.” Barnet called the impersonal killing of foreign enemies through new technologies and divisions of labor “bureaucratic homicide.”⁷⁰ Too many layers of management separated the president in the White House from soldiers in the jungles of Vietnam.

Barnet’s *Roots of War* grounded expansionist American foreign policy and the Vietnam crisis in the kind of domestic sources discussed above: expansionist national security managers eager to exercise bureaucratic power and to collude with multinational corporations. These elements exacerbated America’s inherent imperialist streak, causing

⁶⁸ Tony Campolo echoed Barnet’s argument: “The U.S. has become the agent to maintain the status quo. We will back almost any dictator or potentate or regime as long as it does not interfere with the interest of U.S. investments.” See “Door Interview,” *Wittenburg Door*, No. 32 (August-September 1976), 17.

⁶⁹ See Wes Michaelson, “Richard Barnet on Multinational Corporations,” *Sojourners* 5, No. 2 (February, 1976), 17.

⁷⁰ Richard J. Barnet, *Roots of War* (New York: Atheneum, 1972), 3-23

not only the Vietnam War, but dozens of American military interventions—one every eighteen months—from 1948 to 1965. The increasing pace of American military intervention across the world revealed the illegitimacy of a purely technical approach. Vietnam, Barnet contended, had brought the nation to “a spiritual crisis in which the ... very legitimacy of our system [is] under attack.”⁷¹ For other young evangelical leftists, the Vietnam War also signified the failure of the liberal consensus. Near the denouement of fighting in the early 1970s, Wallis wrote that “the now irrefutable facts of the Vietnam War ... have led many to a basic questioning of the purposes and quality of our society.”⁷² CWLF, likewise, blamed “the System” for supporting “the war machine in Southeast Asia. It is the system that has carefully nurtured the most disastrous program of economic and military imperialism this planet as ever witnessed.”⁷³ Jill Shook, linking the American presence in Vietnam to hefty contracts with Esso International, Lear Siegler, ITT Federal Electric, implied that corporations shaped American diplomacy.⁷⁴

A more subtle, though equally insidious, arrangement between corporatism and diplomacy played out in humanitarian aid. Senator Mark Hatfield accused the State and Agriculture Departments of offering famine relief on the basis of where the U.S. could create future markets to sell American products. World hunger, he contended after

⁷¹ Barnet, *Roots of War*; Barnet, *Intervention and Revolution: The United States in the Third World* (New York: World Publishing Co., 1968); William Stringfellow, “Open Letter to Jimmy Carter,” *Sojourners* 5, No. 8 (October 1976), 7-8. On Barnet’s continuing critiques of American foreign policy, see Barnet, “Losing Moral Ground: The Foundations of U.S. Foreign Policy,” *Sojourners* 14, No. 3 (March 1985), 24-28; issue entitled “Empire: The Religion of America,” *Sojourners* 15, No. 5 (May 1986).

⁷² Wallis, “Invisible Empire,” *Post-American*, 1.

⁷³ “Echo from a Politico.”

⁷⁴ Jill Shook, “Vietnam Today,” *Right On* 6, No. 1 (July-August 1974), 7. Sharon Gallagher also impugned military spending, writing, “When we can already kill our enemies several times over, why do we plan to spend billions of dollars on a bomber that may be obsolete by the time it’s built? One answer is that some powerful corporations will profit from building it.” See Sharon Gallagher, *Right On* 6, No. 10 (June 1975), 2. Also see Clancy Dunigan, “Do We Need the B-1 Bomber?” *Right On*, 6, No. 10 (June 1975), 3, 5.

attending a world conference in Rome on hunger and poverty, was far more threatening to global stability than maintaining a weapons balance with the Soviet Union.⁷⁵ Yet politicians and government bureaucrats insisted on a massive budget for national defense, Hatfield lamented, presumably under the illusion that military spending could spark a boom economy. “The ever-growing consumer society is thus at odds with world peace,” echoed Wallis. “An economic system that results in 6% of the world’s population consuming over 50% of the world’s resources each year while millions starve, cannot expect peace in the world.”⁷⁶

Meanwhile, the U.S. was accelerating its military build-up. “The Prussianization of the United States is proceeding apace,” wrote William Cuthbertson. Drawing from Ellul’s notion of a propagandistic media, Cuthbertson and others noted how a martial spirit flourished among Americans. “The saddest part of the spectacle is that the American people, once intensely anti-militaristic, are, for the most part blissfully unaware.”⁷⁷ With no less a respected authority than Mark Hatfield backing them, young evangelicals sought to inform the brainwashed populace by speaking out against American imperialism.⁷⁸ Drinking deep from the wells of revisionist history and New Left sociology, some of the more militant young evangelicals eyed conspiracy at the highest levels of the United States government. The demand for increased corporate profits, they believed, drove unjust distributions of humanitarian aid, sparked wars that

⁷⁵ Mark Hatfield, “Mark Hatfield on World Hunger,” *Right On* 6, No. 7 (March 1975), 4.

⁷⁶ Wallis, “Invisible Empire,” 1.

⁷⁷ William W. Cuthbertson, “The Christian, the American Military Establishment, and War,” 67, in Robert G. Clouse, Robert D. Linder, and Richard V. Pierard, eds., *Politics and Protest: Christianity and Contemporary Affairs* (Greenwood, S.C.: Attic Press, 1968).

⁷⁸ James C. Hefley and Edward E. Plowman, *Washington: Christians in the Corridors of Power* (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House Publishers, 1975), 110.

killed millions in Southeast Asia, and imposed jarring systems of technology on third world nations. America, they increasingly asserted, had lost its Christian moorings, if it even had spiritual origins in the first place.

These musings defied the typical evangelical view of the nation. Born into patriotic fundamentalist homes, many young evangelicals instinctively viewed the United States with optimism and gratefulness for the freedoms it offered. A succession of events in the 1960s and 1970s however tarnished this image. While some retained a measure of optimism through the midst of bold lack of action on behalf of civil rights, the Vietnam War, a series of assassinations, the Watergate Scandal, others increasingly did not. Some radical evangelicals—speaking of “Amerika” or “the American way of Death”—corrupted patriotic phrases to express their own anger toward their nation.⁷⁹ All felt despair about the increasingly visible warts of their nation.

Those who criticized “Amerika”—generally ICS, the Post-Americans, and CWLF—typically felt that the nation was nearly beyond repair. The pristine origins imagined by many evangelicals, they argued, were a farce. Even the American Revolution was not very revolutionary, argued Art Gish of the Church of the Brethren, because it did not fundamentally challenge slavery, the economy, or society.⁸⁰ The break from Britain two centuries earlier did not herald an era of new freedoms, argued David Gill. “The same forces of racism, imperialism, pride, violence, greed, technology,

⁷⁹ On “American Way of Death,” see especially the early issues of *Vanguard* that were distributed at InterVarsity’s Urbana 70. For example, Michael Walton, “Dedicated to all International Students at Urbana ’70,” *Vanguard* (December 31, 1970). Copy in Box 68, Folder 7, “Urbana 1961-1974,” InterVarsity Collection, BGC Archives. On the use of “Amerika,” see Richard Quebedeaux, *The Young Evangelicals: Revolution in Orthodoxy* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), 120; Joe Roos, “American Civil Religion,” *Post-American* 1, No. 3 (Spring 1972), 8.

⁸⁰ Arthur G. Gish, *The New Left and Christian Radicalism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1970), 115.

politization, corruption,” he wrote, “have in fact ruled both England and the United States. July 4, 1776 did not change that.”⁸¹ Mourning American abuse toward blacks, women, third-world nations, and the poor, others compared America to Babylon or Rome.⁸² In a speech written by Post-American Wes Michaelson, Hatfield told a group of evangelical students in Western Pennsylvania that “Rome has begun to burn. The time has run out. The challenge and the promise are ours. No cross, no crown. It may be too late to change the historical digression of this country, but it is not too late for us to give a witness to the Christ who came and did not sanction the status quo.”⁸³ The cover of a 1973 issue of the *Post-American* dedicated to exposing American imperialism featured an image of Uncle Sam declaring, “I Love You and Have a Wonderful Plan for Your Country”—a not-so-subtle reference to Campus Crusade’s patriotism and “Four Spiritual Laws” method of evangelism.⁸⁴ “god is an american,” read another *Post-American* cartoon, “and Nixon is his prophet.”⁸⁵ These bitter jabs implicitly rejected the traditional evangelical jeremiad dating back to the Puritans. Calls for America to return to the faith of its fathers, according to these evangelicals, only perpetuated the myth of national piety and the inauthenticity of civil religion. Even as late as the bicentennial, the bitter taste of

⁸¹ David Gill, “Easter and Independence,” *Right On* 7, No. 7 (April, 1976), 10.

⁸² James W. Skillen, “Bicentennial: Jubilee or Judgment Day?” *Vanguard* (January-February 1976), 9. Skillen, a professor at the evangelical Gordon College, wrote, “Our bicentennial celebration ought not to be a glorying in the questionable revolution of 1776.” Notes from a Post-American Bible study called America the most dangerous nation in the world. “She now stands for what Rome stood for.” See “Political Interpretations of John’s Apocalypse,” in Box XI1, Folder “Post-American Letters/Memos/Info from the Office,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC. Also see Jim Wallis, “Evangelism in Babylon,” *Post-American* 1, No. 4 (Summer 1972).

⁸³ See, for example, Bert Witvoet, “Jubilee 1979—Visited and Enjoyed,” *Vanguard* 9, No. 3 (May-June 1979), 27.

⁸⁴ See the November-December 1973 cover of the *Post-American*. Campus Crusade’s “Four Spiritual Laws” tract began with the statement, “God loves you and has a wonderful plan for your life.” Similarly CWLF asserted, “Nationalism is a transitory concept on the way to the New Jerusalem.” See Sharon Gallagher, “Why Do the Nations Rage?” *Right On* 3, No. 12 (June 1972), 13.

⁸⁵ See the cover of the Fall 1972 issue of the *Post-American*.

a fallen nation remained on lips of evangelical radicals, evidence of a formative encounter with the New Left.⁸⁶

II.

Despite their bitter denunciation of the nation; their rejection of unlimited economic growth, big business, technology, and imperialism; their borrowing from New Left thinkers such as Marcuse, Mills, Roszak, and Williams; their rejection of both liberal and conservative sensibilities; and their adoption of activist methods and Manichean language, radical evangelicals have not been classified as part of the New Left. Movement scholars, often unversed in evangelical history, bump up against thorny questions of periodization and definition when considering the incongruities of radical evangelicalism. These questions reveal the overly rigid boundaries of the New Left in sixties historiography.

A genre-bending 1970 book by Art Gish, a Church of the Brethren veteran of the civil rights and antiwar movements, underscores these problems of categorization. In the aptly titled *The New Left and Christian Radicalism* Gish urged evangelicals to merge the “old, old story” with the New Left. Gish argued that Vietnam, racism, and poverty exposed an “evil system that forces men to do evil deeds.” “We reject,” wrote Gish, “the bourgeois liberal contention that all change must be rational, orderly, and within the limits of the present system. The liberal believes that the tendency for progress is incorporated into the very nature of our institutions. Thus he is forced to believe that continual progress is being made; even while poverty, starvation, militarism, and racism

⁸⁶ John Perkins, “Bicentennial in the Other America,” *Sojourners* 5, No. 1 (January 1976), 20-23.

are on the increase.” Gish condemned this view as a naïve commitment to the “present system and a refusal to understand how disorderly, irrational, and violent the present system is.” Moral and spiritual purity demanded resistance to a compromising liberalism.

Gish, however, while echoing the Port Huron Statement’s stress on political purity, authenticity, and stress on small, democratic structures, suggested an idiosyncratic interpretation of the movement. The New Left, he argued, was an ideological descendent of sixteenth-century Anabaptism. Like the contemporary political protest movement, sixteenth-century Anabaptism nurtured a two-kingdom dualism that sharply distinguished between the kingdom of the world and the kingdom of the church. Moreover, it built a socialist economy that “rejected selfish, capitalistic motives,” embraced “the simple life,” adopted nonviolence, and spurned political change from the top down. Anabaptists, who adhered to a “priesthood of all believers,” had even engaged in an early form of “participatory democracy.” The New Left, in refusing “to work through the magistrates to achieve their goals,” resembled radical Christian faith in general and the Anabaptist tradition in particular.⁸⁷

Where the New Left fell short, Gish contended, was in its preoccupation with secular solutions to social problems. Affirming basic emphases of evangelicalism such as “heart change” and personal salvation, Gish added that secular leftists “fail to recognize that sin also has personal roots ... for it is man who built those oppressive structures.”⁸⁸

In explicitly marrying evangelical Christianity and the New Left into a coherent structure,

⁸⁷ Arthur G. Gish, *The New Left and Christian Radicalism* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans Publishing, 1970), 27, 49, 57, 66, 67, 71, 119.

⁸⁸ Gish, *New Left and Christian Radicalism*, 46. Bill Milliken echoed Gish’s critique, explaining to Maoists in the late 1960s that “following Jesus requires new structures, but in the context of my becoming a new person.” See Milliken, *So Long, Sweet Jesus*, 156.

Gish departed from the secular movement. While the diagnosis was the same—that industrialization, new technology, and automation quashed human dignity and creativity, that the military-industrial complex generated wars in third-world nations, that unlimited economic growth produced pollution—the solution was not. Gish suggested that only a loving God could truly liberate his followers from conformity to the established order. Christ, not radical politics nor eastern spirituality, was the ultimate weapon against the technocracy. Belief in divine transcendence could not only lift individuals out of a bureaucratic morass but also offer resources to help politically reconstruct a broken society. Faith in Christ added to leftist politics offered the best hope for a humane and just society. Radical evangelicals in essence sacralized the standard New Left narrative of twentieth-century American history with peculiarly evangelical addendums.

Gish's book, buoyed by its publication from a respected evangelical publisher, enjoyed readership from a generation of evangelical students who wanted to challenge established structures, yet retain their parents' stress on the need for personal conversion. The *Post-American*, *The Other Side*, and several InterVarsity chapter newsletters, for example, reprinted excerpts of *The New Left and Christian Radicalism*.⁸⁹ It circulated among nascent Post-Americans, who added it to required reading lists for seminars in Chicago and evangelical college classrooms. Young evangelical literature repeatedly

⁸⁹ For reprints and reviews of Gish, see David Gill, review of *the New Left and Christian Radicalism*, by Art Gish, *Right On* 5, No. 9 (March 1974), 8; Art Gish, "The New Left and Christian Radicalism," *The Other Side* 6, No. 5 (September-October 1970), 16-22; Arthur G. Gish, "The New Left and Christian Radicalism," *Post-American* 1, No. 1 (Fall, 1971), 8; Gish, "To Be a Christian Is to Be a Radical," *Manna* 1, No. 3 and No. 4 in Folder 344:5, InterVarsity Collection, BGC Archives. On required reading, see Boyd Reese, "Is Sojourners Marxist? An Analysis of Recent Charges," *TSF Bulletin* 8 (November-December 1984), 17. Also see "The Quest for Discipleship: A Summer Education-Action Seminar" syllabus in Box IV3, Folder "News Releases and Post-American," in Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

affirmed Gish's themes, particularly his basic insistence on linking spiritual principles to contemporary leftist politics.⁹⁰

The late publishing date of Gish's effort and the tardy emergence of young evangelicals in general, however, camouflaged the evangelical New Left in broader circles. Few evangelicals actually joined SDS or other New Left groups.⁹¹ The anti-authoritarian language of early 1960s participatory democracy did not result in evangelical egalitarian communities until 1970. The literature of Roszak, Marcuse, and Whyte penetrated the campuses of Wheaton and Calvin only by the late 1960s.⁹² Evangelicals in Berkeley did not voice the language of the streets until the late 1960s. Not until the early 1970s did young evangelicals nurture lofty aims of transforming entire societies beyond the university or their own tradition. Even then, the Post-Americans, who never grew beyond 50 full members in its intentional community, did not reach 40,000 readers by 1980, a full decade after the secular New Left staggered to an unseemly end.⁹³ Evangelical radicals—affiliated primarily with the Post-Americans, CWLF, and ICS—remained a minority within evangelical political progressivism,

⁹⁰ Boyd Reese, for example, used the text in a course on Christian social involvement he taught at Trinity College. See Reese, "Is Sojourners Marxist?" 14-17.

⁹¹ For examples of the very few evangelicals in SDS, see Campolo, "Door Interview," 23; David Larsen, "Evangelical Christian Higher Education, Culture, and Social Conflict: A Niebuhrian Analysis of Three Colleges in the 1960s" (Ph.D. dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1992), 167-168; Milliken, *So Long, Sweet Jesus*, 100-111; Richard Mouw interview, July 12, 2006.

⁹² The Post-Americans were a primary conduit of New Left thought to the masses of potential young evangelical converts around the nation. Holding seminars throughout Chicago and at evangelical schools like Wheaton and Houghton on topics such as "The Structure of American Wealth and Power," "The Power Elite," "Corporate Capitalism," and "War and U.S. Globalism," the Post-Americans built up a base of support among young evangelicals. See, for example, the syllabus for A Chicago seminar entitled "A Quest for Discipleship: A Summer Education-Action Seminar Led by Members of the *Post-American* Staff," in Folder "Post-American Internal," Box XI1, Sojourners Collection, WCSC. For the bulletin of a November 1971 all-campus forum led by Wallis and six Post-Americans held at Houghton College, see "Radical Christianity in Contemporary Culture" in Folder "Post-American—Internal," Box XI1, Sojourners Collection, WCSC. They held workshops on "New Left, Counter Culture, and Black Liberation," "Vietnam and Foreign Policy," and "Man and Technocracy."

⁹³ Ed Spivey, Jr., interview, June 22, 2005.

themselves a minority within their religious tradition. Evangelicals were small, unnoticed latecomers to the movement.

Moreover, as Gish's *Christian Radicalism* suggests, not all New Leftist rhetoric and ideas flowed unadulterated through the ranks of the evangelical left. Though some used rhetoric from the counterculture and even protested on occasion, many explicitly rejected contemporaneous incarnations of the New Left. First, young evangelicals rejected its spiritual vacuity. While many in the New Left nurtured a vague spirituality, young evangelicals' left-leaning engagement of politics emanated directly out of their faith commitment. "We weren't against what they were doing," remembers Sharon Gallagher of SDS-CWLF battles in Berkeley in 1969. "We just saw souls."⁹⁴ Richard Mouw, active in the University of Chicago chapter of SDS, also left the organization in protest of its lack of spiritual depth.⁹⁵ Even Jim Wallis, perhaps the most politically driven of all young evangelicals and a former prominent organizer in the Michigan State University chapter of SDS, left in utter disillusionment the movement he called "once the most hopeful force" opposing "the system" to attend Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.⁹⁶ His faith, while drawing on New Left politics, had superseded those politics.

⁹⁴ Sharon Gallagher interview, July 7, 2006.

⁹⁵ Richard Mouw interview, July 12, 2006, Pasadena, Cal. Mouw was also a leader in the "Ban the Bomb" movement at Chicago, helping to occupy the administration building in 1967. For an example of an SDS member who left the movement for CWLF after spiritual conversion, see Randy Berdahl, "Randy Turns On," *Right On* 2, No. 18 (November 19, 1970), 1. Also see Susan Starkey, "Like Banging Your Head Against the Wall," *Right On* 3, No. 7 (January 1972).

⁹⁶ Wallis, *Faith Works*, 11-13; Jim Wallis, "The Movemental Church," *Post American* 1, No. 2 (Winter 1972), 2-3. Wallis exited the New Left at Michigan State in the spring of 1970 just as the SDS chapter dwindled from being able to mobilize tens of thousands to a handful of stalwarts. More fundamental to his disillusionment was SDS's "collapse into moral confusion." Wallis remembers the "first time antiwar protesters began trashing downtown store windows in East Lansing, Michigan. I wondered what was happening to us. I saw the dangers of hating your country (as some antiwar protesters came to do) instead of loving it enough to try to correct its mistakes. I questioned how a movement for peace could itself degenerate into bitterness, violence, and even hatred. I began to learn that it's easier to criticize your government's policy than to ask tough questions of yourself."

The Christian gospel, he told an audience of students at the American Association of Evangelical Students meeting at Oral Roberts University, was “the most revolutionary—the most radical of all.” “The real revolution can’t just deal with human structures,” Wallis told a *Tulsa Tribune* reporter. “It has to go to the heart of the problem, and the gospel is addressed to all needs, spiritually and socially.”⁹⁷

Os Guinness in his 1973 *Dust of Death*, a thick philosophical tome that wended its way from the Renaissance to the New Left’s Marcuse, explained that that the “Great Betrayal” had replaced the “Great Refusal”: “The New Left’s ‘great refusal’ of the values, principles, ideals, and goals of a bureaucratic society was actually based on the same ‘humanist premises’ that it presumed to reject.” This was tragic, Guinness observed, because the New Left’s grievances were valid and their courage admirable. Moreover, David Riesman, Herbert Marcuse, and C. Wright Mills were modern prophets in their judgment of the technocracy. Guinness wrote, “There had been no lack of human thought, action, and effort—even blood—all given in generous quantities. But underneath the effort of a generation lay dust.”⁹⁸ Despite its incisive critiques of the establishment, the New Left lacked theological underpinnings and spiritual fortitude. Such problems kept Guinness, a chief lieutenant of Francis Schaeffer and critic of culture with affinities to leftist social critiques, from joining the New Left.

Second, young evangelicals objected to recent New Left interest in violence to spark social change. Wheaton student Bill Kallio—while resonating with the profound

⁹⁷ Quoted in Carol Langston, “Campus Rebel Finds New ‘Revolt’” *Tulsa Tribune* (March 26, 1971): 6B. In Box VII8, Folder “Jim Wallis at Trinity,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC. Similarly, after praising many aspects of the New Left, Paul Henry criticized the “moral bankruptcy” of the movement. It allowed individuals to “do their own thing” in regard to sex, drugs, and violence. Moreover, it lacked “any authoritative basis upon which to create a renewed sense of morality or social justice.” See Henry, “Evangelical Christianity and the Radical Left,” 97.

⁹⁸ Os Guinness, *Dust of Death*, ii.

disillusionment felt by SDS members in the early 1970s brought on by “a dehumanizing war and the assassination of three of America’s most idealistic leaders”—denounced its “excessive accent ... on social violence.”⁹⁹ Former Young Life worker Bill Milliken—still convinced that the “beast was big and oppressive” but not that “the only answer is violent revolution”—cut his ties with SDS and left for Koinonia Farm in Georgia.¹⁰⁰ The early-1970s abandonment of non-violence left many young evangelicals disenchanted with the New Left.¹⁰¹

Third, young evangelicals objected that the New Left had abandoned participatory democracy. The New Left turn toward racial separation violated the young evangelical impulse for beloved community and a “distinct radical democratic project” in which blacks could fully participate in the evangelical power structure.¹⁰² They wondered why the New Left would discard the early SDS ideal of blacks-white cooperation in throwing off extant Jim Crow laws, of taking freedom rides, of mutual training for direct action, and of worshipping together at black churches. When SDS affirmed the separatist direction of SNCC in 1967, young evangelicals charged that the movement had abandoned their ambitions of democracy. Moreover, power-grabbing by factions within the New Left, they suggested, pointed to the growing illiberal tendencies of the

⁹⁹ Bill Kallio, “An American Tragedy: The Generation of Cynics,” *Wheaton Record* 93, No. 6 (November, 1970), 4.

¹⁰⁰ Milliken, *So Long, Sweet Jesus*, 100.

¹⁰¹ CWLF member Jill Shook attended a graduate class on issues of liberation, revolution, and violence. Fourteen people attended the graduate class. By the end of the two weeks, she reported, two men who had come into the class convinced that violence was the only way to change things “were confessing their desire to give serious consideration to Jesus as Lord and to practice nonviolent resistance.” See “Dear Brothers and Sisters,” in Box 2, “Jill Shook, Jack Sparks,” CWLF Collection, GTU Archives.

¹⁰² Antony W. Alumkal, “American Evangelicalism in the Post-Civil Rights Era: A Racial Formation Theory Analysis,” *Sociology of Religion* 65, No. 3 (Fall 2004), 200.

movement. CWLF explained that the New Left increasingly resembled the fascist right in its demands for ideological conformity.¹⁰³

As these objections suggest, young evangelicals clearly resonated more fully with early forms of the movement.¹⁰⁴ Young evangelical rhetoric in the early 1970s sounded much like that of early 1960s New Left. Tellingly, Jim Wallis did not give potential recruits at Trinity copies of contemporary New Left literature. He urged them to read Jack Newfield's *A Prophetic Minority*, an adulatory tome written about the early years of SDS, when a commitment to civil rights, participatory democracy, and nonviolence characterized the movement.¹⁰⁵ They claimed the thought and spirit and methods of the New Left at a pristine moment long past, even appropriating the movement as an ideal type. The young evangelicals, it might be said, were New Leftist only in an ahistorical sense.

Given this problem of periodization, historians (if any even knew about radical evangelicals) have placed them outside the traditional boundaries of the New Left. But that might be the fault of a sixties historiography preoccupied with the trajectory of certain "pure" forms of the New Left. The initial wave of New Left historiography traced SDS from its egalitarian phase in the 1960s to its fragmentation along lines of identity in the early 1970s. This tale of declension has left little room for the many leftists who, after the disintegration of SDS, did not join the Weathermen, drop out, or get co-opted by the

¹⁰³ "A Brief History of the Revolution," In Box 2, "CWLF and Redeemer King Church," CWLF Collection, GTU Archives.

¹⁰⁴ Wheaton students paid fairly close attention (and were sometimes more sympathetic) to the early efforts of SDS. See, for example, Carol Ackerman, "SDS Founder Addresses Forum Meeting on Chicago Government, Daley Machine," *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 31 (May 18, 1967), 4; "SDS Protests Us Trade with South Africa," *Wheaton Record* 87, No. 24 (March 25, 1965), 4.

¹⁰⁵ See Reese, "Is Sojourners Marxist? An Analysis of Recent Charges." See Jack Newfield, *A Prophetic Minority* (New York: New American Library, 1966).

right.¹⁰⁶ There were many like Kirkpatrick Sale, one of the first chroniclers of the New Left, who strictly speaking, was not part of the movement he traced. Still, as he wrote in *SDS*, “I was, like most people I know, considerably changed by the events and processes of the sixties which SDS helped to fashion. . . . I came to share the same animus that motivated the shapers of SDS, the same sense of dislocation from the nation that inspired those still on the campuses, ultimately even the same radicalization that SDS generated not only in the universities but throughout so many levels of the society.”¹⁰⁷

Like Sale, many young evangelicals shared the essential spirit that shaped SDS. In fact, some, denouncing the illiberal turn of the movement, characterized themselves as the true carriers of the early tradition. A cohort of young evangelicals in the early 1970s claimed to be the *real* New Left.¹⁰⁸ Scholars, busy tracking the late-1960s immolation of the New Left, have ignored the evangelical incarnation of the New Left, much as they have ignored the kaleidoscopic mass of secular political radicals who were less than faithful in their readings of Tom Hayden and C. Wright Mills. The vitality of evangelical

¹⁰⁶ Histories of radicalism at elite American universities dominated early New Left historiography. See Max Heirich, *Spiral of Conflict: Berkeley, 1964* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971); Irwin Unger, *The Movement: A History of the American New Left, 1959-1972* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974); W. J. Rorabaugh, *Berkeley at War: The 1960s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); George R. Vickers, *The Formation of the New Left: The Early Years* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1975); Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam, 1989); James Miller, *Democracy Is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987). A second wave, to which I seek to contribute, explores New Left impulses on non-elite campuses, see Kenneth J. Heineman, *Campus Wars: The Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era* (New York: New York University Press, 1993); Doug Rossinow, *Politics of Authenticity*. In a particularly influential article, Wini Breines pointed out the organizational affinities of authors of the first wave, arguing that their former affiliations with SDS shaped their narratives in a necessarily partisan manner. See Breines, “Whose New Left?” *Journal of American History* 75, No. 2 (1988), 528-545.

¹⁰⁷ Kirkpatrick Sale, *SDS* (New York: Random House, 1973).

¹⁰⁸ Jim Wallis, “Reflections,” in Ronald J. Sider, ed., *The Chicago Declaration* (Carol Stream, Ill.: Creation House, 1974), 142. Wallis writes, “With the decline of the New Left and other movements for social change present in the sixties, along with the spreading radical Christian consciousness, it is highly probable that the strongest thrusts toward prophetic witness and social justice may well spring from those whose faith is Christ-centered and unapologetically biblical.”

radicalism, an ill-fit to standard narratives of the New Left or the religious right, suggests that boundaries established by scholars of the New Left require expansion beyond Students for a Democratic Society and elite college campuses.

III.

If the radical evangelical story highlights a blind spot in the historiography of the New Left, the evangelical encounter with radical politics also merits attention because of its role in shaping the evangelical political style. Despite their small numbers, evangelical New Leftists reintroduced an activist method and absolutist, moralistic style into twentieth-century evangelicalism.

Juxtaposed against antiwar protests at nearby universities in the Chicago area, activism on Wheaton's campus—the site of the new evangelicalism's first social protests—proved mild indeed. At nearby Northwestern University in the late 1960s, students stalled rush-hour traffic, barricaded the road, trashed the ROTC building, burned flags, and staged mock burials. At Wheaton, students followed procedure, swore off profanity in their antiwar chants, and prayed for their enemies. Nonetheless, even the polite protests of the mid- to late-1960s—let alone the more strident rhetoric and dramatic methods of the early 1970s—was a significant departure for mid-twentieth-century evangelicalism.

To be sure, the “entertaining evangelism” of Youth for Christ in the 1940s and 1950s had led the new evangelicalism toward a more exuberant, flashy style. But as Joel Carpenter shows, Youth for Christ maintained a positive stance toward the establishment,

contributing toward the formation of a new postwar civic faith.¹⁰⁹ The new evangelical participants and benefactors associated with Youth for Christ, generally patriotic and attentive to social propriety, loathed social protest. Moreover, new evangelicals prioritized personal over societal transformation. Two Wheaton students opposed to antiwar protests, for example, explained, “Christ was under the Roman government, a government that was corrupt, unjust, and militaristic. Yet his method was to work at the grass-roots level by showing individuals the need for a radical change in their lives. His was a positive approach, not a negative one of poisoning men’s minds against the government.”¹¹⁰ In advocating this “positive approach,” new evangelicals often marshaled the thirteenth chapter of Paul’s letter to the Romans, which asserted that the state has a sovereign right both to rule over its subjects and a duty to wage war. The church “forsakes the spirit of Christ,” argued a *Christianity Today* editor, when it uses “picketing, demonstration, and boycott” to pressure business leaders to hire more Negroes in their firms.¹¹¹

Such pronouncements infuriated most young evangelicals, who accused the evangelical establishment of justifying blind allegiance to the nation and avoiding messy racial and diplomatic problems.¹¹² Dissent, they argued, was necessary to correct the status quo. Spiritual resources should be used to judge, not merely legitimate current

¹⁰⁹ Youth for Christ received considerable accolades and money from civic leaders for its contributions in stemming juvenile delinquency. See Joel Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 161-176.

¹¹⁰ Priscilla Warmanen and Linda Johnson, “Advocate Positive Goals,” *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 29 (May 15, 1970), 5.

¹¹¹ Carl F. H. Henry, “Equality by Boycott,” *Christianity Today* 11, No. 12 (March 17, 1967), 27.

¹¹² See, for example, the refutation of Romans 13 by a Wheaton student in Shelley Schaap, “Upholds Right of Protest,” *Wheaton Record* 94, No. 26 (May 19, 1972), 5.

conditions.¹¹³ Wheaton student Rob Baptista argued, “If a person finds that the actions of his country violate his moral conscience, then active protest is not only legitimate, but imperative.”¹¹⁴ An evangelical student in the InterVarsity chapter at Cal-Berkeley wrote with some admiration about the Free Speech Movement: “I began to realize that by doing nothing, I was acting. I was supporting the status quo. . . . I decided it was my Christian obligation to picket.”¹¹⁵ “Christians are sometimes tools of the establishment,” wrote one subscriber of *Right On*. “The ‘hands off’ attitude of many Christians where injustice is concerned, has been a stumbling block to the propagation of the gospel. . . . there is not one reason why Christians shouldn’t picket and distribute literature at governmental offices, politic stations and draft boards.”¹¹⁶ While many young evangelicals assured critics that public acts of dissent were just one element of their holistic ministry, clearly civil disobedience was suddenly a live option for the tempestuous 1960s.¹¹⁷ Young evangelicals saw decorous evangelicalism as passé, even immoral, in the face of social injustice.

¹¹³ Contra Karl Marx, who contended that religion was an anti-radical force that legitimizes the status quo, recent scholars have pointed out the activist potential of religion. Smith writes, “Religion provides life, the world, and history with meaning, through a sacred reality that transcends those mundane realities. But in doing so, religion establishes a perceived objective reality above and beyond temporal life, the world, and history, that then occupies an independent and privileged position to act—through those who believe the religion—back upon the mundane world. That which is sacred and transcends temporal, earthly reality also stands in the position to question, judge, and condemn temporal earthly reality. In this way, the ultimate legitimator of the status quo can easily become its ultimate judge.” Christian Smith, “Correcting a Curious Neglect, or Bringing Religion Back In,” in *Disruptive Religion: The Force of Faith in Social-Movement Activism*, ed. Christian Smith (New York: Routledge, 1996), 6.

¹¹⁴ See Rob Baptista, “Obey Conscience or Law?” *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 9 (November 14, 1969), 4.

¹¹⁵ Ginger Johnston, “The Berkeley Affair Dilemma,” *HIS* 25, No. 9 (June 1965), 14-15.

¹¹⁶ Tom, “Letters to the Editor,” *Right On* 2, No. 24 (May 1, 1970), 2, 7.

¹¹⁷ See, for example, a letter to the editor from three Wheaton sophomores Bill Worcester June Hubbard, Karen Petersen, “Christians Can Combine Evangelism, Social Action,” *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 8 (November 7, 1969), 5. The letter was a response to Frank Green, a chemistry professor, who condemned a recent antiwar march on campus. He explained that they help run a coffeehouse ministry and pray as well as march in peace rallies. “We believe in a form of ‘total involvement,’” they wrote, “which includes direct action on social issues as well as evangelistic efforts. . . . We believe that the Vietnam War is morally unjustified and that killing even an ‘enemy’ is not in accord with Jesus’ teaching.”

The debate over civil disobedience at Wheaton, for example, only gradually translated into relaxed rules about demonstrations on campus.¹¹⁸ The demonstrative acts of a few students on behalf of civil rights—a couple of trips to the South to protest with Martin Luther King, Jr. and a boycott of the city of Wheaton’s segregated barbershops in the early 1960s—along with some threatened student demonstrations about campus rules in 1963 led the administration to vow suspension for students leading protests.¹¹⁹ By 1967 administrators had acknowledged protest as “a basic right students have, a basic freedom of expression.” Still, protesters knew that administrators and fellow students would likely frown upon their actions.¹²⁰ A poll taken earlier that year showed that only 37% of Wheaton students, though 61% of newspaper staff members, would join a march “if Negroes were being discriminated against in Wheaton.”¹²¹ Many still argued that protests subverted the ballot box. “A right originally intended to provide for the airing of grievances,” wrote student Steve Talbott, “is being distorted into a license for using mob coercion to exert direct pressure upon government for social and political change.”¹²²

¹¹⁸ A Wheaton College forum on civil disobedience in 1962 revealed early signs of the fragmenting evangelical consensus against extralegal activism. While Earle Cairns, a professor of history, told students that he could not find a sanction in Scripture for civil disobedience and that “a Christian should be submissive to every human institution because every human authority is given by God,” a majority of forum participants were more open to the possibility. Kenneth Kennard, a professor of philosophy, for example, pointed out that Peter defied authorities when he preached the gospel after being ordered not to. Attorney George Leighton, addressing the civil rights movement, told students that Christian duty demands protesting against certain state laws when they violate federal statutes and the Bill of Rights. See “Consensus of Bible Forum Favors Extension of Basic Human Rights,” *Wheaton Record* 85, No. 5 (October 4, 1962), 1.

¹¹⁹ “Semi-Weekly Broadcaster,” May 20, 1963, in File, “Protest, Student,” Vertical Files, WCA.

¹²⁰ See Roger Lundin, “Cadets Plan to Boycott ROTC Review.” In vertical file “ROTC,” WCA. Wheaton’s administration asked antiwar protesters not to assemble on college property, so that the demonstration would not appear to be college-sponsored. See “Wheaton Students Join Demonstration at Draft Board During Moratorium,” *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 5 (October 17, 1969), 3.

¹²¹ “Survey Compares Record Staff, Students,” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 16 (January 12, 1967), 8.

¹²² Steve Talbott, “The Right to Assemble—Was It Meant to Enable Coercive Tactics?” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 31 (May 18, 1967), 2.

The Vietnam War, though more distant geographically, threatened evangelical students' futures more directly and resulted in far more acts of dissent than the civil rights movement. As increasing numbers of students came down against the war, a new concern ignited a lively debate on evangelical campuses about the role of protest and civil disobedience, extending the question "Is the Vietnam War just?" to "If not, how should a Christian dissent from it?" Even the most eager evangelical protesters urged restraint. Not only should dissenters not break laws, they should nurture an inner spiritual decorum, wrote the editor of *HIS*. "If he earnestly believes that God is calling him to picket, he faces a further restriction: He must picket with a broken heart. Arrogance toward supposed oppressors is no virtue. Christ cautioned us to be poor in spirit, to mourn. This doesn't mean convictionlessness, but humble firmness. The 'I'll show 'm' spirit' is anti-Christian."¹²³

An antiwar protest at Wheaton in 1967, one of the first at the college, offers a glimpse of the delicate balance evangelical dissenters tried to strike. As several hundred cadets marched to McCully Field for the annual presidential ROTC review, 22 protesting students greeted them with signs proclaiming "Beware of Escalation," "A Military Solution Is Not an Enduring Solution," and "Pray for Peace." Students sought to balance the boldness of the content of the demonstration—one of the first at the college—with moderation in tone. Student leader Bob Watson pointed out to the media "that no mass appeal was intended by the demonstration." In fact, they had recruited only a small group

¹²³ Paul Fromer, "The Berkeley Affair Brush Fire," *HIS* 25, No. 9 (June 1965), 39-40. Fromer wrote, "A currently fashionable way to draw attention to a supposed injustice is picketing. This can be done legally or illegally. The rights of peaceful assembly and free speech are guaranteed by the Constitution, so the carrying of signs in a demonstration that does not interfere with traffic, etc. is legal, and no violation of Romans 13. However if the picket lines get out of hand and produces a riot, the Christian would be hard put to find an adequate defense. ..."

so that there would be no “irresponsible actions.” Each of the demonstrators signed a letter addressed to President Armerding and the ROTC commander in which they articulated their grievances. They left presidential review early to keep from interfering with the inspection of the cadets. The student paper, clearly sympathetic to the demonstrators, took pains to show that the demonstrators were “good kids”—among them two Woodrow Wilson scholars and six members of the Scholastic Honor Society.¹²⁴

By the early 1970s, even after the college’s antiwar protests had grown more creative and strident, students continued to nurture elements of orderliness and nonviolence.¹²⁵ At the annual ROTC review in 1971, protesters staged a scene symbolizing the deaths of Vietnamese civilians as the ROTC units executed their final routines. Yet after both sides had finished their theater, ROTC men and protestors shook hands.¹²⁶ Notes from the Wheaton students planning to protest Wheaton’s freshman ROTC requirement during the same year emphasized the “peaceful” nature of the demonstration they hoped to carry out. A flyer instructed participants to “meet in the grandstands at McCully Field before the 4:15 ceremony. We will sit quietly through the beginning of the proceedings. Then at a given signal we will rise simultaneously and leave the Field together. After the ceremonies we will protest quietly in different ways along the route of the return. Bring signs if you wish to use them at this point.”¹²⁷

¹²⁴ Stan Shank, “Students Express Concern in Vietnam Demonstration,” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 29 (May 4, 1967), 5.

¹²⁵ “Faculty Commend Student Vigil,” *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 29 (May 15, 1970), 5.

¹²⁶ Carol Anne Galvin, “Students Peacefully Protest Wheaton College ROTC Image,” *Wheaton Daily Journal* (May 14, 1971). In vertical file “ROTC,” WCA.

¹²⁷ “There Will Be a Peaceful Demonstration,” vertical file “ROTC,” WCA. For similar statements from InterVarsity and Fuller seminary students, see Paul Fromer, “How to Change the Power Structure,” *HIS* 29, No. 4 (January 1969), 1-2; Gary Tuttle, “On Dissent,” *The Opinion* 9, No. 5 (May 26, 1970): 5. Tuttle wrote, “And you may say to me that demonstrations are designed to make our representatives aware

Despite this substantial undercurrent of concern for nonviolence and the law, young evangelicals underwent an important transformation in the early 1970s. They began portraying Jesus as a revolutionary figure, adding a harder edge to protests, and displaying more creativity and exuberance as they took their faith and politics to the streets.¹²⁸ Urgency motivated many of them, especially those who saw protests as a way of addressing conflicts between good and evil.¹²⁹ After a particularly contentious month of unrest at Wheaton in May 1970, one Wheaton student complained about the debate over methods. “We decry the ability of the national administration to see beyond the demonstrations to what students are saying. And yet how many of us got so hung up on

that we strongly feel that something must be done to rectify a malignant condition and I say YES! Provided it is non-violent—provided that it does not deprive another of his inalienable rights.”

¹²⁸ On the increasingly hard-edged protests, see “The Dean Burns in Effigy During Ad Hoc Demonstration,” *Calvin Chimes* 63 (April 25, 1969), 3. On Jesus the contentious prophet and revolutionary, see the first issue of the *Post-American*, which features a reprint from *The Other Side*. John Alexander, “Madison Avenue Jesus,” *Post-American* 1, No. 1 (Fall 1971); Milliken, *So Long, Sweet Jesus*, 51, 109; and Joseph Webb, “Gospel as Public Drama,” *Post-American* 4, No. 3 (March, 1975), 24. Webb saw Jesus as the exemplar of a contentious prophet: “When we study the life of Jesus we find some remarkable conflicts with other people, conflicts that Jesus himself created, conflicts with people in positions of authority, people who have the power to make that confrontation extremely risky and potentially disastrous for Jesus, from a human point of view. But Jesus’ confrontations are visible and highly dramatic. . . . His language does not appease—it is confrontational. It is not a language that seeks to minimize differences and keep things running smoothly—it is a language that is sharp, biting, and deliberately baiting. It is not a language at all designed to make friends—it is a language designed to create and foment crisis.” On Jesus the long-haired, bearded street person, see flyer that describes Jesus wandering the streets of Berkeley, where a burly cop detains him and accuses him of vagrancy. See “Jesus in Berkeley,” 21:41: Christian World Liberation Front 1969-1971, Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library. Also see Arnie Bernstein, “Captured by the King,” *Right On* 4, No. 5 (November 1972), 1. Bernstein writes, “Also, the Jesus Christ that I discovered in scripture was far from the Jesus Christ that I had been familiar with. Far from being a white, middle class, Gentile, Nordic war god, born in Kansas City—who defends the ‘American way of life,’ I found that He was a Jew, probably black by Western standards, poor, a conscientious objector, born in a ghetto in the Middle East, and a defender of truth and justice.” Also see Jim Moore, “Will the Real Jesus Please Stand Up?” *Post-American* 1, No. 2 (Winter 1972), 13.

¹²⁹ Sikkink and McVeigh point out that “mainline Protestantism is not characterized by a tension with American society and culture. . . . Liberal Protestants construct a relatively low degree of tension between religious faith and the surrounding social and cultural environment, which may lead to less support for contentious politics as an expression of their religious faith.” Thus, “liberal and mainline Protestants are less likely than evangelicals to approve of contentious tactics.” Also see Rory McVeigh and David Sikkink, “God, Politics, and Protest: Religious Beliefs and the Legitimation of Contentious Tactics,” *Social Forces* 79, No. 4 (June 2001), 1430-1439. The young evangelicals I study are clearly not a part of such a milieu. As products of both conservative evangelicalism and its attendant moral absolutism as well as the New Left (which likewise rebelled against technical or managerial fixes to social problems), the young evangelicals felt marginalized and embattled from many directions. This might help explain their turn toward protest.

the methods of communication (the Memorial Service, the Vigil-forum, the chapel demonstration) that we didn't hear what the people were saying?"¹³⁰ And so as protests continued in the early 1970s, some young evangelicals in frustration stepped up the pressure with not-so-polite tactics. At Calvin, students painted "End the War" in four-foot, white-washed letters high on the wall of an academic buildings¹³¹ At Wheaton, students reenacted death scenes from Vietnam, carried coffins to the city's draft board office, mocked cadet rifle drills with displays of toy machine guns, offered bitter commentary on President Armerding, and wore nooses over their heads at demonstrations.¹³² Nancy Hekkema urged her many classmates opposed to the Vietnam War to refuse to pay telephone taxes because they "go directly to the defense department to help buy napalm and bombs for our mass murder in Vietnam." "Be sure of what you are doing," she warned, "because it is illegal."¹³³

If the polite tactics of Wheaton antiwar protests stretched the new evangelicalism, the far more contentious protests of other young evangelicals, especially those not constrained by college administrations, pushed even further. The Post-Americans and the Christian World Liberation Front, for example, engaged in methods rooted in the activism of the New Left. CWLF pioneered a colorful and confrontational style of protest incubated on the colorful sidewalks of Bancroft and Telegraph Avenues in Berkeley, clearly indebted to the leftist converts of Campus Crusade's Jack Sparks. These converts

¹³⁰ Dan Van Ness, "Business as Usual after Augusta; Students Inconsistently Concerned," *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 29 (May 15, 1970), 4.

¹³¹ "Peace Service, Seminars, City Rally Highlight Calvin Moratorium Activity," *Chimes* 64, No. 11 (October 17, 1969), 1.

¹³² "Funeral March Highlights Moratorium Observance," *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 10 (November 21, 1969), 1. "ROTC Protest Goes Smoothly; Dr. Armerding Holds Front Campus Talk," *Wheaton Record* 93, No. 27 (May 14, 1971), 2.

¹³³ Nancy Hekkema, "Proposes a Tax Boycott," *Wheaton Record* 93, No. 12 (February 19, 1971), 4.

brought with them not only leftist politics, but also demonstrative methods of the counterculture such as guerrilla theater, picketing, leafleting, and direct, personal confrontation.¹³⁴ CWLF's activity explicitly aped the leftist rhetoric of revolution, most especially in its many names. Beyond its blatant borrowing from the Third World Liberation Front, CWLF also went by the "Christian Revolutionary Medical Committee" when it published a handbook on what to do when tear gassed at a protest.¹³⁵ The "DNA Information Committee" leafleted the International Congress of Genetics held at Cal-Berkeley.¹³⁶ The "People's Committee to Investigate Billy Graham" took busloads of Berkeley students and street people to a crusade in Oakland.¹³⁷ The "Christian Revolutionary Art Center" advertised sweatshirts with slogans such as "Jesus the Liberator" and "Wanted: Jesus Christ."¹³⁸

Less obvious were CWLF's political protests. CWLF itself did little protesting that was purely political, though individual members participated in an array of demonstrations ranging from pickets of Sears, strikes against United Farm Workers, and

¹³⁴ David Fetcho, for example, was "into the whole psychedelic/hippie thing—radical politics, revolution, and playing in a rock 'n' roll band." He wrote for the *Berkeley Barb*, the preeminent underground newspaper in Berkeley, and was in the thick of the People's Park riots. See "Meet the Staff: David Fetcho," *Spiritual Counterfeits Project Newsletter* 2, No. 1 (January 1976), 3, copy in CWLF Collection, GTU Archives. For a description of Jim Wallis's involvement in SDS protests at Michigan State in the late 1960s, see Wallis, *Revive Us Again*, 54-58.

¹³⁵ CWLF's first flyer was also a direct copy of TWLF with thirteen demands and statements with a clenched fist on the top. See folder "Berkeley Liberation Program," Box 21, Social Protests Collection, Bancroft Library. On the Christian Revolutionary Committee, see "People's Medical Handbook" in Box 2 "CWLF and Redeemer King Church Notes," GTU Archives.

¹³⁶ "How to Start Something, No. 21 Jack Sparks," *Newsletter of the American Scientific Affiliation* 17, No. 1 (February, 1975).

¹³⁷ Androcles, "Graham Crusade Freak-Out," *Right On* 3, No. 3 (September, 1971), 8. "Androcles" wrote, "Many of us either cringe or speak out at Graham's hand-holding with Nixon and others in power. But one thing has been clear in all of Graham's messages over the past two decades. He preaches a Gospel of liberation and peace and of love and new life through encounter and commitment to a person: Jesus Christ."

¹³⁸ On t-shirt designs, see Box 38, Folder, "Christian World Liberation Front," New Left Collection, Hoover Institution Archives.

antiwar protests at military bases. “There were so many protests,” Sharon Gallagher remembers, “It was a blur.”¹³⁹ As a group, CWLF members generally conducted demonstrations within demonstrations. They often affirmed the causes of leftist protesters, sometimes chanting along, sometimes chanting alternative slogans. In 1969, for example, they picketed the brutal repression of Christians and students in Czechoslovakia at the bay-area Russian tourist bureau; a Nixon appearance at the St. Francis Hotel in San Francisco; and an industrialists’ conference at the Fairmont Hotel.¹⁴⁰ Like secular leftists in Berkeley, CWLF condemned Berkeley landlords for their greed in charging exorbitant rents. But in a leaflet entitled “Why Your Landlord Makes Money” the group asserted that in addition to the coercion of public denunciation, spiritual regeneration of landlords would make the biggest difference. “Pray for your landlord,” CWLF urged, “that his entire being, including his warped sense of values, will be changed as he gets into Jesus.”¹⁴¹ During the Mobilization Parade in San Francisco on November 15, 1969, CWLF distributed leaflets urging an end to the war, but likewise

¹³⁹ Sharon Gallagher interview, July 7, 2006.

¹⁴⁰ Sparks, *God’s Forever Family*, 115-121.

¹⁴¹ “Why Your Landlord Makes Money” in Box 21, Folder 41, “Christian World Liberation Front 1969-1971,” Social Protests Collection, Bancroft Library. For a sense of the tone and language, read the entire text of the leaflet: “We people of Berkeley know that the landlords around here are out to make money. And they’ve certainly been in a position to make plenty of it over the years. With nearly 100% of habitable units occupied, these guys are charging what they want and we have to pay. What exactly motivates our landlords to gouge us like they do? How can they continually take advantage of the people of Berkeley? Your landlord is, of course, on a power trip. He has the age-old misconception that abundance of life comes from abundance of wealth, but it just ain’t so. He’s gouging us so he can rake in all that bread, but where’s it getting him? James, half-brother of Jesus, had a few words for these dudes: “Look here, you rich men, now is the tie to cry and groan with anguished grief because of all the terrible troubles ahead of you. Your wealth is even now rotting away, and your fine clothes are becoming mere moth-eaten rags. ... For listen! Hear the cries of the field workers whom you have cheated of their pay. Their cries have reached the ears of the Lord of Hosts.” “What can be done about it? If the Berkeley landlords really loved the people here, they wouldn’t charge such exorbitant rent. They can get this love from Jesus. Pray for your landlord, that his entire being, including his warped sense of values, will be changed as he gets into Jesus. Come to think of it, some of us need to get into Jesus too. What about you? Will you continue in your apathy?”

condemned the most radical of protesters for trying to destroy American society.¹⁴² This strategy of co-belligerency allowed CWLF to simultaneously engage leftist politics and evangelical spirituality.¹⁴³

By 1970 CWLF had assumed an even more confrontational style, one that resulted on one occasion in the ejection of two dozen CWLF members from a regional SDS meeting in Berkeley. After a CWLFer declared, “I propose that—along with politics—Jesus Christ be discussed as the ultimate solution to the problems facing the world,” two dozen other radical evangelicals applauded and tried to force a vote on the resolution. The irate SDS regional chair yelled, “We will not discuss issues of a non-political nature.” CWLFers shouted back that they were in fact political revolutionaries, but that they followed “God, not men.” “The things we want to say have direct relevance to the issues being raised here,” responded CWLF’s Bill Squires. The CWLF members subsequently staged a sit-in in front of the platform, demanding that SDS “live up to its middle name and permit all views to be heard.” Screaming “Pigs! These are pigs sent by the American government!” SDSers rushed the CWLF protesters, shoving, kicking, and dragging each of them out the doors of the meeting hall.¹⁴⁴

Such confrontations punctuated the more pedestrian, but no less subdued, method of leafleting popular with CWLF. In a leaflet entitled “Weekly Meeting of the Hades Council,” CWLF, in the tradition of C.S. Lewis’s *Screwtape Letters*, personified Satan

¹⁴² Daryl Lembke, “Christian Front in Berkeley,” *Los Angeles Times*, February 8 1970.

¹⁴³ Richard Taylor similarly suggested that young evangelicals join an already existing group such as the United Farm Workers. See Taylor, “Manual for Nonviolent Direct Action,” *Post-American* 3, No. 8 (November, 1974), 24.

¹⁴⁴ Bill Squires interview, September 5, 2006; Plowman, *The Jesus Movement in America*, 70-73; “SDS Confronted at West Coast Conference,” *Free Water* (October 8, 1970), 1, copy in CWLF Collection, GTU Archives.

and his demons conspiring to entice students to hell. “We’ve got a growing group of youth in the United States in particular believing that their whole political, social, and economic system is a gigantic conspiracy. They look at every act of authority in the whole country as specific, unjustified repression.” The tract concluded with Satan snorting, “Now let’s get back out into the world and get people uptight against each other. Rise and chant our slogan “TO HELL WITH EVERYBODY.”¹⁴⁵ This tract, and many others, enjoyed wide distribution in Berkeley. CWLF distributed a leaflet entitled “Jesus in Berkeley” to over 10,000 students during one weekend in 1969.¹⁴⁶

The most prominent leaflet—one more typical of its orientation in the early 1970s as CWLF lost its Campus Crusade roots and grew more sympathetic to leftist political and social concerns—also mimicked the countercultural style of the Berkeley Liberation Program. CWLF moderated the tone and demands of BLP’s manifesto which featured a clenched fist overtop thirteen demands, the last of which read “We will unite with other movements throughout the world to destroy this motherfucking racistcapitalistimperialist system.”¹⁴⁷ CWLF’s version—thirteen demands labeled “New Berkeley Liberation Program—featured the familiar tones of cobelligerency, albeit with a twist.¹⁴⁸ The tract, while disparaging high rent, war, environmental degradation, oppression, and racism, implied that radical politics was not a magic elixir. In fact, the leftist revolutionary movement was simply not revolutionary enough. CWLF urged the tract’s readers to

¹⁴⁵ See Box 21, Folder 41, “Christian World Liberation Front 1969-1971,” Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library.

¹⁴⁶ Sparks, *God's Forever Family*, 112.

¹⁴⁷ See Folder 21, “Berkeley Liberation Program,” June 1969, in Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library.

¹⁴⁸ “New Berkeley Liberation Program,” Box 21:41, Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library.

“RADICALIZE THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT!”¹⁴⁹ CWLF declared, “Jesus proclaimed a spiritual revolution to bring about a fundamental change within, to deal with the faulty components of every system—the human components. Accept Him as your Liberator and Leader; then join others of his Forever Family here to change this world.”¹⁵⁰

What began in the tract as political concern ended in a call for internal spiritual transformation. CWLF never did mobilize in an explicitly political fashion, nor did it depart from its essentially spiritual message. At the Democratic National Convention in Miami in 1972, they unfurled a huge banner in the arena of 15,000 delegates with the essentially spiritual message “Serve the Lord, Serve the People.”¹⁵¹ Spiritual concerns nearly always trumped political concerns, as was the case for Jesus Freaks and evangelicals generally. Despite its continuity in spiritual content, CWLF innovated a new style. Borrowed from the counterculture in Berkeley, CWLF’s bombastic language, street theatre, sheer volume, breadth of audience, and overblown cartoons helped usher in a new confrontational style—in political protest and in evangelism alike.¹⁵²

CWLF confronted mainstream evangelicals en masse for the first time at Explo 72 in Dallas, Texas. Staged by Campus Crusade, Explo 72 attracted nearly 85,000 high

¹⁴⁹ “... And After This War?” and “Proposed Social and Economic Foundations for a Christian Society,” Box 21, Folder 41, Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library.

¹⁵⁰ “... And After This War?” Box 21, Folder 41, Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library.

¹⁵¹ David Gill, “The Messiah in Miami Beach,” *Right On* 4, No. 2 (August 1972), 5.

¹⁵² CWLF member Charlie Lehman called the street theater productions “caustic and satirical.” See undated CWLF newsletter, Jill Shook box, GTU Archives. “Our newer shows have been more in line with the thinking of the Berkeley student. They are more abrupt and coarse. Each show makes a social statement and then applies the gospel.” One production, “The Registration,” depicted the U.S. as a “secular superstate” whose bureaucracy persecutes average citizens. The production regularly drew close to 500 spectators on the UC-Berkeley campus. The newsletter noted that CWLF borrowed street theater techniques from New Leftists in the late 1960s. See “Street Theater” newsletter, circa 1974, in Folder “CWLF—Street Theater,” Jill Shook Collection, GTU Archives.

school and college students for a religious rally. Signs of the establishment at Explo predominated. Students attended seminars on “How to Live with Your Parents,” listened to speakers Bill Bright and Billy Graham, and joined in patriotic rituals such as a salute to the Stars and Stripes and the Pledge of Allegiance. Graham even read a telegram from President Nixon. Yet even amidst the songs, prayers, and seminars of mostly clean-cut, white students shone through a countercultural streak. A group of long-haired Jesus people from California taught them to extend clenched fists and index fingers pointed upward in a “One-Way” Jesus salute. Suburban teens listened to Christian rock bands and let out “Jesus yells.” Most—like barefooted Purdue student Ron Borden who wore an American flag t-shirt—blended the counterculture with the establishment.¹⁵³

A small minority of Explo participants—perhaps only several hundred young evangelicals making common cause for the first time—viewed the spectacle with distaste. The surge of patriotism in the midst of a heavy bombing campaign in Vietnam prompted Jim Wallis to condemn Campus Crusade’s display of civic religion as a “truncated and domesticated gospel.”¹⁵⁴ Sharon Gallagher of CWLF told a *New York Times* reporter, “The whole thing reminds you of the Roman Coliseum. Except in those days the Christians weren’t in the stands. Something’s changed.”¹⁵⁵ CWLF, a group of Mennonites, and the Post-Americans responded. They set up literature booths and wore black armbands to protest the war. Wallis and others quizzed Billy Graham at a press conference about his close ties with Nixon and his tacit approval of the war. The Post-Americans wore sandwich-board signs that read “The 300 Persons Killed by American

¹⁵³ Edward B. Fiske, “A ‘Religious Woodstock’ Draws 75,000,” *New York Times*, June 16 1972, p. 19.

¹⁵⁴ “People’s Christian Coalition—Newsletter No. 4,” May 1972, in Box VII7, Folder “Peoples Christian Coalition Trinity,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

¹⁵⁵ Fiske, “A ‘Religious Woodstock’ Draws 75,000,” 19.

Bombs Today Will Not Be Won in This Generation” (a variation of the convention’s theme, “Win the World for Christ in This Generation”), “Choose This Day—Make Disciples or Make Bombs,” and “Love your Enemies or Kill Your Enemies.” During a military ceremony, they stood under the stadium’s scoreboard, unfurled a banner—“Cross or Flag, Christ or Country,” and chanted “Stop the War!”¹⁵⁶ The protest attracted Dallas policemen and the major news outlets, but not the support of most Explo participants, though many smiled and said “Right On” or “Amen” as they walked by the booth.¹⁵⁷ The *Reformed Journal* correspondent wrote that Campus Crusade, like the federal government, “was perfectly able to swallow up dissent.”¹⁵⁸

Ladon Sheats, an evangelical from East Texas and former IBM executive, soon extended the limits of evangelical activism in the wake of Explo ‘72. Alongside Catholic antiwar activists from Jonah House, on October 5, 1975, Sheats crashed the fiftieth birthday celebration of Pratt and Whitney, a corporation that built jet engines for fighter jets. Sheats marched to a platform that displayed a jet fuselage, poured his own blood into the cockpit, and then wrote the word “death” in blood on the equipment. In a “statement of conscience” to the judge at his trial (and then reprinted in *Wittenburg Door*), Sheats explained that he struck “because ‘participatory democracy’ is an ideal ... only in the pages of social studies textbooks. The U.S. is controlled by a power consortium of the Executive Branch, Pentagon, and Multi-national Corporations. They control our destiny.

¹⁵⁶ Richard K. Taylor, “Hopeful Stirrings among Evangelicals,” *The Witness*, copy in Box IV3, Folder “News Releases and Post-American,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

¹⁵⁷ Peter Ediger, “Explo ‘72,” *Post-American* (Fall 1972), 13.

¹⁵⁸ Marlin VanElderen, “Explo ‘72 and Campus Crusade,” *Reformed Journal* 22, No. 6 (July-August, 1972), 18.

Their music is profits and their dance is death.”¹⁵⁹ The Post-Americans, convinced that international investments owned by American corporations “was a major reason for our willingness to go to war in Korea and Vietnam,” echoed Sheats’ critique. They continued their program of contentious dissent, relying heavily on *The Organizer’s Manual*, an influential resource within the New Left.¹⁶⁰ In 1975 they renamed themselves Sojourners, moved into a dilapidated neighborhood in the northern section of the District of Columbia, and broadened their agenda. They traveled across the Eastern seaboard protesting nuclear weapons on site at munitions factories.¹⁶¹ At home they refused to pay war taxes on their income or telephone bills.¹⁶² They agitated for tenants’ rights, forming the Columbia Heights Community Ownership Project to protect homes from speculators. In a “dramatic protest against what they call real estate speculation,” the *Washington Post* reported, Sojourners members squatted in an apartment building, an act preceded by a march with banners in front of 3rd District policemen.¹⁶³ Sojourners staged hundreds of

¹⁵⁹ Sheats, “Door Reports,” 22; Wes Michaelson and Jim Wallis, “Ladon Sheats: Pilgrimage of a Peacemaker,” *Sojourners* 5, No. 3 (March 1976), 11-19.

¹⁶⁰ See “Bibliography: People’s Christian Coalition,” November 1971, Box VII7, Folder 6, “People’s Christian Coalition Trinity,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC; The O.M. Collective, *The Organizer’s Manual* (New York: Bantam, 1971).

¹⁶¹ During the summer of 1978 alone, Sojourners demonstrated at Rocky Flats, at the United Nations in New York City, at the Seabrook Plant, at Groton, Massachusetts, to protest the Trident nuclear submarine, and joined 100,000 other protesters of nuclear power in the wake of the Three Mile Island disaster. See Sojourners newsletter, Summer 1978, in Folder “Sojo Community,” Boxes VII-III, Sojourners Collection, WCSC. For more on Rocky Flats, see “Flowers at Rocky Flats,” *Radix* 8, No. 3 (Sept-Oct 1976), 17.

¹⁶² “In those early days, our response was simple and straightforward. We did not pay the war tax on our telephone bill, and our incomes were usually below taxable levels. Whenever someone’s income became taxable, we did what we could to reduce it.” See Joe Roos, “Let Your Nay Be Nay,” *Sojourners* 8, No. 2 (February 1979), 5.

¹⁶³ Patricia Camp, “Group Occupies Apartments in Housing Protest,” *Washington Post*, September 16 1978, p. C1.

other similarly theatrical protests in the last half of the decade, over forty in the first six months of 1977 alone.¹⁶⁴

Thus even as nonviolence remained an absolute virtue for young evangelicals, that nonviolence grew more demonstrative. At a community retreat, Sojourners members pledged to pursue this paradox: “Our resistance to evil must never be passive but active, even to the point of sacrifice and suffering. Repentance in our day includes non-cooperation with the arms race and the militarism that has overtaken our society. We therefore refuse military service, military-related jobs, war taxes, and will engage in nonviolent direct action and civil disobedience for the sake of peace and justice as conscience dictates and the Spirit leads us.”¹⁶⁵ In keeping with this perspective, An InterVarsity chapter at the University of Missouri at St. Louis, for example, pursued an active peacemaking approach that sought to transcend both the law-and-order stance of many new evangelicals and the violence of radical leftist groups. These students affirmed nonviolent campus protests, writing in a position statement that “We protest the injustices of the recent campus confrontation at Kent State University between students and National Guard troops in which four students were killed and several more injured. . . . The greater injustice seems to be the killing of the four students and wounding of others by the National Guardsmen, but neither can the stoning of Guardsmen nor the burning of

¹⁶⁴ Robert K. Johnston, *Evangelicals at an Impasse: Biblical Authority in Practice* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979), 107; Wallis, *Agenda for Biblical People*, 102; Wes Michaelson, “Theater at the Capitol,” *Sojourners* 9, No. 1 (January 1980), 20-21. A good example was a September 16, 1981, protest of an Air Force Association “arms bazaar” at the Sheraton Washington Hotel. Eight Sojourners staff members were arrested by police after blocking the hotel driveway. A judge gave them sentences of 30 days in prison. See “Eight Staff Members of Sojourners Magazine, Including Jim Wallis Were Arrested,” *Christianity Today* 25, No. 19 (November 6, 1981), 73. Also see Wallis, *Revive Us Again*, 120-134. Another significant component of nonviolent resistance was their refusal to pay war taxes. See Delton Franz, “Channeling War Taxes to Peace,” *Sojourners* (March 1977), 21-23; and Donald Kaufman, “Paying for War,” *Sojourners* (March 1977), 16-19.

¹⁶⁵ “Community Statement,” Box VI, Folder 1, “Sojourners Community,” Sojourners Collection, WCA.

buildings be considered just. We cannot seek justice by revenge.”¹⁶⁶ InterVarsity nursing students at Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center in New York City, pledged to pursue non-violent means of quelling campus unrest, even physically injecting themselves between opponents in violent demonstrations.

Through the 1970s young evangelical leaders sought to develop clearer principles of active peacemaking. A “Task Force on Evangelical Nonviolence,” for example, urged evangelicals to learn from the experience of women seeking to win the right to vote, from black Christians in the South, and from those who tried to thwart invasions in Europe. These examples might teach the church how to extend its witness beyond “indirect action” to “nonviolent direct action.”¹⁶⁷ A 1974 *Post-American* manual on the subject, for example, disavowed name-calling or the use of hostile words. “In all of our actions,” wrote Taylor, “we will express the love and humanity that is so lacking in this place of death.” He told nonviolent demonstrators to pray for their attackers and to recognize that “police and others are beloved children of God—Christ died for us all.” Further, he urged evangelical activists to “get the facts right”; maintain a humble spirit while protesting; seek spiritual guidance and engage in regular disciplines of prayer and group worship; place a priority on public education; and engage policymakers in good faith negotiations.¹⁶⁸ In a 1978 *Christianity Today* article, Ron Sider suggested the use of

¹⁶⁶ “Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship—UMSL Chapter Position on Campus Disorders,” in Box 21, Folder 2, “Student unrest/dissent (1960s),” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

¹⁶⁷ “Report of the Task Force on Evangelical Nonviolence,” Box 2, Folder 12, “Center for Biblical Social Concern proposal; correspondence September 1974-Sept. 1976,” ESA Collection, BGCA. Also see Ronald J. Sider, “Reconciling our Enemies: A Biblical Study on Nonviolence,” *Sojourners* 8, No. 1 (Jan 1979), 14-17.

¹⁶⁸ Taylor, “Manual for Nonviolent Direct Action,” 24-29. For more on the importance of personal morality among protesters, see Charles Fager, “Ethics, Principalities, and Nonviolence,” *Post-American* 3, No. 8 (November, 1974), 18-20.

blockades as a form of nonviolent intervention.¹⁶⁹ Clearly, this vision of peacemaking did not involve passivity.

Young evangelicals from Sojourners, The Other Side, CWLF, and other communities calculated the effects of their protests and how to carry them out. Public dissent to social injustice, they believed, should be carried out in a thoughtful, not haphazard or emotional, fashion. They carefully chose corporations to boycott.¹⁷⁰ They published task lists, wrote guidelines for contacting the press and the police, played strategy games, engaged in scenario-writing, and conducted “force-field analysis.” Instructions for designing an effective demonstration recommended that words on banners should not exceed six words. They carefully created symbols for dramatic effect. Richard Taylor of the Philadelphia Life Center urged evangelicals to act as Jesus would if he lived in modern-day America, which would be to picket wealthy churches with “Repent” signs; jack-hammer concrete city plazas, plant tomato vines in the cracks; agitate for vegetarianism and against the “great American steak religion; perform “socio-dramas” that illustrated the torture techniques used in Russian prison camps.¹⁷¹ Holding few illusions about short-term policy gains—“Major social evils and injustices,” explained Taylor, “will rarely, if ever, be overcome by one beautiful demonstration”—

¹⁶⁹ Ronald J. Sider, “Blockade: A Guide to Non-Violent Intervention,” *Christianity Today* 22 (February 10, 1978), 45-46.

¹⁷⁰ See “Boycotting Gallo,” *Right On* 6, No. 4 (November 1974), 4; Carolyn Hudson, “March on Gallo,” *Right On* 6, No. 8 (April 1975), 9; Kenneth Winter letter, *Right On* 10, No. 2 (September-October 1978), 2.

¹⁷¹ Richard K. Taylor, “The Peacemakers: Faith and Obedience through Nonviolent Direct Action,” *Post-American* 4, No. 8 (October-November 1975), 16-21.

young evangelicals consoled themselves with the logic that prophetic action had value in itself. Their dissent formalized into ritual protest.¹⁷²

The radical evangelical encounter with the New Left significantly widened the range of social activism in a tradition previously marked by apoliticism and passive ballot punching. From polite protests at Wheaton to the contentious tactics of the Post-Americans, young evangelicals pioneered the reincarnation of “the gospel as public drama”—a drama showing that young evangelicals were not content only to work within existing political structures.

IV.

Attentive to the activist methods of the New Left, young evangelicals also heeded the call of movement “theologian” C. Wright Mills “to serve as a moral conscience and to articulate that conscience” in the use of a moralistic rhetorical style. In his 1958 “Pagan Sermon to the Christian Clergy” Mills told spiritual leaders they were operating in “moral default” in not speaking out against the madness of the nuclear arms race. Christians, he implied, should feel the burden of moral imperatives in ways that

¹⁷² Taylor, “Manual for Nonviolent Direct Action,” 29. Jason Bivins notes that “significant dates on the holy calendar were soon adopted as occasions for challenges to liberal political order.” See Bivins, *Fracture of Good Order*, 62. On the transcendent and spiritual nature of civil disobedience, see letters in “Postmark,” *Sojourners* 12, No. 7 (August 1983), 41; Richard Taylor and Ronald Sider, “Fighting Fire with Water: A Call for Assertive Nonviolent Resistance,” *Sojourners* 12, No. 4 (April 1983), 14-17. For a continuing discussion in the 1980s, see “Civil Disobedience: A Forum,” 23-37; Ched Myers, “By What Authority? The Bible and Civil Disobedience,” 10-14; and Richard Taylor, “With All Due Respect: An Historical Perspective on Civil Disobedience,” 15-18, in *Sojourners* 12, No. 5 (May 1983). On a 1983 conference on evangelical peacemaking entitled “The Church and Peacemaking in the Nuclear Age,” see Folder, “Peacemaking Conference,” Fuller Seminary Archives. On the first national conference on “Christian Conscience and Civil Disobedience,” see Mary McGrory, “Following Conscience’s Lead,” *Washington Post*, May 28, 1985, p. A2.

secular leftists cannot.¹⁷³ Evangelical radicals complied with Mills's admonition, speaking out with spiritual language and moral clarity against not only nuclear weapons, but poverty, sexism, imperialism, and the very structure of American society. Shattering a long-standing evangelical apoliticism, radical evangelicals helped break the mid-century evangelical hesitance to tie faith closely to politics not only by extending the limits of evangelical activism but also with a new rhetoric of moralistic absolutism.¹⁷⁴

This argument must be stated carefully, for mainstream "new evangelicals," though in general abandoning the old fundamentalist rhetoric of religious war and light and darkness, did occasionally use Manichean language.¹⁷⁵ Billy Graham, for instance, regularly denounced communism at his crusades in the 1950s. "Only as millions of Americans turn to Jesus Christ at this hour and accept him as Savior," Graham told attendees of his crusades, "can this nation possibly be spared the onslaught of demon-possessed communism."¹⁷⁶ This kind of language, however, seems to have been limited to anticommunism among new evangelical elites. They rarely, perhaps in the interest of social relevancy and evangelism, extended Manichean language to domestic issues. Young evangelicals, however, began to sound more like their fundamentalist

¹⁷³ C. Wright Mills, "A Pagan Sermon to the Christian Clergy," *Post-American* 3, No. 9 (December, 1974), 12-15. This was a reprint of Mills's speech text originally published in the March 8, 1958, issue of *The Nation*.

¹⁷⁴ Grant Wacker points out that this engagement of faith and politics was adversarial, that there were many, not only in the evangelical right, but also "the evangelical left who consider themselves culturally sophisticated and politically liberal, yet who cannot countenance the loss of Jewish-Christian values in the public discourse and in the 'reality defining' institutions of the land. See Grant Wacker, "Uneasy in Zion: Evangelicals in Postmodern Society," in *Reckoning with the Past*, D.G. Hart, ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995), 388.

¹⁷⁵ On the Manichean worldview of fundamentalists, see Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 211.

¹⁷⁶ Turner, "Sharing God with Modern America," 131.

grandparents than their new evangelical parents in their liberal use of words such as “sin,” “satanic,” and “demonic.”

How did non-fundamentalist evangelicals come to use such apocalyptic language? In part because of a Manichean moral rhetoric inspired by the New Left and the counterculture—an irony since the New Left was not explicitly religious and was in fact often hostile to faith. Nonetheless, the New Left nurtured an ethos that resonated with many characteristics of conservative religion, particularly in its search for meaning and authenticity, its demands for total commitment, and its view of the world as divided between light and darkness.¹⁷⁷ InterVarsity’s president, John Alexander, wrote that leftist radicals “almost consider themselves today’s Christians, the only ones dedicated to Christ’s concern for the peopleness of people. They are the righteous. The segregationists and inactive are the sinners.”¹⁷⁸ Moreover, they nurtured a hope that revolution was coming in a kind. The revolution would be a cosmic adjustment in history, not unlike the Christian conception of the “Second Coming.” There was “an apocalyptic sureness that a Judgment Day is coming to help the Oppressed.”¹⁷⁹ This apocalyptic sensibility contrasted sharply its perception of the liberal approach toward social ills. The New Left denounced what it saw as the slow application by liberals of science, technology, and education in pursuing social justice. Following the lead of civil rights activists, many of whom were rooted in old-time religion, and SNCC, which SDS saw as something of the soul of the New Left, the New Left criticized the approach of John F. Kennedy and his liberal advisers, who sought to apply steady and incremental pressure on southern states.

¹⁷⁷ Especially see the “Values” section of the Port Huron Statement.

¹⁷⁸ Paul Fromer, “The Berkeley Affair Brush Fire,” *HIS* 25, No. 9 (June 1965), 38-40, 44-45.

¹⁷⁹ Seerveld, “Christian Faith for Today,” 9.

The New Left instead echoed the SNCC call for a theologically pessimistic, activist role in forcing an immediate end to the sin of segregation.¹⁸⁰

Northern young evangelicals, themselves believers in original sin and tied genealogically to the abolitionists of the nineteenth century, could and did identify with the religiously saturated call for an end to segregation.¹⁸¹ Though their response came late, the inspiration of civil rights action decisively drove radical young evangelicals past liberal perspectives. Like New Leftists, radical young evangelicals denounced the slow reformist sensibilities of liberalism that failed to decisively confront segregation. Liberalism in both its political and theological forms, they said, was an effete ideology that accepted the basic values of the system and failed to agitate for immediate, radical change to existing conditions.¹⁸² It might be easy, some of the more strident young evangelicals acknowledged, to “embrace a liberal political philosophy,” but such a

¹⁸⁰ See David L. Chappell, *A Stone of Hope: Prophetic Religion and the Death of Jim Crow* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004). Wallis remembered that the civil rights movement, rooted in the black churches and a very powerful spirituality, was “far more successful and morally centered than the youthful white student movements” with which he had been involved. See Wallis, *Faith Works*, 13. On SNCC as the soul of the New Left, see Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam Books, 1987), 129. Gitlin evoked religious metaphor when describing the significance of SNCC and southern civil rights activism to the New Left: “In northern movement circles, the names of SNCC leaders became legendary, along with the sites of SNCC’s passion, the Delta, Parchman Penitentiary, and the rest. The southern martyrs became our saints; cherishing them, we crossed the Mason-Dixon line of imagination, transubstantiated.”

¹⁸¹ On the religious rhetoric of the civil rights movement, see Charles Marsh, *The Beloved Community: How Faith Shapes Social Justice* (New York: Basic Books, 2005), 2-3; Chappell, *Stone of Hope*, 87-104.

¹⁸² Bill Craig, “Don’t Be an Armchair Liberal, Follow Great Words with Action,” *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 28 (May 8, 1970), 6. “They tell us that the greatest social sin today is inaction in the face of the great issues of war, racism, pollution and poverty,” wrote Craig. “They look with disgust and disdain at the American who supports Vietnam, the church and the Nixon administration. I suggest that an even greater sin than this is inaction. It is hypocrisy—the hypocrisy—the hypocrisy of the armchair—the liberal who jumps on the bandwagon of every liberal social issue that comes along and remains inactive.” Also see Dale W. Brown, “Reflections” in *The Chicago Declaration*, ed. Ronald Sider (Carol Stream, Ill.: Creation House, 1974), 143-144; Gerald Vandezande, “Opportunity for Participation,” *Vanguard* (May-June 1974), 29; Wallis, “The Movemental Church,” 2. A good example of this was liberalism’s anticommunist stance that kept them away from antiwar activity through the early and mid-1960s. Wallis and many other New Leftists decried the liberal tendency to accept the Vietnam War because it might spread American “freedom.” See Rossinow, *Politics of Authenticity*, 209-246.

moderate approach only accepted “the economic, political, and value assumptions of the status quo, as do conservative philosophies.”¹⁸³ John Perkins, with one foot in civil rights Mississippi and one in northern evangelicalism, bridged the shared tradition of moral-spiritual judgment and action.¹⁸⁴ Ambivalent in the early 1960s toward the civil rights movement, Perkins lashed out against the southern caste system after suffering a beating in the late 1960s from a white policeman.¹⁸⁵ Faith *was* politics, Perkins began to argue: “‘New birth in Jesus’ meant waging war against segregation just as much as it meant putting the honky-tonks and juke joints out of business.” “Racism,” in fact, “is satanic, and I knew it would take a supernatural force to defeat it.”¹⁸⁶

Perkins’s vocabulary signaled a new application of moral and spiritual rhetoric to evangelical politics. Richard Barnet of Church of the Savior in Washington, D.C., told *Sojourners* that questions of international economics were moral, not merely technical or managerial, as John Kennedy had asserted.¹⁸⁷ Genteel liberals such as Kennedy in fact failed to grasp the utter poverty of bureaucratic capitalism and the military-industrial

¹⁸³ Jim Wallis and Bob Sabath, “In Quest of Discipleship,” *Post-American* 2, No. 3 (May-June 1973), 3. This was a prominent theme among young evangelicals. A Teen Challenge chapter in Honolulu made the same claim. After a reprint of Lewis Mumford’s *Pentagon of Power*, their newsletter *Kaleidoscope* held an article that claimed, “We believe that poverty, racism, and social injustice are symptoms of man’s basic problem: ego-centeredness and rebellion against the infinite-personal God.” “We believe that the revolution occurring today is not revolutionary enough!” See “Where We Stand,” *Kaleidoscope* (Winter 1973). See Box IV3, Folder “Articles about Tabloid,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC. Boyd Reese argued that three areas distinguished between liberals and radicals: 1) incremental vs. immediate change; 2) top-down vs. bottom-up change; and 3) acceptance vs. rejection of compromise. See Boyd T. Reese, Jr., “Resistance and Hope: The Interplay of Theological Synthesis, Biblical Interpretation, Political Analysis, and Praxis in the Christian Radicalism of ‘Sojourners’ Magazine” (Ph.D., Temple University, 1991), 192.

¹⁸⁴ Perkins was once called “a Bible-believing fundamentalist for black power.” See Marsh, *Beloved Community*, 5.

¹⁸⁵ An article in the August 10, 1970, issue of *Time* magazine detailed the beating: “I was stomped on by members of the highway patrol. They ... forced a bent fork up my nose, which caused some bleeding. With blood running all over my head, they made me go get a mop and mop up the blood ... and they hit and beat me as I mopped.”

¹⁸⁶ Quoted in Marsh, *Beloved Community*, 170-172.

¹⁸⁷ Quoted in Michaelson, “Richard Barnet on Multinational Corporations.”

complex. Actual evil, two Post-Americans wrote, resides in these systems.¹⁸⁸ Tony Campolo told the *Wittenburg Door* that his campaign was based on “moral questions” regarding the lack of low-cost housing, poor, and how the government is protecting the investments of multi-national corporations. “I think that the Old Testament prophets,” Campolo said, “would have had a heyday analyzing the American economic-political structure.”¹⁸⁹ Jim Wallis continued to use absolutist language to condemn the Vietnam War. Not a “mistake” or a “blunder,” as liberals often argued, the war was a “lie ... a crime and a sin ... that continues to poison the body politic.”¹⁹⁰ Speaking of demonstrations against military fighter jets at Whitney Aircraft in Connecticut, Ladon Sheats explained that protests would likely bring legal prosecution, time in jail away from families, loss of jobs, violence against them, even “fear, loneliness, and despair.” But “the loss of conscience may be a higher risk—the moral and spiritual paralysis that accompanies silence and complicity in the face of evil.”¹⁹¹

Many young evangelicals developed theological categories that mirrored this Manichean worldview. Writers in the *Post-American*, for example, describing American power as a satanic principality, coupled the Apostle John’s image of “principalities and powers” with the leftist fear of government power and economic bureaucracy. Bob Sabath explicated Romans 13 in the context of the thirteenth chapter of Revelation, a book that served as a political-religious manifesto declaring open resistance to the Roman Empire. “Here was the Christians’ first dictate against the hellish iniquities and arrogant

¹⁸⁸ Wallis and Sabath, “In Quest of Discipleship,” 3.

¹⁸⁹ “Campolo, “Door Interview,” 14

¹⁹⁰ Allan C. Carlson, “Radical Evangelicals and Their Anticapitalist Crusade,” *Gazette Telegraph*, November 8 1981, p. 11AA.

¹⁹¹ Jim Wallis, “Pilgrimage of a Peacemaker,” *Post-American* 5, No. 3 (March 1976), 5.

nationalism of the world's most powerful nation," explained Sabath. In only thirty-five years, the early church had transformed from a law-abiding people, suggesting that "even a legitimate state ... is always in danger of becoming satanic. There is an inevitable drift toward the demonic."¹⁹² Wallis grounded this hermeneutical judgment in the creation account, writing that "supernatural beings were created for human good (in fact, we can't function without them), but revolted and fell, with the consequence that they have an ever-present tendency to usurp God's intended purpose for them and hold humans in bondage to their pretensions to universal sovereignty."¹⁹³ Radical evangelicals interpreted these supernatural demons in very specific ways—in the concentrated power of elite Latin American oligarchs, but most often in the "United States of Babylon." "The nation is fallen, explained William Stringfellow. "America is a demonic principality."¹⁹⁴ Study notes from the early years of the Post-American community encouraged followers toward "resistance to the principalities of death" in the administration of Richard Nixon and corporate America.¹⁹⁵ Supporters of Evangelicals for McGovern in Boston ran a

¹⁹² Robert A. Sabath, "Paul's View of the State," *Post-American* 3, No. 3 (April 1974), 8-11.

¹⁹³ Sojourners borrowed much of this from John Howard Yoder's *Politics of Jesus*. Yoder did leave room, however, for redemption in the midst of fallen structures. See p. 146. For more on the "powers," see Wallis, *Agenda for Biblical People*, 60s-70s. On oligarchy, see Boyd Reese, "Is Sojourners Marxist? An Analysis of Recent Charges." Reese wrote, "The way wealth and power concentrated in the hands of a few work to oppress the many is a particularly vivid example of the oppressive functioning of the power." See For a more thorough discussion of Sojourners' political theory, see chapter eight of Reese's dissertation "Resistance and Hope."

¹⁹⁴ William Stringfellow, *Christians and Other Aliens in a Strange Land* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1976), 154-155.

¹⁹⁵ "Political Interpretations of John's Apocalypse" in Box XII, Folder, "Post-American—Internal," Sojourners Collection, WCSC. Also see Emilio Castro, "Strategies for Confronting Unjust Social Structures," delivered at the 1974 Thanksgiving Workshop of ESA, in Folder "1974 Chicago Workshop," ESA Archives. Even into the 1980s, Sojourners wrote caustically about the Nixon years. "Kissinger bears no relation to the pathetic Faustian character who sells his soul to the devil for some petty earthly advantage," wrote Danny Collum. "He more closely resembles the prince of darkness himself as he flies about the globe striking bargains for the souls of not just individuals but nations, and consigning to a fiery death those who meet his disfavor." See Danny Collum, "Ambassador of Darkness," *Sojourners* 12,

newspaper advertisement that condemned Nixon for his “demonic politices” in Vietnam.¹⁹⁶ Bill Milliken spoke of the violence in “pine-panelled offices” on Wall Street, which made “spiritual captives out of those who supposedly own them and pilot a financial empire and distribution process that forces masses around the world into poverty.”¹⁹⁷ Ron Sider and Boyd Reese explained structural injustice in America to the InterVarsity chapter at NYU-Binghamton in terms of “principalities and powers.”¹⁹⁸ Post-American Joe Roos suggested that Watergate and the Vietnam War, which represented “the pinnacle of arrogance,” reaffirmed the role of Satan in temporal affairs. “The prince of this world,” Roos explained, “encourages and delights in the consequent suffering and moral decay.”¹⁹⁹ That young evangelicals’ vitriolic attacks on the power elite of America met with equally contentious responses—“We’ve been the most assailed by people and institutions of wealth and power,” the *Post-Americans* complained to a *Washington Post* reporter—only confirmed their sense of embattlement at the hands of the principalities.²⁰⁰ Liberalism had failed to deliver in the twentieth century. Instead,

No. 8 (September 1983), 5-6; William Stringfellow, “High Crimes and Misdemeanors,” *Sojourners* 13, No. 1 (January 1984), 33-34

¹⁹⁶ *Boston Herald Traveler—Record American* (November 6, 1972), 8, quoted in James Alan Patterson, “Evangelicals and the Presidential Elections of 1972, 1976, and 1980,” paper presented at the Southeastern Regional Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Central Wesleyan College, March 30, 1984, p. 4.

¹⁹⁷ Milliken, *So Long, Sweet Jesus*, 168.

¹⁹⁸ Lee A. Wyatt, “Discipleship Workshops Newsletter,” April 15, 1981, Folder “Discipleship Workshops,” ESA Archives.

¹⁹⁹ Joe Roos, “The Arrogance of Power,” *Post-American* 4, No. 2 (February 1975), 6-7. For a less strident version of this sentiment, see Miriam Adeney, *God’s Foreign Policy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 110-113.

²⁰⁰ Julia Duin, “A Most Unusual Magazine,” *Washington Post*, December 25, 1976, copy in Box IV3, Folder “News Releases and Post-American,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC. On a batch of *Vanguard* magazines being held up at the U.S.-Canada border for being “subversive literature,” see Robert Carvill, “Counterpoint,” *Vanguard* (January 1971), 22. An angry Carvill called the U.S. government a “friend of the Anti-Christ.” For more on the “us-versus-them” mentality that gripped the Reformational community,

Dale Brown explained, “the collective forces of evil, which transcend our own personal struggles with individual sin and our daily associates, have threatened the existence and stability of our so-called great civilization.”²⁰¹ A controlling metaphor of warfare between good and evil—“The church of Jesus Christ is at war with the systems of the world, not détente, ceasefire, or peaceful coexistence, but at war”—characterized young evangelical conceptions of American society.²⁰²

If radical evangelicals predicted the fall of human civilization to the forces of evil, they nonetheless suggested that the larger war between good and evil had already been won. The work of Christ on the cross had already defeated the demonic nature of American power brokers, evident or not, had already been stopped by the work of Jesus on the cross.²⁰³ The cosmic implications of the crucifixion and resurrection extended beyond “the liberal ... theology which reduced Jesus to a Galilean boy scout.”²⁰⁴ Instead, explained Tom Skinner, “Christ is the embodiment of truth, the embodiment of justice and the embodiment of the person who has come to destroy the works of the devil. And the works of the devil are: war, poverty, hunger, racism, pollution and all those things which set people apart. Jesus Christ has come to destroy these works.”²⁰⁵ Young

see Theodore Plantinga, “The Reformational Movement: Does It Need a History?” *Myodicy* 24 (September 2005).

²⁰¹ Dale W. Brown, “The Powers: A Bible Study,” *Post-American* 3, No. 1 (January 1974), 3.

²⁰² Wallis, *Agenda for Biblical People*, 132.

²⁰³ John Howard Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1972), 162. Stringfellow, in fact, felt so strongly about the powers that he refused to vote in 1976, feeling that a vote for either Nixon or McGovern was a compromise. See *Post-American* (October 1976). Stringfellow wrote, “Abstention from voting may be, in 1976, a political act of maturity, and of conscience and faith.”

²⁰⁴ Quoted in See Carol Langston, “Campus Rebel Finds New ‘Revolt,’” *Tulsa Tribune*, March 26 1971, p. 5.

²⁰⁵ Tom Skinner in Milliken, *So Long, Sweet Jesus*, 13. J.R. Moore put it this way: “The gospel is therefore one full-orbed message. It is the good news that God has intervened in human history, fought the decisive battle against every evil, and established a kingdom of righteousness, justice, and peace among

evangelicals saw themselves as foot soldiers in a battle that had already been won, as offering hope for social justice that secular messianisms could not. Radical evangelicalism, explained Post-American Boyd Reese, sees “spiritual as well as political dimensions to the struggle for justice, with praying together one of the most radical political actions people can take.” “It will not be long until American power will have to answer to Christian prayer and protest.”²⁰⁶ Young evangelicals were participants with God in the fight with and ultimate victory over the American principalities of darkness.

The evangelical left thus readily appropriated Manichean rhetoric and activism both toward evangelical and leftist ends. John Perkins, for example, continually urged civil rights activists to adopt evangelical virtues of sexual purity, Scripture reading, and prayer. Their activism, he suggested, would be “sharper and their courage deeper.”²⁰⁷ Jim Wallis, on the other hand, sought to fill the ranks of the fragmenting New Left with a mass of activist-oriented evangelicals.²⁰⁸ These activists—equipped with spiritual resources to nurture justice, compassion, and community—would recover the best virtues of the old New Left even as they rejected the contemporaneous incarnations such as Black Power, Maoism, and the Weathermen of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Claiming loyalty to Jesus, the ancient Jewish prophets, and nineteenth-century abolitionists over Marx and leftist sociologists, young evangelicals offered *Ramparts*’ James Nolan

men which will come to fruition in the return of Jesus Christ to reign over a renovated cosmos.” See Moore, “Mission as Subversion,” 7.

²⁰⁶ Quote from Peoples Christian Coalition newsletter No. 4, May 1972, in folder “News Releases and Post-American,” Box IV3, Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

²⁰⁷ Marsh, *Beloved Community*, 168.

²⁰⁸ Steven Miller paper presented at the Southeastern regional meeting of the American Academy of Religion, March 15, 2003, Chattanooga, Ten.

evidence that CWLF's movement rhetoric was only an evangelistic ploy.²⁰⁹ Nolan, however, overlooked evidence that faith also animated its leftist politics. Even as CWLF tried to convert secular leftists, young evangelicals made common cause with their politics. No friend of the Vietnam War or Richard Nixon's politics, CWLF protested the president's appearance in San Francisco by waving signs that read "Turn to Jesus, Mr. President."²¹⁰ The multiple agendas of young evangelical activists blended together, blurring lines between politics and faith. This was precisely the point—to tie the sacred to the temporal so closely that the two were indistinguishable.

Young Life worker Bill Milliken flirted with violent resistance to the technocracy for nearly a year, until two events turned him decisively against the violent trajectory of SDS and toward a more conventional evangelical piety. First, he discovered the corpse of Santos, his link to SDS, who had died after a drug overdose. Second, he read through the Gospels, where he discovered "a compassionate, yet radical servant for Christ." Milliken never gave up his radical critique of American society—he still railed against the technocracy, confronted southern clergymen about segregation, and spoke against the Vietnam War—but he did try to fashion a more coherent union between a radical social critique and his evangelical faith.

It was a union inspired in part by Clarence Jordan, the founder of the racially integrated Koinonia Fellowship in Americus, Georgia. Ladon Sheats, the young IBM

²⁰⁹ "We have studied the lives of revolutionaries, but their promises have left us with despair," wrote InterVarsity students at the University of Wisconsin after condemning the Vietnam War. "We ought to study the life of Jesus Christ." See "Despair Eats at Students," *Manna* 1, No. 1 (September 14, 1970), copy in Box 344, Folder 2, "Manna," InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

²¹⁰ Sparks, *God's Forever Family*, 115-117.

executive turned radical, drove Milliken and four Lower East Side converts—Eddie, Bobo, Maurice, and Dean—to Stony Point, New York. There they met the “Southern redneck” Jordan along with a young minister from Texas, an architect from St. Louis, a fiery evangelist from Detroit, an executive with IBM, a sensitive young man from Connecticut who had recently bailed out of a lucrative family business, and three suburban Young Life workers. Jordan led this odd assortment of folks disgruntled with establishment evangelicalism and American corporatism in a retreat marked by spiritual catharsis.

Holding the group spellbound far into the night with stories of overcoming racism in the South, Jordan told them, “You see, you got a lot of people saying Christ changed them. That’s a bunch of bull! They just changed Christ and put Him in heaven where they don’t need to contend with Him. How do I know that? Because His people ain’t changed.” After two days of Jordan’s exhortations, the group found itself exhausted. They had been “stretched, bent, pulled, taken apart and put together.” “I felt,” said Milliken, “like I couldn’t have absorbed another new idea or thought.”

Jordan presided over a communion service to close the weekend gathering. As the 14 men sat around an old wooden table holding two candles, a large loaf of bread, and a pitcher of wine, they prayed and reflected for a long period of time. “My eyes,” remembered Milliken, “would shift back and forth, watching the flickering, dancing flames of the candles, looking around at the small group of people that were no longer strangers but brothers. It was peaceful. I felt my worn-out mind, body, and soul refreshed, renewed and healed.” As Jordan spoke the words, “And on the last night ... they broke bread,” Milliken’s doubts and questions faded amidst the “profound presence of Christ.

... It was beautiful; it was powerful; it was joyful. ... I saw the plan for God's new order unfolding before me." Milliken had found no peace in the domesticated Jesus of conservative evangelicalism. Nor had he found an alternative in "the movement, with its machine-gun carrying Jesus." Yet in this moment of spiritual cleansing, Milliken explained, "God gave me a bridge. ... A third alternative emerged."²¹¹

²¹¹ Milliken, *So Long, Sweet Jesus*, 109, 121, 134-140.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE THIRD WAY: THE POLITICS OF SPIRITUAL COMMUNITY

“I realize that my license is from Massachusetts and the license plates on the car are from Texas, but that’s because I just moved here to D.C. to join this community and so did the person who owns this car; but the car isn’t registered in her name or mine because all our cars are legally owned by just a few of us, and I don’t know why the registration isn’t in the glove compartment because that’s where it was in the last car I drove. I live here in the neighborhood, but I’m not sure who we pay rent to because I’ve just moved into a household and we share all our chores and I happen to take out the garbage and sweep the steps, but I don’t pay the bills ... and I consider these people like my family anyway and ... sir, being angry isn’t helping at all and it really isn’t very good for you.” —A Sojourner talking to a police officer at a traffic stop¹

By the early 1970s political activists, evangelical and secular alike, despaired over their lack of progress. Even after years of dissent, big business remained big. The war continued. Racial conflagration persisted. Richard Nixon coasted to a second easy victory. As the technocracy reigned unimpeded, activists felt as if they had exhausted established methods for political change. Tom Skinner, the fiery black evangelist so critical of American structures at Urbana 70, explained that he had never seen someone actually get in the system, work themselves way up to a position of power, and then effect change. “By the time you’ve done that,” said Skinner, “you’ve had to prostitute yourself on the way up and you forgot what you came there for. ... You see,

¹ Joyce Hollyday, “How to Tell a Sojourner in a Crowd,” *Sojourners* 8, No. 9 (September 1979), 23.

the system is essentially too evil to change—it cannot change.” Society still needed “radical, revolutionary” efforts to defeat the technocracy.

Such evangelicals saw the contemporaneous New Left approach, however, as no more an option than liberalism. Despite Skinner’s affinity for the radical social critique and the participatory democracy of the New Left, he questioned its more recent affinity for violence, which was to “blow the whole system up, just bomb it out, pick up guns, take to the streets and wipe out the entire establishment and start all over.” The “technocracy is so powerful and resilient,” he explained, that the revolution would almost certainly fail:

The so-called radical plants a bomb underneath a General Motors plant and blows it sky high and then wipes his hands and says we got General Motors. The truth of the matter is that he hasn’t touched General Motors. Tomorrow morning the executive committee of General Motors will call an emergency meeting, they will find a new location and build a new plant; they will double production facilities in the existing plant to make up for the one that was bombed out. The insurance will cover the rebuilding of the new plant and what that doesn’t cover will be written off of next year’s income tax. So you haven’t really touched General Motors, you’ve simply inconvenienced them. Inconveniencing the system is not the way to radically change it.

Disavowing both the liberal and New Left approaches (political conservatism wasn’t even an option), Skinner proposed social change through spiritual revolution, a “third way” grounded in historic Christianity that would sweep aside established political categories and strategies. The third way would establish microcosmic communities of authenticity, peace, and justice. “Have some people who can get together and begin to produce live models of what the world ought to be,” suggested Skinner. Such a community would be a “new order,” a “beloved community,” a “forever family,” as some in the evangelical left variously called this third way. “What

Jesus has in mind is, through a radicalized group of people, to produce a new community, a new order of things that will be a live model, on earth, of what is happening in heaven. So when the lonely and the despondent, the unloved, the despised, the hated stand up and say, ‘Where has the love gone?’ the new order, the new community, stands up and says, ‘Over here! Love is practiced among us. We are the epitome of love, we live it out.’”² This third way of spiritual community, epitomized by the popular evangelical song “They Will Know We Are Christians by Our Love,” would legitimately repudiate the dehumanizing forces of the technocracy.

Inspired by the zeitgeist of the seventies and Skinner’s vision of a new order, thousands of young evangelicals sought to construct models of the third way. They established dozens of intentional communities, including the Christian World Liberation Front in Berkeley, California; the Post-American community in Chicago; The Other Side in Philadelphia; and Patchwork Central in Evansville, Indiana, all close-knit groups bound by spiritual fervor, strict rules, egalitarianism, and simple living.

I.

Young evangelicals grounded the third way in Christian spirituality. Biblical allusions and spiritual disciplines coursed through their daily lives. Battling an evil

² Tom Skinner in Bill Milliken, *So Long, Sweet Jesus* (Buffalo: Prometheus Press, 1973), 12-13; Peter Scholtes, “They Will Know We Are Christians by our Love,” 1966 by F.E.L. Publications. The lyrics read, “We are one in the Spirit, we are one in the Lord / We are one in the Spirit, we are one in the Lord / And we pray that all unity may one day be restored / And they'll know we are Christians by our love, by our love
They will know we are Christians by our love / We will work with each other, we will work side by side
We will work with each other, we will work side by side / And we'll guard each one's dignity and save each one's pride / And they'll know we are Christians by our love, by our love / They will know we are Christians by our love.

war and a bureaucratic society that failed to stamp out poverty and racism, they felt a deep existential sense of human sin and social depravity. They spoke of Jesus Christ as the bridge between the depravity of the earth and the integrity of the divine.

“Christians derive strength in the inevitability of Christ’s victory,” wrote Post-American Dennis MacDonald. “They find their hope and identity in the coming order when all will be new, when men will learn war no more, when justice will flow like water and when love will be law.”³ Young evangelicals, rationally defending theism, spreading the message of Christ’s salvific work on the cross, and practicing the faith in community, thus grounded the politics of the third way in faith.

For a group deeply touched by a counterculture imbued with mysticism, many young evangelicals were startlingly preoccupied with rational proofs of the faith.

Moderate evangelicals, those who nurtured relatively close ties to the new evangelicalism and who associated with Wheaton, Calvin, and InterVarsity, especially sought to establish the veracity of the Christian gospel and to nurture a thinking faith that would pass muster in the modern American university. Adhering to a long apologetic tradition, many young evangelicals, moderates and conservatives alike, voraciously read dozens of titles defending the reliability of Scripture and the uniqueness of Christ. Paul Little’s *Know Why You Believe*, for example, answered questions commonly faced by college students: How do I know there is a God? Are miracles really possible? Why is there pain and evil? Did Christ really rise from the dead? How can I know the truth, since some claim that Christian experience is psychological? The InterVarsity Press book sold 330,000 copies from 1967 to 1978,

³ Dennis MacDonald, “Christian Transcendence: Dope or Hope,” *Post-American* 1, No. 2 (Winter 1972), 8-9.

ranking 26th on a 2006 *Christianity Today* list of books that shaped evangelicalism after World War II.⁴ While most of these sales came from conservative and fundamentalist quarters of evangelicalism, works by Little, C. S. Lewis, and evangelical publishers InterVarsity Press, Word Books, and Eerdmans also helped feed the emerging evangelical left's appetite for apologetic texts, according to a trade magazine.⁵

By the early 1970s, however, Francis Schaeffer had risen as the most influential apologist for the faith among members of the emerging evangelical left. Schaeffer founded L'Abri Fellowship, a retreat center in the Swiss Alps, in 1955 as a bastion of Calvinist orthodoxy complete with restrictions on music, film, and other fundamentalist taboos. By the late 1960s, however, Schaeffer had turned into a hippie

⁴ See Paul E. Little, *Know Why You Believe* (Chicago: InterVarsity Press, 1968). InterVarsity emphasized this intellectual approach to faith among new evangelicals and the emerging evangelical left. Little's book was used extensively in InterVarsity chapters across the nation. Sharon Weaver, a Kansas State University student in the early 1970s, remembers the InterVarsity thrust toward the expository method of Bible study, a more rigorous and systematic treatment of Scripture. InterVarsity leaders also recruited top evangelical scholars to boost students' ability to articulate their faith. Harold Ockenga, Wilbur Smith, and Carl F. H. Henry, all pillars of Fuller Theological Seminary, spoke at student conferences and wrote apologetics texts for InterVarsity, among them Henry's *Giving a Reason for Our Hope*. The apologies by these new evangelical spokesmen centered not on the minutiae of fundamentalist dogma, but on what Carl Henry termed the "great verities" of historic Christianity. See Sharon Weaver interview, March 18, 2006; Carl F. H. Henry, *Giving a Reason for Our Hope* (Boston: W. A. Wilde, 1949).

This impulse to "prove" the Christian faith characterized evangelicalism generally, among socially conservative Christians as well as the progressives I describe. Campus Crusade, for example, sent Josh McDowell on the road to demonstrate that "there is an intellectual basis for faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God." From 1964 to 1979, McDowell spoke to more than 5 million students on more than 549 campuses in 53 countries. See "Foreword" in Josh McDowell, *Evidence That Demands a Verdict*, revised edition (San Bernardino, Cal.: Here's Life Publishers, 1979). *Evidence* ranked 13th on the *Christianity Today* list. Another key book for young evangelicals was C.S. Lewis's *Mere Christianity*, third on the list. Stan Shank, who ran LaSalle's Logos Bookstore in Chicago, explained that "Lewis, in his many writings, presented a positive critical approach to the Bible that could stand up intellectually to any scientific inquiry. . . . Lewis should be the cornerstone of any Christian bookstore's attempt to minister to the young evangelical." See Bill Ellis, "Books for Young Evangelicals," *Christian Bookseller Magazine* (January 1975), 25.

⁵ Bill Ellis, "Books for Young Evangelicals," *Christian Bookseller Magazine* (January 1975), 22-25, 59-60.

guru who blended a countercultural style with traditional defenses of the faith. The bucolic setting and Schaeffer's growing reputation as a thinker willing to take on all philosophical comers attracted youths traveling from India to the West still high on opium as well as earnest evangelical students traveling east from America. They all came in search of resolution to existential questions. Clad in knee-high knickers, beige Nehru jackets, long hair, and a white goatee, Schaeffer engaged them through rambling lectures, exchanges over modest meals of soup, bread, and cheese, and more widely through his prolific writings.⁶

In all these forms Schaeffer condemned the torpor of twentieth-century Western thought. Blaming Hegel's notion of synthetic truth as the precursor of philosophical relativism, Schaeffer led university students on sweeping journeys through modern philosophy. In after-dinner conversation in the Swiss chalet, Schaeffer breezed through the deficiencies of Kant, Hegel, and other Western philosophers. Søren Kierkegaard was a particular beneficiary of abuse from Schaeffer for his suggestion that a "leap to faith" was necessary to overcome the paradoxes inherent in Christianity. Western philosophy had abandoned the Reformation synthesis of reason, truth, and faith, Schaeffer expounded, in favor of a soft "new theology" that denied "the God behind truth." Philosophers had separated the "lower story" of natural revelation from the "upper story" of divine revelation. This separation, marked by a "line of despair," left the "upper story" unhinged and susceptible to mysticism,

⁶ John Y. Crighton, "Undercover," *HIS* 35, No. 5 (February 1975), 11-12. For a more extended physical description of Schaeffer and L'Abri, see Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God: How I Grew Up as One of the Elect, Helped Found the Religious Right, and Lived to Take All (or Almost All) of It Back* (New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2007), 208-209.

despair, and the nihilism of modern existentialism.⁷ Conservative evangelical faith, rooted in verifiable natural theology, alone offered the truth that the counterculture sought in vain. Christians, he told Wheaton students in 1965, can and should “rationally prove the authority of the Bible.”⁸

This in itself was not innovative for evangelicalism; scholars had been denouncing philosophical relativity since before the fundamentalist-modernist controversies of the first decades of the century. Schaeffer, however, emphasized evangelical rationality as an evangelist and a cultural critic. While most evangelists conducted altar calls, Schaeffer sought to marshal secularism against itself through an analysis of modern culture. Out of a tradition that often demanded distance from contemporary culture, Schaeffer spoke with fluency of Van Gogh, Henry Miller, the Beatles, and Federico Fellini, describing their common cries of despair and how that contributed to modern ailments such as environmental degradation, racism, and the “plastic culture.”⁹

While evangelical scholars typically dismissed Schaeffer’s analysis of philosophy, culture, and literature as lightweight, students unversed in high or popular culture were drawn like moths to light.¹⁰ For Wheaton students struggling with their college administration to watch the movie *Bambi*, Schaeffer’s calm, didactic

⁷ Francis Schaeffer, *The God Who Is There* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1968), 20-22, 143-147.

⁸ “Schaeffer Stresses Rational Christianity,” *Wheaton Record* 88, No. 2 (September 30, 1965), 3.

⁹ During a lecture entitled “The True Revolutionary” at Calvin College, Schaeffer said, “I agree with the hippies. What they are saying by the way they live is this: We live in a plastic culture and it stinks. And they’re absolutely right. See “Schaeffer Draws Culture in Analysis of Modern Problem,” *Chimes* 63, No. 5 (October 18, 1968), 1.

¹⁰ For a series of critiques by evangelical scholars, see Ronald W. Ruesegger, ed., *Reflections on Francis Schaeffer* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986).

discussions of Fellini felt both incongruous and liberating.¹¹ Schaeffer's riffs on John Cage and Salvador Dali thrilled culturally literate students worried about the intellectual integrity of evangelical scholarship. Schaeffer's visit, historian Mark Noll recalled, was one of the most stimulating campus events of the 1960s. Thousands of young evangelical students—among them Os Guinness, Clark Pinnock, Jack Sparks, Sharon Gallagher—made their way through the Swiss mountains to L'Abri. Those who didn't make the journey heard Schaeffer speak at their evangelical college campuses—or read one of Schaeffer's over 2.5 million copies of eighteen books published by InterVarsity Press between 1965 and 1975.¹²

With the exception of young black evangelicals, even some of the more radical evangelicals not associated with evangelical colleges such as Wheaton carried on this new evangelical apologetic tradition. CWLF, nurturing an exclusive faith and

¹¹ This serious style of apologetics among young evangelicals even extended to some quarters of the black community. John Perkins, for example, gained notoriety in Simpson County, Mississippi, as a “different kind of black preacher. He wore a goatee and wire-rim glasses and comported himself in a professorial manner, speaking in a gentle and melodious voice, divining the secrets of the Bible. He taught from flow charts and mimeographed handouts and quoted the Scofield Reference Bible, whose marginalia placed each passage in an elaborate dispensationalist framework. ‘They don’t expect me to make no kind of spectacle,’ he said. Some local blacks thought he was teaching a different kind of religion altogether, and in a sense he was. He was teaching them about a quieter devotion grounded in the ‘objective truth’ of scripture, about relating to Jesus as lord, savior and friend, and to God as trustworthy father who never leaves.” See Charles Marsh, *The Beloved Community: How Faith Shapes Social Justice, from the Civil Rights Movement to Today* (New York: Basic Books, 2005), 166.

¹² See Michael Hamilton, “The Dissatisfaction of Francis Schaeffer,” *Christianity Today* 41, No. 3 (March 3, 1997), 22-30. For more on InterVarsity Press and Schaeffer, see Andrew T. LePeau and Linda Doll, *Heart. Soul. Mind. Strength. An Anecdotal History of InterVarsity Press, 1947-2007* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2007), 122-123. Many evangelical students were inspired by Schaeffer and other authors with InterVarsity Press to receive Ph.D.s and take positions at universities. InterVarsity Press, which printed most of Schaeffer's books, stocked its 45 Logos bookstores on university campuses with Schaeffer's writings as well as other books on apologetics, among them Pinnock's *Set Forth Your Case*, which attempted to “present compelling reasons to the mind for receiving Christ as Savior.” See Clark Pinnock, *Set Forth Your Case: Studies in Christian Apologetics* (Nutley, N.J.: Craig Press, 1968). “Schaeffer was instrumental in popularizing and legitimizing the life of the mind for many twentieth-century evangelicals,” wrote Robert H. Krapohl and Charles H. Lippy, *The Evangelicals* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1999), 298. For examples of articles by Francis Schaeffer in *HIS* magazine, see “Despair in Art,” *HIS* 29, No. 1 (October 1968), 6-10; “Foreign Films: Freedom through Illusion,” *HIS* 29, No. 3 (December 1968), 31-34; “Alternative to Despair,” *HIS* 29, No. 4 (February 1969), 30-33; “True Spirituality,” *HIS* (June 1972), 18-24.

asserting that Christianity was the true religion and that all others were false, went on the offensive against popular Eastern spiritualities in Berkeley. CWLF's critique centered on these religions' polytheism. Their many gods, young evangelicals asserted, meant that its adherents lived in irreconcilable tension. Only Christian faith could ensure that God and humanity could live "totally united, totally reconciled. Separation is conquered; alienation is conquered; death is conquered."¹³ By the mid-1970s this impulse had coalesced in a branch ministry of CWLF called the Spiritual Counterfeits Project.¹⁴ Formed by three former hippies—Bill Squires, Brooks Alexander, and David Fetcho—who had all dabbled in eastern mystic religions, SCP took on a host of "false religions" led by Sun Myung Moon and Guru Maharaj Ji.¹⁵ They picketed the visit of Maharishi Mahesh Yogi at the San Francisco Civic Auditorium in early 1975, calling attention to the use of Transcendental Meditation (TM) in public schools.¹⁶ In 1976 SCP filed a civil suit in the U.S. District Court of New Jersey against the New Jersey public schools for including the practice of transcendental meditation in its curriculum.¹⁷

¹³ "Up from Zen," *Right On* 3, No. 27 (August 4, 1971), 2, 7.

¹⁴ On the Spiritual Counterfeits Project, see carton 22, reel 83, folder 43 in Series "Counterculture, Community, and Alternative Religion, 1963-1981," Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, Cal. This collection includes back issues of the *SCP Journal* and manuscripts of books jointly published by CWLF and InterVarsity Press. See, for example, Isamu Yamamoto, *Guide to Cults and New Religions* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1983); Joel A. MacCollam, *The Way of Victor Paul Wierville* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1978).

¹⁵ On Moon, see "The Christian Student Coalition of UC Disavows Sun Myung Moon as a Representative of the Christian Faith in any Sense of the Term" signed by Baptists, CC, IV, CWLF, and others; "An Open Letter to the Unified Family of Sun Myung Moon"; and "Prophet? A Challenge to Sun Myung Moon." On Guru Maharaj Ji, see "Open Letter to the Devotees of Guru Maharaj Ji," in Box 2, "Jill Shook," CWLF Collection, GTU Archives.

¹⁶ See CWLF newsletter, circa 1975, in Box 2, "Jill Shook," CWLF Collection, GTU Archives.

¹⁷ See "SCP Wins TM Lawsuit: "Victory At Last!! TM Ruled to be Religious in Nature!!" Berkeley Christian Coalition newsletter (November 1977), 1. In Box 2, "Jill Shook, Jack Sparks," CWLF Collection, GTU Archives.

Most young evangelicals, however, were too busy justifying their own faith to antagonize others. Robert Price, a child of fundamentalism, depended heavily on the “knights of truth” such as Schaeffer, Guinness, and John Warwick Montgomery to carry him through periods of doubt. Vacillating between periods of great zeal and great doubt, Price traveled the evangelical world for sustenance from the giants of the faith. He journeyed to Berkeley to meet with Sharon Gallagher and Jack Sparks; to Wheaton to meet with Carl F.H. Henry and Merrill Tenney; to Chicago to meet with Wallis and the Post-Americans; and finally to Boston to attend Gordon-Conwell Seminary. The evangelical apologetics he had read convinced him that the “stakes indeed were high: if Evangelical Christianity was not true, and based upon historically true events, why then life really held no significance at all!”¹⁸

Young evangelical publications, moderate and radical alike, devoted significant space to addressing these concerns. The early issues of the *Post-American* featured lengthy articles by Clark Pinnock and others on why Christianity was “intellectually satisfying.”¹⁹ At InterVarsity conventions Pinnock, author of *Set Forth Your Case: Studies in Christian Apologetics*, gave lectures on proofs of Christianity. Ron Sider argued for the veracity of the Easter resurrection. Defending the reliability and historicity of New Testament documents, Sider took on form criticism and asked why Jesus’ followers would have willingly undergone persecution if the resurrection

¹⁸ Robert M. Price, *Beyond Born Again* (self-published, 1993). 1-3. For a description of the existential questions of Wheaton students in the late 1960s, see Robert Webber, *Evangelicals on the Canterbury Trail* (Harrisburg: Morehouse Publishing, 1985), 25-27. Also see Paul M. Bechtel, *Wheaton College: A Heritage Remembered* (Wheaton, Ill.: H. Shaw Publishers, 1984), 290.

¹⁹ Jim Moore, “In Defense of the Christian Faith,” *Post-American* 1, No. 1 (Fall 1971), 12-13. Moore wrote, “The use of sound historical evidence is as vital to arriving at an accurate conception of Jesus as it is to exposing the Vietnam fiasco.”

never happened.²⁰ The Christian World Liberation Front devoted extensive space to the search for Noah's ark and proof of a worldwide flood. InterVarsity Press and Word Books bolstered these efforts with reissues of C. S. Lewis titles addressing problems of pain, the existence of God, and evil.²¹ Even the most radical of young evangelicals, such as the Post-Americans, struggled with questions of theodicy. This apologetic agenda, inherited from an older, more socially conservative generation, would lay the foundation upon which the third way could be constructed.

If the evangelical search for rational truth sustained their faith, the evangelical predilection for evangelism motivated an attempt to share that faith through modeling the third way. While some, again typically those with close ties to the new evangelicalism, continued traditional techniques of confrontation and mass evangelism, most disparaged these methods.²² The Post-Americans and *The Other*

²⁰ Ron Sider, "A Case for Easter," *HIS* 32, No. 7 (April 1972), 26-31.

²¹ See Bill Ellis, "Books for Young Evangelicals," *Christian Bookseller Magazine* (January 1975), 24-26, 59-60. Copy of article in Folder IV1, Sojourners Collection, WCSC. Lewis, who was by far the best selling author in the 45 Logos Bookstores, "presented a positive critical approach to the Bible that could stand up intellectually to any scientific inquiry." Particularly good sellers were *The Problem of Pain*, *Mere Christianity*, and *God in the Dock*. Also see Anthony Campolo, *A Reasonable Faith: Responding to Secularism* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1983).

²² John Perkins, for instance, tried to convert every Unitarian, Jewish, and atheistic civil rights activist who arrived on his porch. CWLF likewise invited non-believers to a Billy Graham crusade, one of the tried and true evangelical methods of evangelism since the 1950s. When Graham arrived in Oakland in 1971 to hold a crusade at the Coliseum, CWLF's "Committee to Investigate Billy Graham" rented buses that cruised Telegraph Avenue with someone hanging out the door yelling, "People of Berkeley! Investigate Graham! Find out what he's saying. Is he a threat to the community? Is he really a prophet of God? Is he a lunatic? Is he a political agent of Nixon? Who is this man? Come to the Coliseum and find out. Free rides both ways. People's free buses returning at 10: 30!" The buses were filled every night. Though most participants in the emerging evangelical left objected to Graham's close ties to Nixon and to his singular focus on a limited definition of evangelism in the 1960s and early 1970s, they were sympathetic to his evangelistic concern as a whole. CWLF for instance appealed to its readers each week in a recurring *Right On* column to "accept Christ" because he "holds the key to the solution of any basic problem you can suggest." See Marsh, *The Beloved Community*, 168; Jack Sparks, "How to Start Something," *Newsletter of the American Scientific Affiliation* 17 No. 1 (February 1975). One CWLF member acknowledged the difficulties in proselytizing "hippies who don't believe in logic" and "leftists who don't believe in God." See Jill Shook letter to "Hedie and Fred" entitled "A Cosmic Overdose, circa 1974, in Box 2, "Jill Shook, Jack Sparks," CWLF Collection, GTU Archives.

Side, for instance, dismissed Billy Graham's mass revivals as "electronic evangelism." They criticized Jesus Freaks' habit of accosting vacationers on the beach. They objected to Campus Crusade's use of the "Four Spiritual Laws" tract.²³ The Post-Americans, as well as many InterVarsity students, who were more sympathetic to the message, found the tract's spiritual laws—Law #3, for example, "God LOVES you and offers a wonderful PLAN for your life"—to be juvenile and simplistic. "Evangelizing," sermonized one article in InterVarsity's newsletter, is more than "just a recital of some spiritual laws."²⁴ In a report to InterVarsity's leadership in 1968, Robert Bluford, Jr. wrote that "There is a noticeable lack of concern for political or social issues. ... The Crusade offers easy answers to very complex problems."²⁵ Reports circulated of a system at Crusade of weekly reports to ensure that each member achieved a conversion quota. "I was absolutely sick at heart to see a spiritual ministry reduced to a combination of holes in an IBM card," wrote an InterVarsity regional director in 1966.²⁶

Emerging members of the evangelical left rather endorsed an "incarnational" approach to evangelism. They discouraged blind preaching of the gospel in favor of befriending non-believers and modeling a new society. "Pray about this," urged a

²³ On ambivalence toward Graham, see David Gill, "Letters," *Right On* 9, No. 2 (September-October 1977), 2; Dorothy Friesen and Gene Stoltzfus, "Billy Graham in Manila," *Right On* 9, No. 2 (September-October 1977), 18-19. They wrote, "Like you, we believe in the cause of evangelism. But your style is something we cannot afford." On "electronic evangelism," see Mortimer Arias, "Evangelization: Incarnational Style," *The Other Side* (September 1978), 31.

²⁴ See Carolyn Blunk, "Rice Hosts Session," *The Branch* 1, No. 8 (April 20, 1973), 1. Copy in Folder 124:11, InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

²⁵ Robert Bluford, Jr., "Brief Summary of Inquiry Made Regarding Campus Crusade for Christ and Inter-Varsity," May 1968. In Folder 20:3 "Campus Crusade: Correspondence and Materials, 1960-1976," InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

²⁶ David Adeney, "Eastern Regional Report—January 1966," May 20, 1966, Box 20, Folder 3, "Campus Crusade: Correspondence and Materials, 1960-1976," InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

CWLF member in Berkeley, “There is a significant group of people the brothers and sisters have been interacting with for some time who are on the verge of response to Jesus.” Soon after, members of CWLF rejoiced at the news of “a number of new brothers and sisters who’ve become Christians recently, including Greg, Wayne, Dave, Ricardo, Carol, Jackie, and others.”²⁷ This attraction of spiritual searchers to a beloved community was evangelism in its purest form, said Clarence Jordan, a mentor to many third-way evangelicals. It was “based not upon a sermon, not upon a theory, not upon an abstraction, but upon the word of God made flesh and dealing with us, and restoring us to our right minds.”²⁸ A position paper by students at the Institute for Christian Studies at Toronto similarly read, “We would want to speak of ‘evangelism’ as the magnetic Life-Way of a People who are compellingly attractive because they are engaged as a Shalom-bringing People in politics, education, economics, the arts ... engaged in everything as a distinctive People, drunk on the New Wine of Jesus Christ!”²⁹

ICS’s embrace of an evangelism that encompassed all of life, from politics to the arts, points to a broadening of method and definition. For most in the emerging evangelical left, evangelism entailed more than pleas to “ask Christ into your heart.” CWLF sought to administer what they called the “whole gospel” by providing lodging and food for transients in Berkeley. Evangelism for Art Gish meant “calling sin by its name—militarism, pride, racism, materialism, and economic exploitation,” then

²⁷ See “Prayer and Praise,” CWLF Newsletter, n.d., in Box 2, “Jill Shook, Jack Sparks,” CWLF Collection, GTU Archives.

²⁸ Marsh, *The Beloved Community*, 56.

²⁹ “Where Are All the Christians Hiding?” *Vanguard* (January 1971), 11. Also see John F. Alexander, “New Directions for Jubilee Fund: A Continuing Effort to Support Justice and Freedom in the Context of a Holistic Gospel,” *The Other Side* (September 1978), 14-17.

inviting people to “salvation from these structures of sin.”³⁰ For Calvin professor Richard Mouw, evangelism involved social and political activism.³¹ This impulse to make the word of God “flesh” offered a new method of evangelism, one that attempted to reveal the work of Christ by making systems just. The emerging evangelical left, with its deep awareness of sin and its confidence that Christ could bridge the depravity of humanity with the salvific power of the divine, invited the “unsaved” to participate in both spiritual and social regeneration.

If the emerging evangelical left eschewed the formulaic conversions and extended the definition of evangelism, it exploded the cultural boundaries of established evangelicalism. InterVarsity pushed against old denominational allegiances. The Post-Americans experimented with Pentecostal and contemplative modes of worship. Evangelical college students nurtured the language of the streets, dismissing legalistic fundamentalism in favor of a freer, more spontaneous faith.

To be sure, most retained traditional spiritual disciplines of prayer, worship, and Bible-reading. However, they practiced these disciplines in new ways. Men arrived at prayer meetings and worship services wearing beards and blue jeans, women in peasant skirts. A freer style—with raised arms, guitars, and casual language—characterized their worship. They played guitars instead of pianos and organs. They sang “Kum-ba-yah, My Lord” and “Pass It On,” songs inspired by young evangelical

³⁰ Art Gish, “Reconsideration,” *Post-American* 1, No. 4 (Summer 1972), 12. Once he added a social dimension, Gish adopted many of the traditional methods of evangelism. Noting the irony, Gish wrote, “I used to make fun of the fundamentalists for their street preaching, handing out tracts, and door-to-door visitation. But then while working in the movement, I discovered that I was also doing street preaching, handing out tracts, and doing door-to-door visitation. The content may have changed, but the form was the same!” Also see John Alexander, “Prophetic Evangelism,” *The Other Side* 19, No. 6 (June 1983), 8-9.

³¹ Richard Mouw, *Political Evangelism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1974).

melding of orthodox doctrine and countercultural style. Instead of sitting on pews, they perched on folding chairs or sat cross-legged on the floor. Leaders eschewed formal sermons in favor of more casual “teachings” or group sharing. At Chicago’s Circle Church, members projected worship songs on the wall, acted out skits, and used multi-media presentations.³² Members of CWLF worshiped through folk dance and urged readers of *Right On* to frequent the Conservatory Theater, the San Francisco Symphony, and the Art Museum.³³ At Church of the Savior in Washington, D.C., members made pottery and staged festivals with choreographed pageantry. For countercultural evangelicals from conservative evangelical congregations, these new styles were refreshing in their end run around traditional worship forms.³⁴

This relaxed mode of worship and dress extended to language. At Wheaton, students occasionally hissed during chapel.³⁵ Others flouted their parents’ censure of profanity. They never swore in God’s name, but other vulgarities sprinkled *Right On*, internal Post-American documents, and daily speech.³⁶ CWLF applied colloquial

³² “twentyonehundred,” produced by a Fuller student, was a prominent young evangelical example of a multi-media presentation using themes from the counterculture. The 90-minute production featured nine projectors, five screens, stereophonic sound, lighting effects, rotating prisms, and live actors. It opened with etchings by Gustave Dore of Dante’s *Divine Comedy*, then faded to images of pollution, crowding, inflation, and loneliness. Ninety minutes later the production ended with the affirmation that “Jesus is the way.” Along the way, viewers were bombarded with pulsing colors, slides, and music from the Beatles, Vanilla Fudge, Led Zeppelin, Traffic, and Peter, Paul, and Mary. On “twentyonehundred” at Urbana 70, see Box 344, Folder 11, “Urbana Meetings 1968-1971,” InterVarsity Collection, BGC Archives.

³³ See, for example, ads for the Pacific Film Archive, Berkeley Repertory Theatre, and the Oakland Symphony in “The Billboard,” *Right On* 5, No. 10 (April 1974), A1-A4.

³⁴ “There were occasions in the repetitious absurdity of services when I just wanted to stand up and scream at the top of my lungs just to have broken the futility of it all!” remembered Circle Church’s pastor about worship at Moody Church. See David R. Mains, *Full Circle: The Creative Church for Today’s Society* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1971), 20.

³⁵ Donn Welton, “Chapel Outbursts Show ‘Childish Mentality,’” *Wheaton Record* 89, No. 12 (December 8, 1966), 3.

³⁶ For examples of profanity, see the September 1971 issue of *Right On* and letter from Bill Wicher in *Vanguard* (March-April 1972), 20. “I got plenty sick of seeing people work their asses off for

language to Scripture itself. In *Letters to Street Christians*, the group's translation of the Apostle Paul's letters to the early church, "two brothers from Berkeley" explained that they wanted "to get the New Testament down for right where kids are today. ... 'Cause of that we had to get away from formal language and dusty religious rap. Dig it."³⁷ This "hippie Bible," written by CWLF's Jack Sparks and staffer Paul Raudenbush, became a bestseller in evangelical circles. Published by Zondervan, *Letters* sold over 100,000 copies in 1970 alone.³⁸

The language of the street came out of a new taste for the popular counterculture. In the early 1970s members of the emerging evangelical left became devotees of Bob Dylan and Peter, Paul, and Mary.³⁹ *Right On* staffers and other members of CWLF even fraternized with Dylan and some of the dynamic personalities of the counterculture.⁴⁰ Francis Schaeffer, one of the primary interpreters

nothing but money," complained a CWLF editorial. See "Reach Me," *Right On* 1, No. 14 (April 24, 1970), 3.

³⁷ Flyer advertisement for *Letters to Street Christians*, in Box 2, "Jill Shook, Jack Sparks's Letters," CWLF Collection, GTU Archives. Letters rendered James 2:17-20 this way: "Brothers and sisters, why say you trust in Jesus when you don't live like it? You're just jiving Him and yourself, and that isn't the kind of faith that makes you a member of God's forever family. ... You say you believe in God. Right on! So do all the devils in Hell, and it really freaks them out. You'd better dig it: a plastic trust without action is dead. Dig?" See Jack Sparks and Paul Raudenbush, *Letters to Street Christians* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1971).

³⁸ On sales, see Larry Eskridge, "God's Forever Family: The Jesus People Movement in America, 1966-1977," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Stirling, 2005), 196. For another example of colloquial Bible translations popular among young evangelicals, see Clarence Jordan, *The Cotton Patch Gospel* (Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys Publishers, 1968).

³⁹ Wheaton President Hudson Armerding's son Taylor played in a rock band that featured many Dylan songs. See interview with John Currie. Also see Jon Dahl, "Grad Talks to Dylan's Aunt; Learns of Singer's Youth," *Wheaton Record* 93, No. 27 (May 14, 1971), 3.

⁴⁰ Gallagher sat in the alternative press section next to Abbie Hoffman (as a correspondent for *Popular Mechanics*) at the 1972 Democratic National Convention. The CWLF delegation at the convention also talked with members of Gay Liberation, Pop People's Party, Yippies, Zippies, Vietnam Veterans Against the War, Krishnas, and the poet Alan Ginsburg. See oral interview with Sharon Gallagher, July 7, 2006, and David Gill, "The Messiah in Miami Beach," *Right On* 4, No. 2 (August 1972), 5-6. For an interview with John Lennon and Yoko Ono, see Steve Turner, "John and Yoko Interviewed," *Right On* 4, No. 5 (November 1972), 4. For an interview with Noel Paul Stookey of Peter, Paul, and Mary, see "Just Plain Noel Stookey," *Right On* 4, No. 8 (March 1973), 5, 11. Some of the

of popular culture for young evangelicals, affirmed this engagement with the counterculture and introduced InterVarsity students to the exotica of the counterculture under the guise of criticism.⁴¹ Sharon Gallagher of CWLF remembers learning during her four weeks at L'Abri an approach in which "you don't hide from culture, you transform it. You go watch a movie and then critically engage it. That's what inspired me to come back from L'Abri and write movie reviews for *Right On*. No other Christian magazine was doing this."⁴²

Many began to borrow new forms, not just from the counterculture, but also from other religious traditions. A Calvin student, for example, explaining that he was dispirited by "theological fence-tending," sought ecumenical ties with a wide spectrum of Christian traditions.⁴³ Others found alliances formed in co-belligerency against the war and for civil rights to be more compelling than old denominational loyalties

other prominent interviewees included Eldridge Cleaver, Bobby Seale (founder of the Black Panthers), Anthony Bryant (hitman for the Black Panthers), Bob Dylan, Dennis Peacocke (Berkeley Free Speech), Bill Garaway (draft resister); Mike Kennedy (established SDS in Houston, later converted to a charismatic Episcopal group, the Church of the Redeemer). Word Books published Cleaver's *Soul on Fire* in 1978.

⁴¹ "According to Dad, Samuel Becket, Jean Genet, The Beatles, Bob Dylan, et al., were doing God's work. They were preparing men's hearts, in 'pre-evangelism,' and 'tearing down the wall of middle-class empty bourgeois apathy.' Jimi Hendrix was right to scorn that plastic business, man! All we needed to do was provide the answer after the counterculture rebels opened the door by showing people that life without Jesus was empty. ... Since that language was rock and roll, art and movies, it suited me perfectly. Not only had the fundamentalist taboos of my childhood lapsed; they were reversed. In fact, during our many arts weekends I was encouraged to play the latest records, and then we would have discussions on what it all meant." Mick Jagger, Keith Richards, Paul McCartney, Jimmy Page of Led Zeppelin; Eric Clapton, Timothy Leary, Bob Dylan, Joan Baez all visited L'Abri or had other close connections with the Schaeffers. See Frank Schaeffer, *Crazy for God* (Carroll & Graf, 2007), 211-212.

⁴² Sharon Gallagher interview, July 7, 2007. Young evangelical publications began to offer movie reviews during this period. See, for example, the May 1970 issue of *HIS* for reviews of *The Graduate* and *Midnight Cowboy*. Just several years before, movies were banned on many evangelical campuses. Calvin College for instance censured *Chimes* editor George Monsma for printing a review of a movie. See "Chimes Censured: Student Council Supports Editor with a Vote of Confidence," *Chimes* 57, No. 20 (April 12, 1963), 1.

⁴³ John Lagerwey, "The Great Gap," *Chimes* 60, No. 22 (April 1, 1966), 2.

nurtured by their parents.⁴⁴ The diverse conglomeration of Kuyperian Calvinists and Anabaptists, Plymouth Brethren and Presbyterians, and Mennonites and Methodists at the 1973 Chicago Declaration Workshops testified to this ecumenical impulse. The *Post-Americans*, a template of the ecumenicity of the emerging evangelical left, drew not only from traditional evangelicalism and New Left politics, but also from Anabaptist, Catholic, and Pentecostal traditions.⁴⁵ Orthodox, Episcopalian, and Catholic sensibilities attracted CWLF's Jack Sparks and dozens of Wheaton students.⁴⁶ Conversely, the broadening of evangelicalism attracted those from other traditions. Anabaptists such as Ron Sider, John Howard Yoder, and Art Gish as well as Calvinists such as Richard Mouw began to move into the evangelical orbit in the early 1970s.⁴⁷ Whatever the trajectory, this new ecumenical sensibility ran deep in the young evangelicalism.

⁴⁴ In this they followed the advice of Francis Schaeffer, who advised evangelicals to be "co-belligerents" with non-Christians on select issues. See Roger Dewey, *Inside* (November 1973), copy in Folder "1973 Chicago Declaration," ESA Archives.

⁴⁵ Seventeen Christian traditions were represented in the Sojourners community in the late 1970s. Their worship style was described as "mixture between high Episcopal and holy roller." See Philip Muston, "Sojourners: Unique Community, Unique Message," *On Being* (December 1979-January 1980), 63-66. Copy in Box IV1, "Articles and Critiques about Sojourners," Sojourners Collection, WCSC. On Catholic influences, see "Interview with Ralph Martin," *Post-American* 4, no. 2 (February, 1975): 8-14 and an entire issue of *Sojourners* entitled "Incarnating Love: Dorothy Day and the Catholic Workers," *Sojourners* 5, No. 10 (December 1976). On the contemplative strain among young evangelicals, see the August-September 1975 issue of the *Post-American*, which features articles on Thomas Merton, prayer, the Church of the Savior, and on integrating the inner life of contemplation and social action. For a sympathetic Reformed analysis of Pentecostalism in high churches, see Richard Mouw, "Catholic Pentecostalism Today," *Reformed Journal* (July-August 1972), 8-15. On the Pentecostal influence on the young evangelical community Grace and Peace Fellowship in St. Louis, see Egon Middelmann, "A Community of Worship" in "Grace and Peace: Perspectives on our History," ed. Grace Marsh (November 10, 1974), 4-7. In ESA Archives.

⁴⁶ On the Wheaton connection with Episcopalianism, see Robert Webber, *Canterbury Trail*, 38-49, 96. CWLF split into two in 1975 when Jack Sparks and others decided to turn Eastern Orthodox.

⁴⁷ See *Engaging Anabaptism: Conversations with a Radical Tradition*, ed. John D. Roth (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 2001). See especially contributions by Richard Mouw, Samuel Escobar, and Richard Hays.

Despite openness to new forms and alliances, then, most young evangelicals sought to retain their evangelical identity.⁴⁸ On important matters of piety such as prayer, the second coming of Christ, and sympathy to Billy Graham (despite their many criticisms of the larger-than-life evangelist), even many so-called “radicals” showed continuity with their parents.⁴⁹ Moreover, despite political differences with the new evangelicalism, young evangelicals also sought to establish ecclesiastical continuity with evangelical social efforts, though they had to search deep into the nineteenth century to uncover an evangelical tradition rich both in the kind of social concern and piety they liked. In this historical project, the emerging evangelical left drew from Nazarene scholar Timothy Smith, whose 1950s research on revivalism, perfectionism, and social reform in the nineteenth-century gradually filtered down to young evangelicals such as Bill Leslie of Elm-LaSalle Bible Church in Chicago.⁵⁰ In

⁴⁸ To be sure, many young evangelicals perhaps exaggerated their practices of piety in order to get a hearing from their constituency. And some young evangelicals faltered under the weight of existential questions, unable to recover their conservative faith. Others immersed themselves in social activism, indifferent to their faith. See for example the case of Jonathan Stielstra, president of the sophomore class at Calvin College in 1966. Stielstra transferred to the University of Wisconsin, where the six-foot-three student gravitated to leftist politics and the free-wheeling campus life. In 1967 Stielstra helped plan campus protests against Dow Chemical Corporation (whose headquarters, where his uncle Stieley worked, were in Michigan). His most notorious action took place in October 1967, when he cut down the American flag atop Bascom Hall. After a search (complicated by police confusion between Jonathan and his identical twin brother Phil) and a 23-day jail sentence, Stielstra followed the trail of the New Left and counterculture—to Columbia and Paris for student rebellions, to Hanoi in May 1968 with SDS, to the Democratic convention in Chicago, and to Woodstock and Altamont. See David Maraniss, *They Marched Into Sunlight* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003), 239-240, 391-393, 510.

⁴⁹ One Wheaton student, considered a campus rebel, was observed by President Armerding praying earnestly for the college’s administration. Jim Wallis, after hauling the first batch of *Post-Americans* into his apartment in the middle of the night, sank to his knees and began to pray. “Strong feelings of gratitude, expectation, and bold, confident faith rushed over me,” he later recalled. The *Post-Americans* met four times a week for “Biblical meditations.” See “Community Proposal,” n.d., in Box XII, Folder “Post-American Letters/Memos/Info from the Office,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC; Bechtel, *A Heritage Remembered*, 295; Jim Wallis, *Revive Us Again* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1983), 15. On prayer, see Jim Wallis, “The Work of Prayer,” *Sojourners* 8, No. 3 (March 1979), 3-5.

⁵⁰ Timothy L. Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957). Also see Norris Magnuson, *Salvation in the Slums: Evangelical Social Work, 1865-1920* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1977).

the mid-1960s Leslie, upon learning that British evangelicals had been at the forefront of crusades for prison reform and the abolition of slavery, began to preach he called “a balanced Gospel” to his congregation.⁵¹

Wesleyan scholar Donald Dayton, whose book *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* traced an evangelical preoccupation with social concerns through American history, most persistently promoted the new genre. Following Smith’s lead, Dayton highlighted Charles Finney and Theodore Weld, whose egalitarian tendencies helped stoke the flames of abolitionism; Oberlin College, an institution whose reformist impulses contributed to feminism, the peace movement, and the theory of civil disobedience; Arthur and Lewis Tappan, whose fortune funded benevolent societies; and Phoebe Palmer, an evangelist whose work helped form the feminist movement. Dayton’s work on Jonathan Blanchard explored the “radical” heritage of Wheaton College, which was “born in the throes of social reform and abolitionism.” Blanchard, like Charles Finney, sought a “perfect state of society” and was willing to use church discipline on those who held slaves, or even supported the institution of slavery. Significantly, Blanchard stressed that “slave-holding is not a solitary, but a social sin.” This, argued Dayton, was what the twentieth-century version of Wheaton College had failed to recognize about sin—that it was a structural problem, not just personal failings. A spiritual biography of Charles Finney written by Wheaton’s president V. Raymond Edman which ignored Finney’s many ethical judgments and focused only on “the spiritual” nature of revival, explained Dayton, underscored how Wheaton and

⁵¹ James Hefley and Marti Hefley, *The Church That Takes on Trouble* (Elgin: David C. Cook Publishing Company, 1976), 72-73; Donna Wessel, “Evangelicals in Politics: Our Forebears Legislated Morality Too,” *HIS* (March 1983), 19-21. Wessel highlighted abolitionism and organizing trade unions among lower-class evangelicals. “We must take the political legacy of Wilberforce, the ‘Great Abolitionist’ seriously,” she wrote, “and do what we can to influence public policy.”

broader evangelicalism had abandoned its activist heritage in a “great reversal.”⁵²

Mining nineteenth-century America for a radical evangelical heritage allowed Dayton to suggest that authentic evangelicalism truly did address contemporary social issues such as poverty and race relations.⁵³

Dayton’s project allowed young evangelicals to simultaneously critique and claim their evangelical heritage. The critique centered on the ethical apostasy of contemporary evangelicalism. Dayton himself described *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* as the product of his struggle to “reconcile the seemingly irreconcilable in his own experience: the [quietist] Evangelical heritage in which he was reared and values bequeathed him by the student movements of the 1960s.”⁵⁴ Nineteenth-century evangelicals, Trinity professor Pinnock implied, would have embraced the civil rights movement. Referring to the nineteenth-century abolition of slavery, prison reform, human treatment for the mentally ill, and improved working conditions for industrial workers, Pinnock wrote, “There was at the time no dichotomy between spiritual renewal and social compassion.”⁵⁵ Real evangelical spirituality in fact launched social

⁵² This term was coined by David Moberg. See Moberg, *The Great Reversal: Evangelism versus Social Concern* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1972). Also see “Great Reversal” chapter in Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 85-92. On Dayton receiving a standing ovation in the mid-1970s when he gave a lecture at Oklahoma Wesleyan University, see Donald Dayton interview, July 12, 2006. Students subsequently tried to persuade administrators to name a dorm after one of the subjects—abolitionists Orange Scott—in *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage*.

⁵³ Donald W. Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 1, 19. The book was an expansion of a series of articles first published in the *Post-American* from June 1974 to May 1975. Radical Anabaptist-oriented evangelicals expressed ambivalence toward Dayton’s analysis. Nineteenth-century evangelicals nurtured a sense that America, with the help of spiritual revival, could act as a benevolent force. Anabaptists, with their sharp skepticism about the promise of the state, questioned the reforming impulse of evangelicals who closely identified America’s destiny with eschatological hope.

⁵⁴ Dayton, *Discovering and Evangelical Heritage*, 1.

⁵⁵ Clark Pinnock, “Election Reflections,” *Post-American* 2, No. 1 (January-February 1973), 1-2. CWLF member Sharon Gallagher similarly wrote, “Coming into an awareness of the cultural and

reform, as Smith suggested in his seminal work. In marshaling evangelical models against contemporary failures, the emerging evangelical left claimed an evangelical identity. They sought to reclaim authentic evangelicalism from its contemporary quietist and rightist forms. Dayton's historical narrative both burnished their evangelical credentials and extended their critique of the tradition.⁵⁶

Dayton's recovery of his own tradition, InterVarsity's stress on apologetics, and Schaeffer's call for a rational faith collectively suggested that the emerging evangelical left (which consistently used "evangelical" as a self-identifier) sought to retain an evangelical identity and an orthodox faith. Like St. Peter, they stood "ready to give the reason . . . concerning the hope that is within you." Yet this hope, they qualified, should avoid twentieth-century political precedents. Suggesting that authentic faith should result in a politics that was "ultimately far more revolutionary" than either mainstream evangelicalism (preoccupied by biblical inerrancy) or the radical Left, parts of the emerging evangelical left sought to pioneer a third way rooted in authentic spiritual community.⁵⁷

political dimensions of the gospel made my spiritual life more meaningful and intense." See "A Conversation with Young Evangelicals," *Post-American* 4, No. 1 (January 1975), 6-13.

⁵⁶ Nineteenth-century evangelicalism so inspired the emerging evangelical left that Evangelicals for Social Action considered producing a film on "a leading figure of the 19th century," perhaps Charles Finney, and Jim Wallis in the 1980s sought to replicate the revivalism and social action of the previous century in a series of urban revivals. See "Discipleship Workshop Executive Committee Meeting," December 9-10, 1977, in Folder "Discipleship Workshops," ESA Archives; Jim Wallis, "From City to City," *Sojourners* 13, No. 3 (March 1984), 4. More than thirty years later, *Sojourners'* Jim Wallis would repeatedly declare that he was "a 19th-century evangelical born in the wrong century." See Wallis, *God's Politics: Why the Right Gets It Wrong and the Left Doesn't Get It* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005); Wallis, *The Great Awakening: Reviving Faith and Politics in a Post-Religious Right America* (New York: HarperOne, 2008).

⁵⁷ Os Guinness, *The Dust of Death: A Critique of the Establishment and the Counter Culture, and the Proposal for a Third Way* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1973), 368-369. On conservative counter-efforts of *Christianity Today* and Harold Lindsell, concerned almost solely by the "battle for the Bible" as the main evangelical concern of the era, see Lindsell, *Battle for the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976).

II.

If the evangelical left valued the community of faith, it also cultivated faith in community. Disillusioned with burgeoning evangelical congregations in suburban Chicago that had succumbed to the technocracy, professional editor Lane Dennis moved to the northern woods of Michigan's Upper Peninsula to escape the "mass world with its impersonal power."⁵⁸ The technocracy, he lamented, had concocted a poisonous cocktail of insidious consumerism, fragmented relationships, authoritarianism, ecological collapse, and spiritual lethargy. But Christ offered a third way of "radical communion with fellowman" that in important respects resembled the secular cooperative living movement.⁵⁹ The more strident advocates of the third way suggested that only communal living—with its intimate relationships, egalitarian temper, simple living, and ecological sensitivity—could challenge the life-draining technocracy. "Each new defection from the old," wrote Dennis, "loosens the grip of official consensus. Each new community points to what life can be."⁶⁰ Spiritual community pointed to a new spiritual, social, and political order.

⁵⁸ Lane T. Dennis, *A Reason for Hope* (Old Tappan, N.J.: Revell Co., 1976), 13-50. As Dennis fired up their cook stove for the first time, he experienced "an elating moment. I actually had visual images in my mind of ties with the technological society being literally severed. We didn't need it any longer. We could generate our own heat! It was really quite a liberating thought." For an articulation of young evangelical discomfort with traditional worship styles, see Ted Smith, "A Community of Fellowship," in "Grace and Peace: Perspectives on our History," ed. Grace Marsh (November 10, 1974), 7-8, copy in ESA Archives.

⁵⁹ Many young evangelical communities viewed themselves as part of the larger cooperative living movement. Over a dozen were included in the "1975 Community Directory" found in *Communities: A Journal of Cooperative Living* 12 (1975), copy in Box VI10, Folder, "News Articles and Papers," Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

⁶⁰ The space program, Dennis analogized, was the religion of the technocracy. It was overly reliant on science and technology, administrated by a vast government bureaucracy, sought to supersede God, and was complete "with rituals, cultic celebrations, a priesthood of scientists and technicians to guard and interpret, saints, and even martyrs. President Nixon described the first moon landing as the greatest event since creation." See Lane Dennis, "Living in a Technological World," *The Other Side* 9, No. 3 (May-June 1973), 36-41. On the revolutionary nature of community and its challenge to the establishment, see John F. Alexander, "In Search of Who We Are: A Look at the 'Fundamentals' of

The small-is-beautiful impulse so prevalent in the broader counterculture found many adherents within the emerging evangelical left. “Small scale culture—based on intimacy, sympathy, trust, and face-to-face relationships—has increasingly been replaced by the mass world with its impersonal power relationships,” wrote Lane Dennis.⁶¹ Bigness came under attack in the early 1970s as third-way evangelicals railed against mass production, plastics, large supermarkets, suburbs, large-scale evangelism, and megachurches.⁶² They despaired at their own complicity, recognizing that each time they purchased a commercial product, watched a movie, even left their hometown communities to pursue education and jobs, they were perpetuating mass culture. Even the most heroic attempts to break the technocracy through mass politics in the 1960s, they recognized, had come to an ignominious end. American bigness was hegemonic.

In response, third-way evangelicals downsized. They sought to emphasize the small by living locally, unmediated by machines, the media, or corporations. True fulfillment, they resolved, came from the “do-it-yourself” approach of forming food cooperatives, tilling gardens, and most of all, from fully participating in community

“Radical Christianity,” *The Other Side* 14 (July 1978), 11-16; Rick Cassidy, “Was Jesus Dangerous to the Roman Empire?” *Right On* 10, No. 4 (January-February 1979), 3. Cassidy answered Yes, because Jesus showed concern for the sick, for women and Gentiles and he called “explicitly and implicitly for radical modifications in those patterns.” In his views of material possessions and social relationships, he was “a serious threat to the continuance of Roman rule in Palestine and the Empire itself. If large numbers of people ever came to support the new social patterns that Luke portrays Jesus advocating, the Roman empire could not have continued. ... Jesus pointed the way to a social order in which neither the Romans nor any other oppressing group would be able to hold sway.”

⁶¹ Dennis, “Technological World,” 38.

⁶² Robert Schuller, pastor of the Crystal Cathedral in suburban Orange County, was derisively called “a little man with a big church.” They particularly objected to the plush building, which Schuller described as a “money generating factory with 4100 income producing seats.” See “Loser of the Month,” *Wittenburg Door*, No. 34 (December 1976-January 1977), 5. Also see “Door Interview: Dr. Robert H. Schuller,” *Wittenburg Door*, No. 25 (June-July 1975), 8-15, 18-20. This issue was devoted to “the big church phenomenon,” calling Schuller’s Crystal Cathedral a “tower of Babel.”

life. “Community,” wrote Sparks, is not impossible, but “actually represents the only effective way to fight the bondage of the economic bureaucracy. That’s the kind of community we in CWLF are committed to.”⁶³ The authenticity, affection, and love found in the close communal relationships, many of them posited in an impressive flood of books and articles, most authentically challenged the technocracy.⁶⁴ They harbored hopes that it could eventually even be defeated through the proliferation of small, self-sufficient, alternative communities unencumbered by entrenched institutional forms. Many members of the emerging evangelical left—comprised primarily of evangelicals associated with Wheaton, Trinity, and Calvin—formed dozens of intentional communities across the nation.⁶⁵ Anabaptist, charismatic (both

⁶³ Jack Sparks, review of *The American Condition*, by Richard Goodwin, on a peach-colored leaflet in Box 2, Jill Shook, CWLF Collection in GTU Archives. Conversely, “know-how and clever manipulation of resources” were not enough to find fulfillment or fix global economic problems, wrote Sparks in a glowing review of *Small Is Beautiful*, a book read copiously by young evangelicals. See Sparks, review of *Small Is Beautiful*, by E. F. Schumacher, on an orange-colored leaflet in Box 2, Jill Shook, CWLF Collection in GTU Archives.

⁶⁴ See, for example, Dave and Neta Jackson, *Living Together in a World Falling Apart* (Carol Stream, Ill.: Creation House, 1974); Jack Sparks, “Community: The Closeness We Need,” *Right On* 6, No. 8 (April 1975), 4-5; “Even Bibles are Mass Produced,” *Manna* 1, No. 5 (circa Fall 1970), 1; Joan Wulff, “Searching for Community in an Individualistic Age,” *HIS* 42, No. 6 (March 1982), 5 (1, 4-5); Jim Wallis, “The New Community,” *Post-American* 2, No. 4 (September-October 1973), 1; David H. Janzen, “The Empire of Mammon and the Joyous Fellowship,” *Post-American* 2, No. 4 (September-October 1973), 2, 15; Elizabeth O’Connor, *The New Community* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976); O’Connor, “Common Life,” *Sojourners* 5, No. 4 (April 1976), 35-37. Also see numerous articles throughout the 1970s in *HIS* on “small groups.” An important inspirational text for young evangelicals was Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Life Together* (New York: Harper, 1954). The Jacksons’ *Living Together* was an “instant bestseller” when it arrived at Chicago’s Logos Bookstore. See Bill Ellis, “Books for Young Evangelicals,” *Christian Bookseller Magazine* (January 1975), 25. For a satirical contrast of the cold, impersonal “neo-evangelical hug” and the warm, affectionate hugs at *Sojourners*, see Jim Stentzel, “Evangelical Hugging,” *Sojourners* 7, No. 1 (January 1978), 24. On the important role of feelings and authentic expressions regarding controversial issues within ESA, see “Hot and Cold” game rules; Howard Walden to Ron Sider, February 13, 1976; and “Minutes of Planning Session,” March 19, 1976, in Folder “Discipleship Workshops,” ESA Archives.

⁶⁵ Jubilee Fellowship of Germantown in Philadelphia; Post-American Community in Chicago/Sojourners Fellowship in Washington, D.C.; Koinonia Farm in Americus, Ga.; Worden Street Community and Christ’s Community in Grand Rapids; Christian World Liberation Front in Berkeley, Cal.; Church of the Savior in Washington, D.C.; Menominee River Fellowship in Wallace, Mich.; Grace and Peace Fellowship in St. Louis; Patchwork Central in Evansville, Ind.; The Bartimaeus Community in Berkeley, Cal.; Community Covenant in Missoula, Montana; and New Covenant Fellowship of Urbana-Champaign, Ill.

Protestant and Catholic), and Jesus People-oriented evangelicals, often with fewer ties to the “new evangelicalism” and nurturing less of a political profile, established hundreds more.⁶⁶

While these intentional communities took a multiplicity of forms—some strictly communal, featuring shared homes, furniture, and incomes; some allowing families to live discretely within a larger neighborhood of members—all of them sought to cultivate authenticity, close egalitarian relationships, and mutuality.⁶⁷ Nancy Amerson, a member of Patchwork Central, an intentional community in Evansville, Indiana, shared a freezer, lawn mower, washer and dryer, garden tiller, and vehicles with her fellow members, an arrangement valued for its promotion of community interaction as much as its thriftiness.⁶⁸ During worship services at CWLF, members passed a hat. Those who had extra money would add it to the collection; those who needed money would take it. Those with extra clothes would leave them on the

⁶⁶ Sojourners kept a card file with a list of more than 130 U. S.-based communities, house churches, resistance groups, and emerging fellowships with which they had personal contact. They also kept a list of more than 200 additional communities which they had heard about. See Bob Sabath, “A Community of Communities: The Growing Ecumenical Network,” *Sojourners* 9, No. 1 (January 1980), 17-19. Examples of Anabaptist-oriented communities include Reba Place Fellowship in Evanston, Ill; Plow Creek Fellowship of central Illinois; Grain of Wheat Fellowship in Winnipeg, Manitoba. Examples of charismatic communities include Church of the Redeemer in Houston, Tex.; Church of the Messiah in Detroit; Community of Celebration in Woodland Park, Col.; Community of Celebration in Scotland; New Jerusalem Community in Cincinnati; Son of God in Cleveland. Examples of Jesus People communities include Bethlehem Covenant Community (seven households) in Lake Oswego, Oregon; Highway Missionary Society near Grants Pass, Ore; House of Elijah in Yakima, Wash.; Shiloh Youth Revival Center, which established over 180 communal houses across the nation (70 in Oregon alone) between 1968 and 1978. See Joe V. Peterson, “Jesus People: Christ, Communes and the Counterculture of the Late Twentieth Century in the Pacific Northwest,” (Master’s thesis, Northwest Christian College, 1980), 32, 40. The Brunswick Christian Community, renamed the North Coast Christian Community in Ohio, included Silver Spring Christian Community and Akron Christian Community, among others. On groups with a contemplative emphasis, see Jubilee Community in Winnipeg, Manitoba.

⁶⁷ Many of these communities taught children non-competitive games—the garden plot game and the “game of the nations”—that demonstrated the inequities of global systems. See Elizabeth MacDonald, “Games Children Play,” *Vanguard* (May-June 1977), 17-19.

⁶⁸ Elaine M. Amerson, “Christian Family Lifestyle Guidelines,” in *Living More Simply*, ed. Ronald J. Sider (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1980), 63-68.

porches of the many CWLF houses for others to take.⁶⁹ Third-way evangelicals coveted the closeness, smallness, and earthiness of such arrangements, which tended to spark serendipitous conversations on stairways and spontaneous prayers on the porch. Mennonite Doris Longacre likewise urged readers to be intentional about building relationships when entertaining. She encouraged people while eating during meals to engage in self-disclosure and profound conversation; to read devotional or biblical literature aloud; to tell stories and experiences; and to share object lessons.⁷⁰ At Reba Place, an intentional community on the northern edge of Chicago, members shared income, chores, meals, and worship services.⁷¹ The schedule, while busy, was simple—no need for daycare, for individual budgeting, for juggling church and family time. Third-way evangelicals sought to circumvent the fragmentation of modern commuter lifestyles.⁷²

In their efforts to recover deteriorating American family life, the young evangelicals resembled their socially conservative evangelical counterparts. Mending “the floundering family” with its divorces, abuses, and neglect in the midst of an “impersonal, institutional-industrial society,” diagnosed Elaine Amerson of Evansville, Indiana, would require the nurture of “human values instead of material

⁶⁹ Walt and Ginny Hearn interview, July 9, 2006, Berkeley, Cal.

⁷⁰ Doris Janzen Longacre, *Living More with Less* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1980).

⁷¹ Dave and Neta Jackson describe a taxing schedule for Reba Place members: daily devotions with household of 15-30 minutes; meal attendance three times a day; personal counseling once a week; household business meeting once a week; Sunday morning worship; Sunday small group (one hour); Sunday teaching (one hour); Tuesday members meeting and small group (two hours); Wednesday all-Fellowship members meeting (one hour); Friday evening common meal; Saturday morning cleaning and maintenance. More time was spent on music and drama practices, social service activities, and other leadership meetings. “More than one free night per week,” write the Jacksons, “was a rare luxury for most people.” See Dave Jackson and Neta Jackson, *Glimpses of Glory: Thirty Years of Community: The Story of Reba Place Fellowship* (Elgin, Ill.: Brethren Press, 1987), 209.

⁷² Cathy Stentzel, “Household Living,” *Sojourners* 6, No. 11 (November 1977), 31.

values” and “biblical foundations that undergird and strengthen the family.”⁷³ For Amerson, this meant limiting vocational pursuits so that she had time to scavenge at Midwestern auctions for used furniture with her family, to garden, and to cook. Real cooking, as opposed to heating up pre-packaged meals or eating at restaurants, meant that families could prepare—and eat—meals together. For other women, it meant pursuing a vocation while enjoying a built-in day care center full of close, reliable friends. “‘Aunts’ and ‘uncles’ abound in the style of the almost-extinct extended family,” noted Amerson.⁷⁴ Third-way evangelicals thus suggested expanding the conventional family into a much larger unit of kinship. The expansion of the nuclear family could help shore up the fragmenting American family rent apart by pervasive mobility, apartment living, and industries that operated around the clock.⁷⁵ For the 40 members of the Post-Americans, even a birth was a community event. The group gathered at the bottom of the stairs to hear member Jackie Sabath’s labor cries.⁷⁶ For families without a father or mother (and even those with both), community life offered resources for guidance and discipline. In many evangelical intentional communities, adults often disciplined children who were not their own. Wallis, a single man who

⁷³ Also see Tom Sine, *The Mustard Seed Conspiracy* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1981), 63-65; Ron Sider and Richard K. Taylor, *Nuclear Holocaust and Christian Hope: A Book for Christian Peacemakers* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1966-1967); Dennis, *Reason for Hope*, 25-31.

⁷⁴ Elaine M. Amerson, “Christian Family Lifestyle Guidelines,” in *Living More Simply*, ed. Ronald J. Sider (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1980), 63-68.

⁷⁵ Sparks, “Community: The Closeness We Need,” 4-5. In an interview of children in the Sojourners community, one said, “People in suburbia, they always look real bored. They hardly talk. Suburban kids are rivals—they try to be better than the other person. They all stay inside. I wish I knew what they did inside there—probably have two color TV sets.” See “Out of the Mouths of Babies,” *Sojourners* 7, No. 9 (September 1976), 30-31.

⁷⁶ Wallis, *Revive Us Again*, 106; “Celebrating Marriage in Community,” *Sojourners* 6, No. 12 (December 1977), 25. On home childbirth, see Dawn Ward, “All in the Family: Having Babies at Home,” *The Other Side* 14 (July 1978), 45-47.

lived in a house with children, married and single people, explained, “It feels like a family and it runs like a family.”⁷⁷

In addition to shoring up family life, community living encouraged a rigorous spirituality. Third-way evangelicals devoted remarkable chunks of time to community service, worship and Bible study. CWLF’s weekly calendar, for example, included a class on the Old Testament at 4 p.m. on Sundays, a “Bible Rap” at 2 p.m. at Ludwigs Fountain on the UC-Berkeley campus during the week, an evening study at 7:30 p.m. on campus, a Wednesday class on “Genesis in Space and Time at 4 p.m., a Wednesday evening forum called “The Loaded Questions” at 7 p.m., the Thursday evening “Androclean Forum” in Oakland, a Friday evening “Covenant House Discussion” at 7:30 p.m., and a mass group worship service called the “Family Celebration” on Saturday at 7:30 p.m. Members also ran sessions for guerrilla theater and a magazine with tens of thousands of subscriptions.⁷⁸ Church of the Savior, which asserted that “A surrender to Christ is a surrender to His people—total involvement in the life of the church,” required a rigorous membership process of six courses, filling out an

⁷⁷ Malcolm Doney, “People Who Need People,” *Today* (November 1982), 34-36. Copy in Box VIII, Folder “Articles about Jim Wallis,” Sojourners Collection. WCSC. On the importance of parent-child negotiation, see Jim and Kathy McGinnis, “Parenting for Justice,” *ESA Update* 5, No. 5 (September-October 1983), 3-4. For other third-way parenting advice, typically centered on non-competition, see “Family: Parenting for Peace and Justice,” *Sojourners* 13, No. 4 (April 1984), c16-17; “Cooperative Games for the Whole Family,” *The Other Side* 19, No. 1 (January 1983), 12-14; Meredith Sommers Dregni, *Experiencing More with Less: Intergenerational Curriculum for Camps, Retreats, and Other Educational Settings* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1983).

⁷⁸ Walt Hearn remembers the difficulties in keeping it all going with new converts. “In the mailroom for *Right On*, sometimes they’d answer mail, sometimes they wouldn’t.” See Walt and Ginny Hearn interview, July 9, 2006. Like CWLF, the Post-Americans held required activities every evening of the week: on Monday, a biblical meditation; on Tuesday, a business meeting; on Wednesday, a visitor’s night; on Thursday, a biblical meditation; on Friday, a biblical meditation; on Saturday, an accountability session; and on Sunday, worship with “the gathered community.” Each of these meetings followed an evening meal, at which members should “make every effort to be present each night.” See “Community Proposal,” circa 1972, in Box XII, Folder “Post-American—Internal,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

extensive application, and then a period of sponsorship.⁷⁹ Church of the Savior and Gospel Temple in Philadelphia voluntarily submitted income tax returns to each other as a gesture of accountability for generous giving to charities.⁸⁰ Moreover, simply living together meant having one's speech, activities, and pieties almost constantly monitored in efforts toward spiritual improvement. Third-way evangelicals termed this spiritual accountability "discipleship." Some communities took discipleship so seriously that they excommunicated members "living in sin" for failing to conform to spiritual standards.⁸¹ In the newly reorganized Sojourners community, Jim Wallis began to redirect his enthusiasm, formerly reserved for opposition to the Vietnam War. "We are becoming more pastoral," he wrote. "The new front is spirituality."⁸² Living together in community reinforced right living and the practice of spiritual disciplines.

⁷⁹ Elizabeth O'Connor, *Call to Commitment* (Washington, D.C.: Servant Leadership Press, 1994), 25-27.

⁸⁰ See chapter, "Watching over One Another in Love," in Ron Sider, *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1977), 199. Sider wrote, "Truly being sisters and brothers in Christ means unlimited economic liability for each other or responsibility for the economic lifestyles of the other members."

⁸¹ On discipleship, see David Gill, "The Meaning of Conversion: Discipleship and Life," *Right On* 6, No. 6 (February 1975), 8; David Gill, "The Meaning of Conversion: Communities in the World," *Right On* 6, No. 7 (March 1975), 9; "In Quest of Discipleship: A Post-American Education-Action Seminar in Chicago," Summer 1973, in Box IV3, Folder "News Releases and Post-American," Sojourners Collection, WCSC; Wes Michaelson, "Evangelicalism and Radical Discipleship," in *Evangelicalism and Anabaptism*, ed. C. Norman Krauss (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1979), 63-82; and Bob Sabath and Jim Wallis, "In Quest of Discipleship," *Post-American* 2, No. 3 (May-June 1973), 3. A key text on discipleship read by young evangelicals was Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship* (New York: MacMillan, 1959). On community discipline and excommunication, see Art Gish, *Living in Christian Community* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1979), 133-179; Art Gish, "Love as Church Discipline," *The Other Side* 9, No. 2 (March-April 1973), 133-179; Ron Sider, "Spare the Rod and Spoil the Church: Would your Church Excommunicate Anyone? Why not?" *Eternity* (July 1976), 18-20, 46.

⁸² Quoted in Jim McManus, "Sojourners: Magazine, Community—And More," *National Catholic Reporter* (n.d.). Copy in Box IV3, Folder "News Releases and More," Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

Third-way evangelicals, in addition to cultivating a small-is-beautiful impulse and authentic spirituality, experimented with egalitarian methods of governance. Contra the bureaucratic structures of technocratic America society, they argued, community living offered the opportunity to form authentic democratic structures that gave voice to the voiceless. Third-way evangelicals, for example, applauded developments at InterVarsity's Urbana 70. Minority groups of all kinds—blacks, women, the deaf—all demanded time on stage. Convention planners worried about “strongly reacting people in the audience” if women weren't adequately represented.⁸³ A correspondent from *Presbyterian Journal* noted not just the vocal participation of appreciable numbers of black students, but also a “more spontaneous and pronounced” reaction by students generally. “Students fired questions at speakers from the floor of the Assembly Hall. ... An underground newspaper carried on a running dialogue with convention speakers.”⁸⁴ This underground newspaper, which became ICS's *Vanguard*, printed all names in lower-case, reflecting their aversion to hierarchy and their affinity for flouting literary convention.

The egalitarian temper that pervaded even the cavernous Assembly Hall at the University of Illinois flourished more in smaller settings.⁸⁵ The Post-Americans, who

⁸³ David M. Howard to Urbana '70 Executive Committee, in Box 68, Folder 7, “Urbana 1961-1974,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA.

⁸⁴ James W. Reapsome, “Similar, but Different,” *Presbyterian Journal* 30 (January 20, 1971), 4-5.

⁸⁵ InterVarsity, though large, still had a reputation for being decentralized and less hierarchical than Campus Crusade. Their reputation was that “no one was in charge.” See “Problems for Solving, 1973,” in Box 72, Folder 6, InterVarsity Collection, BGCA. Because “of the changing mood of the campus,” InterVarsity administrators agreed to involve students at fairly high levels of decision-making. See “Minutes of the Meeting of the Staff Advisory Committee of the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship Held at Elburn, Illinois, March 22-25, 1965,” Box 34, Folder 1, “1951-1965,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA. Similarly, the Urban Life Center in Chicago sought to include students in decision-making. “In the beginning, it was stated that a distinguishing mark of this new institution would be an egalitarian decision-making process. The constitution at the time of incorporation indicated that up to half of the governing board might be composed of students—a provision that still stands.” See Eunice and Donald

never exceeded 100 people, for example, sought to form a “chiefless” community characterized by mutual submission.⁸⁶ Wallis and Sabath wrote, “The model we have chosen to follow is that of voluntary horizontal relationships between communities and people rather than the model of top-down decision-making structures.”⁸⁷ By 1979 this had evolved into a decentralized system of six un-ordained elders with no head minister for community of 60 core members. Wes Michaelson, editor of the *Post-American*, member of Church of the Savior, and top aide to Oregon Senator Mark Hatfield, noted, “A lot of people are realizing that distinctions between the ordained and the nonordained Christian are not that important any more.”⁸⁸

The egalitarian impulse extended beyond ecclesiology to the mundane details of community life. The Post-Americans pooled their paychecks, leveling individual wealth by distributing allowances of only \$200 per month. They devoted the remaining income to the magazine and social services. Decisions about issues as practical as finances, as mundane as home maintenance and quiet times, and as sensitive as sex, discipline of children, and drinking were hashed out in regular evening discussions.⁸⁹ To keep preachers from undue influence at the Circle Church in

Schatz, “The Urban Life Center” in *The Urban Mission*, ed. Craig W. Ellison (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1974), 104.

⁸⁶ “What Is the People’s Christian Coalition?” *Post-American* 1, No. 1 (Fall 1971), 5; Marlin E. Miller, “The Recasting of Authority: A Biblical Model for Community Leadership,” *Sojourners* 8, No. 2 (February 1979), 24-27.

⁸⁷ See Jim Wallis and Bob Sabath, “In Quest of Discipleship,” *Post-American* 2, No. 3 (May-June 1973), 3. For a Post-American primer on how to run small group discussions, particularly on how to keep the group from chasing tangents and keep a participant from dominating, see “Guidelines for Small Group Discussions” in Box XI1, Folder “Post-American—Internal,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

⁸⁸ Quoted in Kenneth L. Woodward, “Power to the Laity,” *Newsweek* (March 6, 1978), 95-96.

⁸⁹ Joe Roos, “Economic Koinonia,” *Sojourners* 8, No. 8 (August 1979), 24-25; “When Religion Blends with Social Activism,” *U.S. News & World Report* (December 31, 1979), 81-82. Economic sharing led some young evangelicals to reject commercial insurance, preferring instead to depend on

Chicago, fellow ministers, elders, and members vetted sermons multiple times each week.⁹⁰ At the Oregon Extension of Trinity College, an alternative wilderness school established in 1975 as a haven for progressive evangelical students, the ten faculty members and twenty students shared cooking, cleaning, washing, and maintenance chores.⁹¹ Some communities ritualized the principle of mutual submission through foot-washing rites and hymn-singing.⁹²

Some third-way communities informalized or entirely dropped what CWLF called “titles of distinction.” Art Gish argued that “the use of titles means perpetuation of inequality and authoritarianism.” Using “Mr.” and “Mrs.” created generational barriers. Using “pagan titles” like “professor” or “doctor” set people apart from others.” Using “Reverend” violated the Anabaptist notion of the “priesthood of all

God and the community. See this letter from a member of an intentional community in Washington: John Swarr, “Feedback,” *Post-American* 2, No. 3 (March-April 1973), 14; and “Interview with Reba Place Fellowship,” *Post-American* 2, No. 4 (September-October 1973), 8-11.

⁹⁰ For a description of the sermon-vetting, see Mains, *Full Circle*, 43. “Each sermon is now a composite of the thoughts of the five. Whoever preaches goes over his thoughts with another member of the team on Monday, or before. If anything basic needs changing, it should come out here. On Tuesday the entire staff hears in summary the emphasis of the sermon. Again there is criticism and added perspective from the various backgrounds and viewpoints. Once or twice more the speaker meets in private session with other staff members as the week continues. We try to contribute ideas for illustration or application. We listen carefully for thoughts which detract from the main thrust rather than enhance it. We watch for improper English. We attempt to ask how this applies to Fred, or Jack, or Betty. Will it meet their needs where they are? On Saturday morning the whole staff has breakfast together, listens to the sermon, goes over the various parts they will play in the total service, and then prays. By Sunday morning the material has been well polished and should prove helpful to our people.”

⁹¹ See Box 58, Folder 5, “Student Training Programs, 1976,” InterVarsity Collection, BGCA; Randall Balmer, *Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory: A Journey into the Evangelical Subculture of America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 210.

⁹² The lyrics read, “Male and female, God created; Man and woman, by God’s love. Boy and girl, Girl and boy ... Single or together, Equal and sharing, Boldly declaring, This is who we are We are all the Children of God Hallelujah! Free to be loved and equal, we are all the children of God! Hallelujah! We are children of God!” See Donald Marsh and Richard Avery, “Male and Female,” 13, in Sharon and Tom Neuffer Emswiler, *Sisters and Brothers Sing!* (Normal, Ill.: Wesley Foundation Campus Ministry, 1977). *Sojourners* and *The Other Side* advertised this songbook. On mutual submission within community, see Judy Alexander, “Servanthood and Submission,” *The Other Side* 9, No. 4 (July-August 1973), 2, 40-43.

believers.”⁹³ “Either everyone should be given these titles,” wrote Gish, “or no one.”⁹⁴ John Alexander, editor of *The Other Side* magazine, suggested, “Perhaps instead of status titles like managing editor and assistant editor, we should work toward a committee of editors who make decisions together. Of course, a leader would be chosen, and gifts and responsibilities would be recognized. But ‘editor-in-chief’? It sounds pagan to me. If Jesus had an advisory board, it would have been composed of fishermen, publicans, former prostitutes, and other nobodies.”⁹⁵ Even Jack Sparks, the charismatic leader of CWLF who came as close to an authoritarian leader as any among young evangelicals, was known as “Daddy Sparks,” which made his insistence on becoming “Father Sparks” all the more jarring when he joined the Orthodox movement in 1975. Most settled on using “brother” and “sister,” despite the terms’ gender distinctions.⁹⁶

Third-way evangelicals extended their egalitarian claims beyond language to vocation. Some communities encouraged men to stay home to raise children while women entered the workforce. Gish advised men to wash dishes and women to fix cars in order to break down hierarchies of vocation and gender.⁹⁷ Many allowed

⁹³ Arthur G. Gish, “Simplicity,” *The Post-American* 1, No. 2 (Winter, 1972), 10.

⁹⁴ Arthur G. Gish, *Beyond the Rat Race* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1973), 51.

⁹⁵ Alexander continued, “Should we really have boards composed of famous names, money, and power?”; “We must be prophetic whatever the cost. . . . We must never aim to please financial backers.” See Alexander, “Christian Journalism,” 46. Similarly, see Howard A. Snyder, “Should the Protestant Pastor Be a Superstar?” *The Other Side* 9, No. 2 (March-April 1973), 8-11.

⁹⁶ Sojourners, for instance, eliminated “sexist language” (as well as hierarchical terms such as “master,” “Lord,” “King,” and other “power words”) from their worship. See “Suggested Bibliography” and “Worship Survey Results,” in Box VII1, Folder “Inclusive Language and Worship,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

⁹⁷ Gish, *Beyond the Rat Race*, 53, 166. Gish wrote, “There is an executive (a man) who considers his time so valuable and important that he hires a secretary (a woman) to do the menial, insignificant tasks that would be a waste of his time. . . . Work and relationships do not need to be structured that way. Why can’t everyone do both desirable and undesirable work? Everyone should spend some time

women to publicly pray and preach. Grace and Peace Fellowship, a community started by Presbyterian seminarians in 1969 in the Skinker-De Baliviere neighborhood in St. Louis, for example, objected to their denomination's stance limiting female leadership.⁹⁸ Jim Wallis likewise declared that Sojourners was working "hard at raising leadership—both men and women."⁹⁹ For many young evangelicals, feminism offered a welcome challenge to the technocratic default of putting decision-making "in the hands of a very few men" and of making traditionally feminine vocations demeaning. If women worked inside the home, their tasks had by technology been made "largely dull, repetitive, never-ending jobs that any non-creative person can be trained to do." If women worked outside the home, they were exploited through low wages and left unprotected by unions.¹⁰⁰ Such observations inspired the rise of the evangelical feminist movement, many of whose most important leaders emerged from third-way circles.

Egalitarian evangelicals also fought the class inequities inherent in the technocracy. On speaking tours of evangelical campuses in the 1970s and 80s, Sider emphasized that "God is on the side of the poor."¹⁰¹ Etta Worthington told

cleaning toilets and no one should spend a major amount of time doing it. ... A related despicable practice is the hiring of servants to do our dirty work at a salary much lower than we would ever want to receive for doing more enjoyable work. It is sobering to notice all the black women entering wealthy white suburbs early in the morning. We all know what they will be doing and why. ... Simplicity implies giving up our privileged position in the world."

⁹⁸ Referring to the Presbyterian Church in America's ecclesiology, Grace and Peace Fellowship's constitution read, "The Session disagrees with BOCO 7-2 that only a man can be a deacon and therefore does not intend to utilize the office until qualified men and women can be elected to the office." See "Constitution of Grace and Peace Fellowship," October 7, 1972, p.9 in ESA Archives.

⁹⁹ Quoted in Muston, "Sojourners: Unique Community, Unique Message," 66.

¹⁰⁰ Dick and Joyce Boldrey, "Technocracy and Women's Liberation," *Post-American* 1, No. 4 (Summer 1972), 10-11.

¹⁰¹ Paul Hayes, "Sider Speaks on Hunger," *Wheaton Record* 104, No. 12 (January 18, 1980), 2; Ron Sider, "Is God Really on the Side of the Poor?" *Sojourners* 6, No. 10 (October 1977), 11-14; "Door

InterVarsity students that “the Scriptures have a definite bias in favor of the poor.”¹⁰² Many regularly cited the biblical parable of the rich, young ruler, who is told by Jesus that it is easier for “a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.”¹⁰³ CWLF’s “An Open Statement to the Hearsts and the SLA,” for example, while condemning the Symbionese Liberation Front’s kidnapping of the nineteen-year-old Patty Hearst, nonetheless argued that her fate was due “to the sins of the upper class of which the Hearsts are a part. They are part of an unjust establishment which allows some to have millions and others to live on the brink of starvation, and which drives some of its young people to extreme acts in the attempt to redress the imbalance.” Citing Jesus’ parable of the rich, young ruler, CWLF insisted that the church-going Hearsts should have “done what Jesus commands them to do as one of his would-be wealthy followers—that is, give their riches to serve the poor.”¹⁰⁴ Sojourners cultivated similar logic in internal community discussions during the 1982 Lent season. Member Danny Collum spoke of “the class bias of God” and the ability of the poor to understand the gospel better than middle-class Christians.¹⁰⁵ Even some Reformed scholars nodded at the bottom-up ethos of the third-way evangelicalism, affirming notions of preference for the poor.¹⁰⁶

Interview: Ron Sider,” *Wittenburg Door*, No. 51 (October-November 1979), 12-16; Peter H. Davids, “God and Mammon,” *Sojourners* 7, No. 2 (February 1978), 11-17.

¹⁰² Etta Worthington, “’Tis a Gift to Be Simple,” *HIS* 35, No. 8 (May 1975), 4.

¹⁰³ See, for example, Ron Sider’s presentation at the International Consultation on Simple Life-style in Hoddeson, England, in 1980. Alan Nichols, “Lausanne Occasional Paper 20: An Evangelical Commitment to Simple Life-Style,” in *International Consultation on Simple Life-style* (Hoddesdon, England: Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization, 1980).

¹⁰⁴ Christian World Liberation Front, “Kidnapped: An Open Statement to the Hearsts and the SLA,” *Right On* 5, No. 9 (March 1974), 3. Jim Wallis lauded the statement in the subsequent issue of *Right On*, praising CWLF for being “uncomfortably Christian.”

¹⁰⁵ In a March 10, 1982, discussion among the Sojourners community, an unidentified leader argued that the poor held a more concrete, rather than abstract, theology, and that they understand

This preferential view of the poor mirrored (and was in many ways derivative) of the ethos of the sixties. Third-way evangelicals' assertion of a divine class bias came in the throes of Latin American liberation theology and Students for a Democratic Society, both important influences on the emerging evangelical left. SDS, for example, had tried to create egalitarian political structures—what the Port Huron Statement called “participatory democracy”—to give the poor more power. Liberation theology similarly sought to use political activism rooted in Christian mission to bring relief and justice to the poor. Like liberation theorists and SDSers, third-way evangelicals saw hope for liberation in alternative education. In part intended to provide education to the poor and in part to sidestep the bureaucratic nature of college education, several communities offered no-tuition classes at “free universities.” These interactive classes featured fewer lectures, more discussion, and marginalized topics and texts not typically offered at evangelical colleges.¹⁰⁷ CWLF, for example, launched a free university called “The Crucible,” which offered classes on “History of the Radical Church,” “Liberation and the Christian Sister,” and “Marxist Ingredients for a Prophetic Critique on Contemporary Society,” and “Introduction to New

feelings of powerlessness. “When powerless, your only hope is in God.” In Box IV1, Folder, “Articles and Critiques about Sojourners,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC. On evangelical condemnation of corporate abuse of workers and resonance with Cesar Chavez, see Carolyn Hudson, “March on Gallo” *Right On* 6, No. 8 (April 1975), 9; Dave Lumian, “Letters,” *Right On* 6, No. 1 (July-August 1974), 2; Jim Stentzel, “That Others May Simply Live,” *Sojourners* 8, No. 2 (February 1979), 3-4. Also see Donald Kraybill, *The Upside-Down Kingdom* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1978). Kraybill contended that Jesus, in radically opposing the dominant culture by reaching out to social outcasts and rebelling against authorities, pointed his followers toward a posture of skepticism toward secular wealth and power.

¹⁰⁶ Gordon Spykman, ed. *Let My People Live: Faith and Struggle in Central America* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 227-228.

¹⁰⁷ One Post-American memo suggested ways to facilitate egalitarian exchanges—“Ask persons to paraphrase each other when communication is critical or when hearing seems not to be occurring. Make the statement, ‘I hear you saying ...’” See “For Staff Only,” internal memo on techniques for leading Summer Education-Action Seminar, Box IV3, Folder, “News Releases and Post-American,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

Testament Greek.”¹⁰⁸ The Post-Americans offered courses on “The New Left and Counter-Culture,” “The Christian and Cold War Ideology,” “Racism,” and “What Is Christian Radicalism” at their free university two Monday evenings each month.¹⁰⁹ In the late 1960s Wheaton College’s student government sought to sidestep the strictures of the administration’s conservatism by offering classes on black history, Asian history, and “White Racism in America” (taught by the Chicago-based Committee for One Society). Despite these ambitious programs, evangelical free universities, like their New Left counterparts, failed to attract blue collars to their universities or demonstrations.¹¹⁰

Their egalitarian aims succeeded much more in the form of food cooperatives and housing reform movements. More circumspect in their ability to actually circumvent capitalist structures, third-way evangelicals nonetheless hoped to soften the harshest elements of the economic system on the poor by providing “good food for low prices.” Sojourners operated a low-budget food cooperative in an unheated basement of one of the community’s households. Open each Friday for 12 hours, the coop sold fresh produce, cheese, eggs, bread, canned goods, and other bulk items. In 1979 the cooperative grew 200 members, many of whom were low-income

¹⁰⁸ “The Crucible,” *Right On* 4, No. 3 (September 1972), 5; CWLF newsletter, November 1, 1973, copy in CWLF Collection, GTU Archives. The Crucible was the most successful of the evangelical free universities. It was the predecessor to the New College Berkeley, now affiliated with the Graduate Theological Union.

¹⁰⁹ “Minutes of the Peoples Christian Coalition,” October 3, 1971, in Box VII7, Folder “People’s Christian Coalition, Trinity,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

¹¹⁰ Attendance at these free university courses was mixed. Eighty-four students showed up for the first course on Asian history, but it soon dropped to an average of 12. Forty-four came to the first course on racism, but all were white, already students, and laconic. “One difficulty I have in coming to Wheaton is that y’all won’t talk back—you force us into a lecturing position,” said one African-American instructor. See “White Racism Unmasked at Free U,” *Wheaton Record* 92, No. 10 (November 21, 1969), 3.

neighbors.¹¹¹ Sojourners' tenant organizing campaign flourished even more. Within two years, Perk Perkins, David McKeithen, and Jim Tamialis had organized eight tenant organizations to deflect evictions and rent increases.¹¹² They lobbied District politicians and launched several direct action campaigns against landlords.¹¹³

To be sure, not every group practiced the egalitarian structures they preached. Some students fed their starved appetites for luxury each Christmas, spring, and summer break as they visited their families. Women often complained about being relegated to child-rearing, even in the midst of egalitarian rhetoric.¹¹⁴ Some communities were transfixed by the charisma of a dynamic male leader. And some, particularly in times of community strife, periodically emphasized authority.¹¹⁵ Still, the egalitarian rhetoric and practices shown in governing structures and views toward women, racial, and economic minorities highlighted an important new impulse that would remain, even if in moderated form, characteristic of the evangelical left.¹¹⁶

¹¹¹ Jackie Sabath, *Sojourners' Newsletter* (Spring 1978), 2; "When Religion Blends with Social Activism," *U.S. News and World Report* (December 31, 1979), 81-82; Joyce Hollyday, "The Euclid Food Club," *Euclid Street Journal* (circa 1983), 1, copy in Folder "Food Programs," Box X1, Folder "Local Ministries, Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

¹¹² Joyce Hollyday, *Sojourners' Newsletter* (Spring 1977), 1, copy in Box VII, Folder "Sojo Community," Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

¹¹³ See "Repair and Deduct Is Stuck," flyer of Southern Columbia Heights Tenant Union, in Box VII, Folder "Sojo Community," Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

¹¹⁴ Notes from Sojourner magazine retreat in 1978: that disclose bitterness from "Cathy" about latent sexism, specifically about how women take dictation from men. "This is not an egalitarian community or staff," she declares. "Tricia" complains, "Parenting is not valued in the community; I must do all these other things plus parenting—in order to justify myself in the community." See Box IV2, Folder "Direct Mail and Editorial Reports," Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

¹¹⁵ "There must be leadership with authority" wrote CWLF's Jack Sparks. But these leaders "must literally be the servants of all." See Jack Sparks, "Community: The Closeness We Need," *Right On* 6, No. 8 (April 1975), 4-5. The Post-Americans signed most of their correspondence with this populist phrase: "Serve the Lord. Serve the People."

¹¹⁶ The egalitarian impulse could be seen even in some evangelical historiography. Historians Donald Dayton, Timothy Smith, and Leonard Sweet took a "people's history" approach in which they tried to look at evangelicalism from "the bottom up." For a review of this historiography, see Douglas A. Sweeney, "The Essential Evangelicalism Dialectic: The Historiography of the Early Neo-

Actions on behalf of the poor point to the ways in which, despite the new emphasis on spirituality and community-living, third-way evangelicals paradoxically persisted in their political thrust. Still devoted to social justice despite their disinterest in electoral politics and their newfound preoccupation with spirituality, they pursued social action and politics within the neighborhood more than on a national level. While in Chicago the Post-Americans helped out at a center for delinquent boys and drove busses for special education children. After their move to Washington, D.C., they became enveloped in housing controversies on behalf of poor neighbors.¹¹⁷ Likewise, CWLF visited jails and prisons, and they closely observed and participated in city politics.¹¹⁸ LaSalle Church in Chicago started legal and health clinics for the poor.¹¹⁹ These social service projects pointed to an important shift, namely that many in the emerging evangelical left, disillusioned by the elections of Nixon, the rejection of McCarthy at the 1968 Democratic Convention in Chicago, and the persistence of the Vietnam War, narrowed their political focus to the local level.¹²⁰

Evangelical Movement and the Observer-Participant Dilemma,” *Church History* 60, No. 1 (March 1991), 73-76. On the predominance of “upside-down,” “strength through weakness” rhetoric, see Vernard Eller, “Justice & Grace,” *The Other Side* 19, No. 7 (July 1983), 19-22; Donald Kraybill, *The Upside-Down Kingdom*.

¹¹⁷ Tenant organizing in the Columbia Heights neighborhood became one of Sojourners more successful campaigns in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Three members worked full time in this area. 30 buildings were partially or fully remodeled with hopes of reselling at cost to poor residents. Significant time was spent on lobbying local politicians on city housing legislation. And they organized a 175-person “congress” to plot and celebrate new initiatives. See “The Third Era,” (1981), 3 in folder “Articles about Community,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

¹¹⁸ See, for example, CWLF’s contact with a Berkeley city council member: “Interview: Ilona Hancock,” *Right On* 3, No. 5 (November 1971), 4.

¹¹⁹ On LaSalle’s involvement in city development and politics, see James and Marti Hefley, *The Church That Takes on Trouble* (Elgin, Ill.: David C. Cook Publishing Co., 1976), 86, 159-166. On the local activism of Patchwork Central in Evansville, Ind., see Dana Powell, “Patchwork Central: Abandoning Blueprints for Community,” *Sojourners* 7, No. 5 (May 1978), 20-21.

¹²⁰ Dick Taylor, “Discovering Your Neighborhood’s Needs: A Practical Guide for Beginning a Local Ministry,” *Sojourners* 8, No. 6 (June 1979), 22-24.

For some, however, the local *was* national due to the strategic locations of their communities. The Post-American move to Washington in 1975 allowed the group to engage national issues of poverty and nuclear proliferation even while retaining a local focus. They helped lead protests against nuclear arms at the Washington Sheraton and on the Washington Mall—all mere miles from their intentional community in Columbia Heights. Likewise, The Other Side community moved from a rural farm in central Ohio to Philadelphia, a center for state politics. CWLF purchased large houses down the street from UC-Berkeley in order to engage a campus situated so prominently in the nation’s political consciousness. Similarly groups of students at Seattle Pacific University started loosely organized communities close to the “U-District” in Seattle to be close to antiwar protests.¹²¹ While some third-way evangelicals went to Grace Haven Farm in rural Ohio or to Rising Son Ranch in northern California for brief sojourns of contemplative worship amidst nature, most took the reverse trajectory of the masses of New Leftists who abandoned politics in cities to live in rural Maine and other havens from urban squalor. Many in the emerging evangelical left gravitated toward urban centers to make political statements about race and poverty.¹²² “All this talk about community, by the way, is not an academic exercise,” wrote *The Other Side’s* John Alexander in 1973. “We are moving to Germantown—an integrated section of Philadelphia with low-cost housing. We are

¹²¹ Michael Havens interview, April 3, 2007.

¹²² On the counterculture’s exodus from the cities, see Douglas C. Rossinow, *The Politics of Authenticity: Liberalism, Christianity, and the New Left in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 249.

becoming part of a serious attempt at Christian community in the immediate area. Lots of houses are for sale. Anyone interested?”¹²³

Third-way evangelicals, in emphasizing this socio-political component of community life, sought to head off critics who accused them of social quietism.¹²⁴ First, they pointed out that living in small, egalitarian communities was in itself an act of defiance against the bureaucratic technocracy. Moreover, a non-vote in electoral politics was as much a political stand as a vote for a “lesser of two evils.” The thoughtful abstinence from mass politics by “cells of dissent” clearly challenged the establishment and functioned as a call for more radical political change.¹²⁵

Second, third-way evangelicals suggested that the most effective political tactic in an age dominated by the technocracy was to be prophetic on a local level or

¹²³ John F. Alexander, “Christian Journalism,” *The Other Side* 9, No. 3 (May-June 1973), 47.

¹²⁴ See for instance Paul B. Henry, “Love, Power and Justice,” *Christian Century* 94 (November 23, 1977), 1088-1092.

¹²⁵ On declining to vote, see Jim and Glenda VandenBosch, “Nixon, McGovern and the only choice in ’72,” *Vanguard* (October 1972), 12-17. The VandenBosches, co-directors of development of NACPA in Sioux Center, Iowa, wrote, “From the brief study of the candidates and their policies and beliefs presented here it does seem that George McGovern would provide more of the opportunity for relief to come to an oppressed and confused American society. But that is only a half-hearted statement because of McGovern’s basic humanistic pragmatism.” “One wonders then if the first option for the Christian in ’72 should be to cast a publicly negative vote. Are there channels through which we can say publicly, ‘We are not voting this year because there is no basic choice.’ Groups of Christian people could organize within their community and together go to the polls and indicate publicly to the officials and the press their inability to conscientiously vote in this presidential election. Such Christian action on November 7 could be more responsible than casting a silent and unquestioning vote once again for the lesser of two evils.” Also see Jack Buckley, “Enough Is Enough,” *Right On* 9, No. 2 (September-October 1977), 12. Also see Jim Wallis, “Election Reflections,” *Post-American* 2, No. 1 (January-February 1973), 3. “The result of the election was indeed a disaster of major proportions,” wrote Wallis. Despite his distaste for Nixon, his preference for McGovern was very muted. What we need, Wallis contended, is not national organizations or shrewd strategies. Instead we need transformed lives living in community. CWLF’s David Gill similarly wrote, “Of politics, old-style, we have more than ever: the politics of institutional constipation, personal ambition and demagoguery, public promises, consistent compromise, propaganda, and so on. When we do catch a glimpse of something new and fresh on the larger scene, the system either ignores it (it isn’t marketable) or, what is worse, co-opts it and poisons it. Somehow I just can’t get excited about the options of Carter or Ford; and Eugene McCarthy, who *does* represent a creative alternative doesn’t stand a chance.” See David Gill, “Radical Politics,” *Right On* 8, No. 2 (September-October 1976), 5.

on specific issues instead of backing candidates or parties with many planks that could be manipulated by corporate and media elites. Protest and acts of civil disobedience thus dominated third-way politics. The 1979 journal of a Sojourner member, sorting through the community's busy schedule of protests against military spending, environmental degradation, and abortion, nonchalantly noted that "Jim W., Jim T., Joyce, and Joe R. have all been considering civil disobedience next week. Jim T. felt local ministry needs would not make it possible to do that, while the magazine felt that the other three could. We felt that, from an elder's responsibility point of view, they should still feel free to do the c.d. since Bob, Millie, and Jim T. will all be available for increased responsibilities should they receive jail time."¹²⁶ The Community for Creative Nonviolence likewise maintained a "tradition of public political activity" that involved "pray-ins, laugh-ins, sit-ins, die-ins, and carried-outs" amid their more conventional social services such as a soup kitchen, and pre-trial and hospitality house, a free medical clinic, and a print shop that provided job training.¹²⁷ CWLF member David Gill wrote, "Drop out? No, if that means withdrawal and disengagement. But yes, if that means joining with brothers and sisters in a common and unified witness and life-style radically other than the options thrown up by the world-system." "We must go beyond the system," Gill would later write, "creating a new politics built from the grassroots of the local church: our primary community."¹²⁸

¹²⁶ "Elders' Notes," *Update* (May 17, 1983), 2. In Boxes VII-VI3, "Sojo Community," Sojourners Collection, WCSC. A media magazine report described a chaotic 23-year-old Dana Powell directing office traffic in the magazine's headquarters as volunteers furiously organized an anti-nuclear demonstration. See "On Being," *Time* (December 1979).

¹²⁷ "Shelter in D.C.," *Right On* 9, No. 6 (May-June 1978), 11-12. The CCN described themselves as "decentralized, people-oriented ... Christian anarchists."

¹²⁸ David Gill, "Time to Drop Out?" *Right On* 5, No. 3 (September 1973), 3; David Gill, "Radical Christian," *Right On* 8, No. 2 (September-October 1976), 5. This new politics, Post-American Bob

Disenchanted with national electoral politics, third-way evangelicals sought to challenge the technocracy through small, local, issue-based institutions of faith.

Gill's push for locally based counter-institutions reflects the important influence of ethnic Swiss-German and Dutch evangelicals on the third way. John Howard Yoder, drawing on his Mennonite heritage's long tradition of structured community life, helped inspire the idea that the communal church could serve as a social model to the world.¹²⁹ Yoder's 1972 *Politics of Jesus*, an incisive exegesis of the Gospel of Luke and Paul's letter to the Romans, offered both a rejoinder to Niebuhrian just war realism and a call for a new kind of politics.¹³⁰ Grounding political participation primarily through the Church, Yoder urged Christians to form countercultural communities that would feed the hungry, care for the sick, and speak prophetically to positions of power.¹³¹

Sabath argued, would be subversive. Comparing America to Rome, Sabath contended that if we really worshiped God like the early Christians did, we would be more activist and persecuted. "Perhaps there are so few Christians in prison today because we have forgotten how to worship." See Robert Sabath, "The Politics of Worship," *Post-American* 1, No. 5 (Fall 1972), 8-9.

¹²⁹ Not only did the Bruderhof, the Amish, and conservative Mennonites in Goshen, Indiana; Lancaster, Pennsylvania; and Kalona, Iowa, feature ethnic enclaves, but less traditional Mennonite communal structures were emerging in major cities across the United States. The most prominent was Reba Place Fellowship in Evanston, Illinois, not far from the Post-Americans, with whom they had much contact. Formed out of a crop of Mennonite students fresh out of college, Reba Place settled in a racially transitional neighborhood that soon filled with blacks. This was intentional; the Reba Place founders wanted a place to practice their new social awareness. To ensure interdependence with each other and dependence on the provisions of God, members shared a common purse and refused to purchase automobile insurance. They were attempting to implement a "third alternative to the totalitarianism of collectivism and the alienation of individualism." See Perry Bush, "The Flexibility of the Center: Mennonite Church Conflict in the 1960s," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 72, No. 2 (April 1998), 189-193; Arthur G. Gish, *The New Left and Christian Radicalism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1970), 129; "A Question about Insurance" in *Living More Simply*, ed. Ronald J. Sider (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1980), 157-159.

¹³⁰ John Howard Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972).

¹³¹ John Howard Yoder, "The Biblical Mandate," *Post-American* 3, No. 3 (April 1974), 21-25. In the same issue, Jim Wallis wrote, "The recovery of the church's true identity in the world is most basic to its political responsibility." See Wallis, "Biblical Politics," 3-4. In the 1980s, Stanley Hauerwas emphasized the same idea of constructing the Church as the true community. He differed from many young evangelicals in softening its political element. Christians, he asserted, are summoned to strive for

Even some Reformed evangelicals, whose theology tended toward full participation in national political structures, carried strains of this politically infused separatism in the early 1970s.¹³² Nearly all promoted separate Christian school systems. Some, profoundly shaped by Dutch political philosopher Hermann Dooyeweerd, promoted the creation of distinctly Christian political parties and other national institutions. John Olthuis of the Institute for Christian Studies imagined this remarkable vision:

I find myself hurrying along to catch the opening of Parliament in Ottawa. The Christian political party is now the official opposition. ... As I rush along Elgin Street I pass a church building and note with thankfulness that the sign reads ELGIN CONGREGATION OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST, eloquent witness to the recent formation of one world-wide Christian institutional church—a world-wide, joyful, dynamic, worshipping church—a church which seeks the coming of the Kingdom of God rather than the Kingdom of the institutional church. In the Parliamentary galleries I meet the head of the *Christian Labor Association of North America*, the international association of Christ-believing workers. I leave the gallery and pick up a copy of *Voice*, the Christian daily newspaper. ... The first paragraph of the lead story reads: “Bill 7777 establishes financial equality in education for all school systems.” ... I bump into one of the members of the *Institute for Christian Curriculum Studies*. I mumble my apologies and rush on only to be engulfed by a horde of students buzzing excitedly on their way to the campus of Ottawa's Christian University. ... I take a deep, clean

this rather than the transformation of a nation. See Stanley Hauerwas, *Resident Aliens: Life in the Christian Colony* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1989). On appeals to Anabaptism, see See Clark Pinnock, “The Radical Reformation,” *Post-American* 1, No. 5 (Fall 1972), 4-5; Clarence Jordan, “Love Your Enemies,” *Post-American* 2, No. 3 (May-June 1973), 4-5. Jordan urged Christians to replicate the Sermon on the Mount by loving not only those in your community, but also your enemies. “In that final day, it will be the peacemakers, not the warriors, who will be called the sons of God.”

¹³² Several intentional communities thrived in Christian Reformed circles. See Gene Beerens, “Christ’s Community in Grand Rapids: Intentional Community and the Local Church,” *Coming Together* 1, No. 2 (April 1983), 16-18. On the founding of Innstead Cooperative in 1976, see Joyce K. Ribbens, “Innstead: A Cooperative Way to Homestead,” *Vanguard* 9, No. 1 (January-February 1979), 18-19.

breath. My heart is full of joy, for America is a good place to live, a free place, free for all people to live out of their convictions.¹³³

Though starkly different in scale than Anabaptist communities, the Reformed model of counter-institutions comprised a second important source of the third way.

Whatever the theological source, third-way evangelicalism sought to challenge the machinations of industrial-governmental-media elite by constructing small, authentic communities. The renaming of the Post-Americans to Sojourners in 1975 reflected this new emphasis. Sojourners in this era deemphasized mass politics, embracing instead the marginalization of a persecuted minority.¹³⁴ While critics read this as a relapse into the apoliticism of fundamentalism, the creation of structured community itself functioned as a prophetic voice to and model for broader social structures. The third way's defiance of the technocracy in its emphasis on purity, community living, egalitarianism, and local grass-roots action paradoxically perpetuated the emerging evangelical left's impulse of tying faith very closely to politics.

III.

A remarkable and influential evangelical simple living movement drew from these egalitarian, small-is-beautiful, and local impulses. Third-way evangelicals decried the effects of an insidious and vast technocracy intent on extending an already

¹³³ John Olthuis, "The Wages of Change," 20-21, in John Olthuis, ed., *Out of Concern for the Church: Five Essays* (Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1970).

¹³⁴ They chose Sojourners over Acts, a name which reflected their activist sensibilities (but presented possible confusion with ACTS, American Christians Toward Socialism). It was also a nod to the biblical book that outlined the activities of the early church. Sojourners wanted to replicate an unadulterated community modeled on the New Testament. See "Minutes of Post-American Staff Meeting," October 20, 1975, in Box IV3, Folder "News Releases and Post-American," Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

consumptive society. Even the countercultural sensibilities of the Jesus Freaks, wrote Jim Wallis, had been co-opted. “Their admirable attempt to proclaim the gospel has been corrupted by Jesus medallions for \$18, \$4 love feasts at the Conrad Hilton, Jesus watches ...” These products represented an “ecclesiastical reproduction of the twisted values of technocratic society.”¹³⁵ Living simply, or “more with less” as a popular cookbook of the era termed it, took the offensive against the technocracy by abstaining as much as possible from the market economy.

Some, partly in solidarity with the poor and partly in defiance of technocratic values, intentionally cultivated personal poverty. To be sure, many third-way evangelical students had very little money to begin with. The Post-Americans, for example, moved into adjoining apartments in the low-income section of Rogers Park in the fall of 1972 out of necessity. Unable to afford heating fuel in the winter, they typed the first issue of their magazine with gloves on their front porch with winds whipping in off Lake Michigan.¹³⁶ The location of their first official office next to thundering elevated train made phone conversations difficult. Their poverty, however, increasingly became intentional. When their Chicago neighborhood started “going middle-class,” they moved to Washington.¹³⁷ They chose careers in social services and education and gave much of their income away. Members of the Shiloh communities in the Pacific Northwest signed “poverty oaths.”¹³⁸ Ron Sider proposed a “graduated tithe” in which earners would give away increasing percentages of their income as

¹³⁵ Jim Wallis, “The Movemental Church,” 1, No. 2 *Post-American* (Winter 1972), 2-3.

¹³⁶ Wallis, *Revive Us Again*, 95.

¹³⁷ “Magazine Helped Publish Church’s Activism,” *Milwaukee Journal* (1979), in Box IV3, Folder, “News Releases and Post-American,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

¹³⁸ Peterson, “Christ, Communes, and the Counterculture,” 40.

their income increased.¹³⁹ In this way, even doctors, lawyers, and other high-income earners could be leveled in a gesture of equality. “Think simple. Think poor. It’s a good life,” wrote Etta Worthington to InterVarsity students. “Give it a try.”¹⁴⁰

As third-way evangelicals chose intentional poverty and abstention from the market economy, they increasingly cultivated skills of self-sufficiency. The *Post-American* carried monthly columns by Etta Worthington on recycling, inexpensive but nutritious food, and fixing up homes. CWLF members distributed a pamphlet that offered advice on how to eat on less than 90 cents a day and how to “stretch that hamburger and not lose protein content.”¹⁴¹ Members tended mini-farms within the city limits. Bill and Cathy Squires kept chickens in their backyard and grew organic vegetables. The Wilsons kept rabbits and goats in their backyard. They refused to outsource tasks like food production, housecleaning, and car repair.¹⁴² These simple tasks brought them closer to nature out of a technocratic cycle so complex that it was impossible for them to tell what was in a hot dog, where it was produced, and whether its producers were paid fairly. Eating organic rabbits raised in the backyards of

¹³⁹ Ron Sider, “The Ministry of Affluence,” *HIS* 33, No. 3 (December 1972), 6-8. David Gill similarly suggested a higher tithe rate for “middle and upper-class American Christians, the wealthiest groups of people in history.” See David W. Gill, “The Tithe and the Tax,” *Right On* 10, No. 1 (July-Aug 1978), 19.

¹⁴⁰ Etta Worthington, “’Tis a Gift to Be Simple,” *HIS* 35, No. 8 (May 1975), 1, 3-5.

¹⁴¹ See January 28, 1974, weekly memorandum of CWLF and “Peoples Medical Handbook.” In Box 2, “Jill Shook, Jack Sparks,” GTU Archives.

¹⁴² For examples of the young evangelical impulse to reuse items and fix things themselves, see Etta L. Worthington, “Eat That Garbage!” *Post-American* 3, No. 1 (January 1974), 13; Etta L. Worthington, “Garbage Gardening,” *Post-American* 3, No. 9 (December 1974), 21; Etta L. Worthington, “Simplicity,” *Post-American* 4, No. 2 (February 1975), 15; Dennis, *Reason for Hope*, 46-50. Also see “Recipes for Housecleaning Solutions,” *Sojourners Fellowship Update* (October 27, 1980), 3, in Folder “Community Newsletters,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC.

Berkeley represented the joy of simple living that transcended the soul-losing business world of America.¹⁴³

The most influential pioneers of the evangelical simple living movement of the early 1970s—Walter and Ginny Hearn—operated out of Berkeley as well. Walter, a professor in biochemistry at Iowa State University, earned tenure at age forty-five and sponsored ISU’s InterVarsity chapter as Ginny cared for two children and her elderly mother. Their reasons for “dropping out of the system,” as they called it, were many. First, they wanted an egalitarian marriage, one that avoided dividing labor into professional and family care. Second, after twenty years on the ISU faculty, Walter felt as if he had done all he could to “humanize the bureaucracy” and replicate himself with dozens of graduate students. He wanted to make a more direct impact and be a “generalist” writer. Not sure at first that they could afford this new venture, they experimented with a new spending policy. Accustomed to spending fully their \$20,000 plus salary, the Hearn cut their spending by one-half for two full years. Mostly, they just avoided stores. When they had to shop, they went to day-old bakeries, thrift stores, and flea markets. They frequented co-op bulletin boards, garage sales, and bought furniture from classified advertisements. With a full year’s income saved and hoping that Iowa State could replace him easily with “a woman or a black,” he quit his job to “find a lifework of wholeness.”¹⁴⁴

¹⁴³ This “back-to-the-land” ethos within CWLF played out at Rising Son Ranch, an organic farm on California’s central coast where CWLF sent recently converted drug users to escape “their troublesome city hassles.” See “Why We Raise Rabbits” in an undated CWLF newsletter. On Rising Son Ranch and “city hassles,” see “Opportunities and Challenges for Which the Lord Has Given Us Vision” in Box 2, CWLF, GTU Archives. On the joy and laughter in living simply and in community, see Marty Toren, “The Lighter Side of Living More Simply” and Joe Peterson, “Play” in *Community: A Journal of Northwest Christian Communities*, No. 22 (April 1980), 3.

¹⁴⁴ For a short autobiography of Walter Hearn, see Ronald J. Sider, *Living More Simply: Biblical Principles & Practical Models* (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980), 73-96.

After considering a number of college towns such as Austin, Texas; Fayetteville, Arkansas; and Berkeley, California, the Hearn family chose Berkeley. They purchased a large, inexpensive home on an earthquake fault line with tilted floors resting on a cracked foundation and paid their rent with various editing projects and some adjunct teaching at UC-Berkeley. They ate primarily from farmers' markets, their garden, and forays into local dumpsters.¹⁴⁵ Within three years of their move, they reported satisfaction with their new lives. They enjoyed working together as a couple, sharing kitchen responsibilities and collaboratively editing over fifty Christian books and writing dozens of articles. They held seminars for young writers, volunteered time to the activities of the Christian World Liberation Front, started a house church, and hosted many guests in their large home. They effused to guests about how they got to "spend time extravagantly."

The Hearn family became minor celebrities, featured in dozens of books and publications. The *Los Angeles Times* syndicated an article that portrayed the Hearn family as earthy romantics: "Wandering down an alley behind a grocery store, the bearded man with shoulder-length hair picked up a useful wooden box, an onion and two tomatoes. Of course, admitted Walter Hearn, a little 'glop' would have to be washed off to make them usable. Thus prepared, the tomatoes (minus bruised spots) and the onion (minus a moldy spot) were dropped into an aromatic curry stew he simmered for lunch."

Despite their whimsical unconcern about where they would find their next meal, the Hearn family militantly spread their cause. Charging that anyone who couldn't make it on

¹⁴⁵ Walter and Ginny Hearn interview, July 9, 2006. During my interview with them thirty years after their move to Berkeley, the Hearn family were most animated as they described their first trip to a Safeway in which they uncovered four cases of asparagus. After the interview, Walter took me dumpster diving at a meat shop. We found a slab of pork ribs, which he hosed off at an outside spigot.

\$2,500 a year was “locked into the wasteful, spiritually destructive American way of life,” the Hearnss became exemplars of the nascent evangelical simple living movement.¹⁴⁶

On the Hearnss’ kitchen counter lay the most widely read simple-living manual in evangelicalism, a cookbook called *More with Less*. The cover explained that it was a book of “500 delightful recipes that proves that when we reduce our need for heavily grain-fed meat, the superprocessed, and the sugary, we not only release resources for the hungry, but also protect our health and our pocketbooks.”¹⁴⁷ It was not vegetarian; Longacre knew that a meatless cookbook, like Frances Lappe’s immensely popular and rigidly vegetarian *Diet for a Small Planet*, wasn’t “realistic” for its intended audience of Mennonite farmers. She did, however, drastically cut meat ingredients and eliminate instructions on roasting and carving meat. The recipes themselves were not only nutritious and thrifty, but also exotic, reflecting a substantial global influence on the emerging evangelical left. International recipes from Uganda, Mexico, Vietnam, and other corners of the globe filled its pages. The cookbook’s sequel—*Living More with Less*—offered critiques and suggestions from around the world on nearly every page of the lifestyle manual. In a chapter entitled “Learn from the World Community,” Christians from around the world admonished American readers to build energy-efficient public transportation networks between towns and cities; to learn to cook simple, nutritious meals; to use fewer kitchen appliances; to recycle; to plant home

¹⁴⁶ Russell Chandler, “Ph.D. Scrounges for a Living,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 1, 1975, p. 3. For evidence of low incomes among *The Other Side* readers, see “The Truth about All of You: Results from our Recent Questionnaire,” *The Other Side* 14, No. 4 (April 1978), 6-7. For the story of Jon and Ariel Meeser, who quit a job designing military equipment at Boeing to work in medical technology and to live the simple life, see Adeney, *God’s Foreign Policy*, 121-123.

¹⁴⁷ Doris Janzen Longacre, *More with Less* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1976).

and community gardens; and to value families and friendships above making money.¹⁴⁸

The *More with Less* series sold well despite its preachy premise, unconventional recipes, and obscure Mennonite roots. Upon its release in 1976 sales boomed in Mennonite centers in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana. Sales soon rose among evangelicals across the nation. The Southern Baptist Book Club ordered 2,000 copies. A Methodist order of 2,000 followed.¹⁴⁹ Within months, the publishers told Longacre that interest in her cookbook was “phenomenal.” Sales reached 68,000 within the first year as the public read reviews in hundreds of newspapers across the country and in dozens of evangelical journals.¹⁵⁰ Within several years, Christians as diverse as Catholics (who learned about it from Arthur Simon’s *Bread for the World*), CWLF members, Covenant church members in Minnesota, and Christian Reformed adherents in Grand Rapids, Michigan, were cooking with recipes from *More with*

¹⁴⁸ Published by the Mennonite publishing house Herald Press, *More with Less* germinated from the Food and Hunger Concern office of the relief agency Mennonite Central Committee. A clearinghouse of secular, mainline, and evangelical literature—they drew from the Center for Studies in Food Self-Sufficiency in Vermont, the evangelical Bread for the World, and congressional testimony—The Food and Hunger Concern office sent out bi-monthly news releases on famine, the energy crisis, and simple living. See file “IX-6-3 More with Less Cookbook, 1979-80” in Mennonite Central Committee Collection, Mennonite Church USA Archives, Goshen, Ind. Longacre, *Living More with Less*, 30-36. For spin-offs of *More with Less*, see Longacre, *Living More with Less* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1980); Aileen Van Beilen, *Hunger Awareness Dinners: A Planning Manual* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1978); Susan Godshall and Doris Longacre, *Living More with Less: Workshop Outlines* (Akron, Pa.: MCC Hunger Concerns Office, 1980); Delores Hinstead Friesen, *Living More with Less: Study/Action Guide* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1981); Meredith Sommers Dregni, *Experiencing More with Less: Intergenerational Curriculum for Camps, Retreats, and Other Educational Settings* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1983)

¹⁴⁹ Paul Schrock to Doris Longacre, November 18, 1976, in Folder IX-6-3. MCC Collection, MCA.

¹⁵⁰ Herald Press to Longacre, April 8, 1976; Herald Press to Longacre, November 18, 1976, in Folder IX-6-3, MCC Collection, MCA. Also see Herald Press to Longacre, November 18, 1976. Young evangelical recommendations came from *Eternity*, *National Courier*, *Vanguard*, *Right On*, *Sojourners*, and *The Other Side*.

Less.¹⁵¹ Evangelicals listened to “More with Less” cassette tapes on topics such as “Entertaining Simply,” “Combining Proteins to Get More with Less,” “Theology in the Kitchen,” and “How to Host a More with Less Workshop.”¹⁵² By August 1980, just four years after its release, *More with Less* had entered its twenty-fourth printing with 355,000 copies in print.¹⁵³ The cookbook became a sensation as its influence spread far beyond the Mennonite circles.

The cookbook’s admonition to live healthier, less consumptive, more authentic lives extended across both time and space. *More with Less* represented an evangelical adaptation of a long tradition of anti-materialism in the American context. In their embrace of voluntary poverty and alternative lifestyles, third-way evangelicals were preceded by Jeffersonian Republicans and transcendentalists of the nineteenth century, social thinkers and arts-and-crafts practitioners of the Progressive Era, and contemporaneous small-is-beautiful social critics and young drop-outs.¹⁵⁴ Third-way evangelical attempts to live simply echoed these contemporaneous critics “who

¹⁵¹ See LaVerne Triezenberg to Herald Press, December 4, 1980, Copy in author’s possession, sent by mail from Herald Press archives in Scottsdale, Pa., in February 2006; also see Virginia Hearn to David Swartz, March 1, 2006; Sharon Gallagher interview; Longacre received congratulatory letters from evangelical luminaries such as Oregon Senator Mark Hatfield (see Mark O. Hatfield to Doris Longacre, March 4, 1976. Copy in author’s possession, received from Herald Press archives in February 2006) and World Vision’s W. Stanley Mooneyham (see W. Stanley Mooneyham to Doris Longacre, March 22, 1976. Copy in author’s possession, received from Herald Press archives in February 2006). Longacre spoke at a Wednesday evening meeting of Sojourners in the fall of 1978. See Box VII-VI3, Folder, “Community Newsletters, Fall 1978,” Sojourners Collection, WCSC. On the cookbook’s popularity at Gordon-Conwell Seminary, see Sider, “A Brief Report,” March 1, 1978, in Folder “Discipleship Workshops,” ESA Archives. On the spread of *More with Less* and “hunger awareness” dinners in Christian Reformed circles, see Dan Treizenburg interview, April 19, 2007; Morris and Alice Greidanus interview, January 20, 2008.

¹⁵² “Seeds,” *Sojourners* 7, No. 6 (June 1978), 30.

¹⁵³ Paul Schrock to Reg Toews, June 15, 1983, in Folder IX-6-3, MCC Collection, MCA. By the year 2000, over 800,000 copies were in print.

¹⁵⁴ David E. Shi, *The Simple Life: Plain Living and High Thinking in American Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985). Despite, or perhaps because of, unprecedented plenty, historian David Shi has traced a persistent reactionary, anti-materialist impulse throughout American history.

planted organic gardens, experimented with food production and communal living, and emulated romantic versions of Native American tribal culture.”¹⁵⁵ Secular titles on simple living proliferated in the 1970s: *The Freedom of Simplicity*, *Enough is Enough*, *Living Poor with Style*, *Muddling Toward Frugality*, *No Bigger Than Necessary*, *99 Ways to a Simpler Lifestyle*, and *Small Is Beautiful*.

Like the secular counterculture, the evangelical simple living movement stemmed not just from inclinations to self-improve, but also from genuine efforts to ameliorate social injustice. The broad sociological theory of the 1950s and 1960s gave way to a proliferation of how-to manuals and practical advice in the next decade. The counterculture’s turn to simple living, in part a reactionary response to rapid American modernization, also reflected a broader sociological concern with global hunger and environmental degradation. While the postwar economic boom of the 1950s gave consumers hope that poverty could be eliminated altogether through consumer spending, evidence mounted in the very next decade that American prosperity was not even close to being distributed equally.¹⁵⁶ Michael Harrington’s *The Other America* uncovered an isolated underclass suffering from a “culture of poverty” in the wealthiest nation in the world. The underclass, wrote Harrington, perpetuated itself, unable to break free from poverty while tangled in a web of bad health, poor housing, low levels of aspiration and high levels of mental distress.¹⁵⁷ *The Other America* and

¹⁵⁵ Bruce J. Schulman, *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics* (New York: Free Press, 2001), 90.

¹⁵⁶ Dwight Eisenhower, for example, advised the nation to “Buy anything” during a slight recession in the 1950s. John F. Kennedy argued that “a rising tide lifts all boats.” Lyndon Johnson maintained that the Great Society rests on abundance for all.”

¹⁵⁷ Michael Harrington, *The Other America: Poverty in the United States* (New York: Macmillan, 1962).

the literature of other social critics such as Theodore Roszak, Rachel Carson, and Jacque Ellul echoed Harrington's conviction that poverty was not always the fault of those suffering from it.

The careful readings by third-way evangelicals of these social critics revealed the dissolving boundaries between evangelicalism and broader culture. Many read Harrington and Roszak in college, and evangelical writings on simple living betrayed a deep reliance on Rachel Carson and vegetarian theory in the pages of *InterVarsity's HIS* magazine, Jim Wallis' *Post-American*, and a throng of other magazines and books.¹⁵⁸ At the same time, evangelicals adapted the sensibilities of the seventies to their own purposes. They planted organic gardens, but used homemade recipes from cookbooks cobbled together by their own churches and missionaries. They lived in communes, but organized their structures around Bible studies, prayer meetings, and antiwar protests, not traditions of tribal culture.¹⁵⁹ Kitchens in Francis Schaeffer's

¹⁵⁸ See, for example, Arthur G. Gish, "Simplicity," *Post-American* 1, No. 2 (Winter 1972), 10; Hendrik Hart, "On Simplicity: A Meditation before Christmas," *Vanguard* (November-December 1974), 27-28; Sider, "The Ministry of Affluence," 6-8; Rick and Cindy Westman, "The Liberated Christian Home," *Post-American* 2, No. 3 (May-June 1973), 11; Robert Prud'homme, "Undercover," *HIS* 38, No. 1 (October 1977), 21; Stephen Board, "Ronald Sider: Prophet to a Rich Church," 18-23 and "Can you Live Simply in North America? A Cross Section of Readers Tell How They Cut Back," 20-21, in *Eternity* 30, No. 4 (April 1979), 18-23; Jim Wallis, "Offensive Simplicity," *Sojourners* 9, No. 2 (February 1980), 6; Karin Granberg-Michaelson, "Journey toward Simple Living: How a Middle-Class Couple Struggles to Lower Their Economic Expectations," *The Other Side* 16, No. 11 (November 1980), 39-41; Mary L. Kownacki, "Knots in My Stomach: Why Must Those Who Practice Simple Living So Often Fall toward the Extremes?" *The Other Side* 17, No. 11 (November 1981), 30-32; Virginia Hostetler, "Riding in Style and Missing the Boat: Some Recent Temptations Bring Us Face-to-Face with Questions of Simple Life-Style," *The Other Side* 19, No. 10 (October 1983), 54-55. Prud'homme urged students not to fall prey to slick advertising or to use a financial calculus to make decisions. Like Ellul, he advised against using "technique." Also see Katherine Cook, "St. Francis, You've Got to Be Crazy!" *The Other Side* 20, No. 8 (August 1984), 23-24.

¹⁵⁹ The simple life, for example, could even contribute to world evangelization, one of the most important evangelical concerns. Two and a half billion people had never heard the gospel, Ron Sider estimated. To reach each of these souls would take one missionary couple for every one thousand evangelicals. The financial costs of such a project would not be small, and sacrifices by affluent evangelicals would be needed. In order to fulfill the Lausanne mandate of world evangelization, Christians "must drastically simplify their lifestyles," asserted Sider in *Living More Simply*. See Sider, *Living More Simply: Biblical Principles & Practical Models*, 14-15.

L'Abri wasted nothing out of concern for the environment, yet affirmed “the Lord’s world and creation” through delicious meals, the beauty of candlelight, and fresh flowers.¹⁶⁰ Thus, the proliferation of evangelical simple living manuals in the 1970s—among them *The Simple Life*, *Living More Simply*, *Living More with Less*, and *Beyond the Rat Race*—framed simple living in both political and spiritual terms.¹⁶¹ Herald Press, for example, cast the culinary tips found in *More with Less* as a spiritual discipline and as in being in the tradition of *Diet for a Small Planet*, a book which drew attention to the politics of hunger and eventually helped launch the Food and Development Policy think tank and the Center for Living Democracy.¹⁶² As a cultural critique, *More with Less* reflected Roszak’s assessment of modern consumerism. Longacre instructed the graphic artist to “exclude a lot of lavish color photos ... of super pretty foods, elegantly garnished and displayed.” The final version featured a few simple photographs of international scenes and variations on a theme of measuring spoons.¹⁶³

¹⁶⁰ Sharon Gallagher, “How Should We Then Live?” *Radix* 8, No. 5 (March-April 1977), 13.

¹⁶¹ Perhaps the clearest example of how some young evangelicals marshaled their commitments to simplicity, equality, and community into rules for spiritual living was Arthur Gish’s *Beyond the Rat Race*, a sequel to his *The New Left and Christian Radicalism*. Gish’s new effort to apply “the radical theology of revolution” to the area of lifestyle urged evangelicals to get rid of televisions and radios, to quit washing their cars, to encourage men to wash dishes and women to fix cars, and to live in sharing communities. Such tasks, Gish maintained, were in fact practices of the third way. The simple life—its repudiation of materialism, its embrace of the family and healthy living—when lived in community was a legitimate protest of the technocracy. See Gish, *Beyond the Rat Race*, 37, 112-132. “Unfortunately,” wrote Lane Dennis, “due to the perverse pervasiveness of techno-materialism it is next to impossible to live this way without the support of some sort of community.” See Dennis, “Living in a Technological World,” 40. For another statement, see Lindsay Jane Dubs, “A Household Energy Inventory,” *Sojourners* 7, No. 6 (June 1978), 16-17.

¹⁶² Frances Moore Lappe, *Diet for a Small Planet* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1971). *Vanguard* editors participated in a “Ten Days for World Development” conference in Canada 1977 in which Frances Moore Lappe, author of *Diet for a Small Planet*, was a featured speaker. See advertisement on page 3 of the January-February 1977 issue of *Vanguard*.

¹⁶³ See Doris Longacre to Marie K. Wiens, March 2, 1976, Folder IX-6-3, MCC Collection, Mennonite Archives.

The international motif in *More with Less* points to one of the ways in which the simple living movement made inroads into mainstream evangelicalism. The movement expanded rapidly in the 1970s, partly due to the influence of third-world evangelicals, foreign travel, and missionaries. Brief sojourns into the earthy sensibilities of third-world cultures often entranced evangelicals, many of whom expressed new desires to grow corn, bathe less frequently, and buy fewer plastics. When they returned, many were repulsed by American conspicuous consumption upon their return. Nearly all expressed a desire, redoubled after more than half a million evangelicals read Ron Sider's 1977 book *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*, to give generously and live on little.¹⁶⁴ The romance of organic living, an implicit rejection of middle-class, suburban life, intertwined with evangelical guilt for American material plenty in the face of third-world hunger.

The 1974 Lausanne International Congress on World Evangelization, for instance, revealed the potency of the burgeoning simple living movement beyond third-way intentional communities. The Lausanne International Congress on World Evangelization brought together 2,700 evangelists from 150 nations to discuss the theology, strategy, and methods of evangelism. The resulting "Lausanne Covenant" stated, not unexpectedly, that "The goal should be, by all available means and at the earliest possible time, that every person will have the opportunity to hear, understand, and to receive the good news." Less expected were subsequent sentences that emphasized simple living and generosity toward the poor as an important element of evangelism: "We cannot hope to attain this goal without sacrifice. All of us are

¹⁶⁴ For a sense of how *Rich Christians* profoundly shaped a good many evangelicals, see Folder "Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger," ESA Archives.

shocked by the poverty of millions and disturbed by the injustices which cause it. Those of us who live in affluent circumstances accept our duty to develop a simple life-style in order to contribute more generously to both relief and evangelism.” The Lausanne movement, very much in the evangelical mainstream, continued to stress simple living through the 1970s and 1980s. As the movement peaked in the late 1970s, an International Consultation on Simple Lifestyle released “Lausanne Occasional Paper 20: An Evangelical Commitment to Simple Life-Style,” the first in the series’ nearly two dozen papers not to deal with an explicitly evangelistic theme.¹⁶⁵ A proliferation of simple-living appeals supplemented the official pronouncements of Lausanne across broader evangelicalism.¹⁶⁶

The simple-living ideal extended even to the Southern Baptist tradition, out of which President Jimmy Carter diagnosed an American “malaise.” Carter’s evangelical piety and his reading of Schumacher’s *Small Is Beautiful* in the context of the late-1970s energy crisis prompted Carter to go on a personal retreat at Camp David. He emerged from the compound speaking about “a crisis of the American spirit” in the

¹⁶⁵ Alan Nichols, “An Evangelical Commitment to Simple Life-Style,” copy in Box 36, Folder 9, Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization, BGCA. For copies of the *Simple Lifestyle Newsletter*, see Box 36, Folder 15.

¹⁶⁶ See, for example, Vernard Eller, *The Simple Life* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983); Arnold D. Weigel, “The Simple Life,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 26, No. 1 (February 1974), 87-88; David W. Gill, “The Simple Life,” *Christianity Today* 18 (July 26, 1974), 29-31; Larry L. Rasmussen, “The Simple Life,” *Religion in Life* 43, No. 3 (Autumn 1974), 381-383; Frank E. Gaebelein, “Challenging Christians to the Simple Life,” *Christianity Today* 22 (September 21, 1979), 22-26; Emmert F. Bittinger, “Simple Life: A Chapter in the Evolution of a Doctrine,” *Brethren Thought and Life* 23, No. 2 (Spring 1978), 104-114; Leon Morris, “Thinking Things Through: The Witness of the Church Is Adulterated by the Affluent Lifestyles of Its Members,” *Christianity Today* 22 (September 21, 1979), 60; Ronald J. Sider, “Does God Live in Glass Houses? Cautions against Ecclesiastical Elegance,” *Christianity Today* 23 (August 17, 1979), 14-19; Ronald J. Sider, *Living More Simply: Biblical Principles and Practical Models* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1981); Richard J. Foster, *Freedom of Simplicity* (New York: Harper and Row, 1981); Ronald J. Sider, *Lifestyle in the Eighties: An Evangelical Commitment to Simple Lifestyle* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982). The ideal extended even to radical Calvinists. See John A. Olthuis, “Can Less Be More? Remarks about the Idea of Progress, 39-50. In James Skillen, ed., *Christian Politics: False Hope or Biblical Demand?* (Indiana, Pa.: Jubilee Enterprises, 1976).

tone of an evangelical jeremiad: “In a nation that was proud of hard work, strong families, close-knit communities and our faith in God, too many of us now worship self-indulgence and consumption.” “Human identity is no longer defined by what one does but by what one owns,” Carter sermonized, but “owning things and consuming things does not satisfy our longing for meaning.”¹⁶⁷ Critics panned Carter’s idealistic approach to the energy crisis as naïve. Millions of Americans, however, among them many third-way and mainstream evangelicals, resonated with Carter’s sense of malaise. The zeitgeist of the American seventies was fertile ground for evangelicalism to resolve its angst over the American technocracy through the penance of simple living.

The evangelical third way thus enjoyed considerable reach across the ecclesiastical spectrum and across the nation itself. In its most rigorous form among intentional communities, the third way offered authentic relationships and a fulfilling spirituality in protest against a technocratic American culture. Many, lasting a decade or longer, in fact enjoyed surprising staying power. That they were grounded in divine transcendence and sacred texts and lived out in “the church” seems to have contributed to the greater persistence and intensity of third-way communities compared to many of their secular counterparts. Despite the movement’s ultimate failure in sparking a swell of small communities, it was only a relative failure in comparison with the thousands of irreligious utopian communities that fizzled within months or years of conception. Even in its looser forms, the third way subtly shaped the broader evangelical

¹⁶⁷ Quoted in Shi, *The Simple Life*, 270-272.

consciousness on issues such as poverty as well as the living habits of millions of moderate evangelicals.

The third way also offers new perspective to questions that preoccupy the vast historiography of the demise of the New Left. For example, did dissenters who withdrew from electoral politics and mass movements into communities essentially turn apolitical? Third-way evangelicals themselves would have disagreed. Even as they refused to align with the New Left, liberalism, or conservatism; even in their isolationist tendencies; even in their boycotts of electoral politics, they insisted that their communities were eminently political. They were building micro-societies that would prefigure coming justice—that of Jesus’ second coming but also of a more just and humane society. They reasoned that a corrupt world obsessed with bigness could only be reached creating alternative social structures that would shine as a beacon to the world. Os Guinness suggested the political nature of their project when he urged Christians to build close-knit communities that would “forge solidarity with those who suffer.” This prophetic task demanded not a “quiet in the land” approach, but a rational and social toughness “beaten out by the hammer of transcendent truth on the anvil of empirical reality.”¹⁶⁸ The idea, then, was to change politics by transcending electoral politics or inverting national politics by emphasizing local politics.¹⁶⁹ Politics was a spiritual quest; as for all social activists, the personal and the political can never

¹⁶⁸ Guinness, *Dust of Death*, 375.

¹⁶⁹ A former InterVarsity leader stated this point clearly in the first issue of the *Post-American*: “An ethically self-conscious community which is militant in its refusal to be co-opted by the American ethos and firm in its purpose can create such an alternative. These grass-roots unlike kibbutzim and monasteries, should not be separatist, but bases for penetrating society with the message of total redemption in Jesus Christ ...” See Dennis MacDonald, “The Order of the Shovel,” *Post-American* 1, No. 1 (Fall 1971), 6.

be truly separated. To judge that they can be separated, the young evangelicals argued, only revealed a lack of political imagination.

Communities of “loving defiance” characterized by smallness and an egalitarian structure could quash the dehumanizing trends in American life as third-way evangelicals modeled a third way of authentic relationships, grass-roots activism, and faithfulness to Jesus Christ. That the third way retained the subtle political edge of its disillusioned young evangelical leftists complicates the standard narrative of “the seventies” as a decade of declension, of unremitting spiritual inwardness and political apathy.¹⁷⁰ A closer examination shows that, at least in the case of third-way evangelicals, spiritual politics was instead simply re-formed.¹⁷¹ Ironically, the third way, rather than moderating evangelical politics, actually intensified the entanglement of religion and politics. “The recovery of the church’s identity in the world is most basic to its political responsibility. . . . The church is thus an inexhaustible

¹⁷⁰ Most historical treatments of the 1960s end by decrying the fragmentation and loss of political commitments at the end of the decade. “The perfect Seventies symbol,” one critic said, “was the Pet Rock, which just sat there doing nothing.” Quoted in Schulman, *The Seventies*, xii. For a typical argument that the outward-focused 1960s evolved to an inward-focused 1970s, see Charles Morris, *A Time of Passion: America, 1960-1980* (New York: Penguin, 1984); Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam, 1987); Erlend Jorstad, *Evangelicals in the White House: The Cultural Maturation of Born-Again Christianity* (New York: E. Mellen Press, 1981), 40s; Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin, “The Failure and Success of the New Radicalism,” in Steve Fraser and Gary Gerstle, eds., *The Rise and Fall of the New Deal Order, 1930-1980* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).

¹⁷¹ Jama Lazerow, for example, suggests that one way to de-center the 1960s is to look for commonalities with decades before and after. The evangelical left, vibrant in the 1970s, adds weight to the persistence of the 1960s into the 1970s. See Lazerow, “1960-1974,” in *A Companion to 20th-Century America* (New York: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), edited by Stephen J. Whitfield, 87-101. During the 1973 Thanksgiving Workshop, the group considered this proposal: “We propose that Christians across the country form coalition on the local level which would concentrate on specific problems in their communities. These coalitions would serve as means of social witness and focus on issues of social justice and righteousness.” See “From the Political-Social-Economic Involvement Group,” in Folder “1973 Chicago Declaration,” ESA Archives.

revolutionary force in the world,” wrote Wallis.¹⁷² In the next decade, evangelical politics on the grassroots level, pioneered by the advocates of the third way, would extend to the higher reaches of electoral politics.

¹⁷² Jim Wallis, “Biblical Politics,” *Post-American* 3, No. 3 (April 1974), 3-4. Wes Michaelson, member of *Sojourners*, similarly wrote, “When any of us consider the tactics and strategy of political action, the last place we look for guidance is to the church, or to Jesus of Nazareth. And those who give allegiance to Christ rarely emerge from their prayer meetings to march in picket lines or petition their Congress. ... But this dichotomy makes no sense. ... Essentially, there is no difference between what is a political task and a spiritual one. The two are really the same.” See Michaelson, “Politics and Spirituality,” *Post-American* 3, No. 3 (April 1974), 26-29.