

William Jennings Bryan the Fundamentalist in the Scopes “Monkey” Trial

Chang Hoon Kim

(Hyangsang Church, Associate Pastor, New Testament)

- I. Introduction
- II. Bio of William Jennings Bryan
- III. Context of the Scopes Trial
- IV. Events Leading up to Trial
- V. Bryan the Fundamentalist in the Scopes Trial
- VI. Aftermath of the Scopes Trial
- VII. Conclusion

[Abstract]

This article delves into the influence of the so-called Scopes “monkey” trial upon the reputation of conservative Christianity in American society and the role of a Christian fundamentalist named William Jennings Bryan in the trial. This trial occurred in the year of 1925 as a test case devised by ACLU to challenge the newly established Butler Act, which prohibited all public schools in the state of Tennessee from teaching evolutionism. Although Bryan as a representative of American fundamentalists, who treasure biblical inerrancy and biblical literalism, did his best in the trial not only to champion Christian fundamentalism and creationism but also to object to biological and sociological Darwinism, he was not well-prepared enough to answer Clarence Darrow’s strategically devised interrogations. Even though Bryan needed the help of theological, geological and scientific professionals, he did not have any help and fought a lonely fight at the arena. His lack of the rationality and logicity in his response to Darrow’s interrogation and his negative attitude to science caused American society to see the fundamentalists as anti-intellectual and ignorant. Although the fundamentalists won legal victory at the court, they met with a psychological defeat at the city of Dayton. It turned out that this trial was a disaster in terms of the social reputation of conservative Christianity. Since the Scopes trial evangelicals and fundamentalists became reluctant to be involved in social issues and it is not still certain that they regained the credibility from

American public. Therefore, William Jennings Bryan in the Scopes trial teaches us that Christian conservatives cannot be too careful and wise in defending Christian doctrines and values in public arena.

키워드: The Monkey Trial, The Scopes Trial, William Jennings Bryan, Antievolution movement, fundamentalist, fundamentalism

논문투고일 2020.07.31. / 심사완료일 2020.09.01. / 게재확정일 2020.09.03.

I. Introduction

The Scopes Trial was a public performance in which two celebrated gentlemen, William Jennings Bryan and Clarence Darrow, supporting respectively the opposing thoughts, i.e. creationism and evolutionism, dueled with each other. Ironically, the person, John T. Scopes, who gave the trial a name, was not in fact the protagonist of the trial by whom the public was attracted. Most people were not actually interested in figuring out whether John Scopes had really taught evolution in biology class because they knew that the trial was intentionally dramatized in order to show the whole nation, or the whole world, “a confrontation between charismatic personalities.”¹ Both the prosecution team and the defense team attempted to “shape public perceptions of their opponents both within and outside of the courtroom” and “find ways to package the outcome of the case to have maximum effect on public policy” by using strategic dramaturgy.²

Bryan acted on the stage as the symbol of the fundamentalists and attempted to protect Christian value in the middle of the secularization of American society. He thought that America was established on the grounds of Christian values and Christianity should still play an important role in determining what is right or wrong. On the other hand, Darrow was the champion of the secularism and liberation from the Christian initiative in American society. He thought that Christian doctrine and value did not have to play a

1 Michael Lienesch, *In the Beginning: Fundamentalism, the Scopes Trial, and the Making of the Antievolution Movement* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 140.

2 Lienesch, *In the Beginning*, 141.

major role in determining the content of education in public school because the United States is not a theocracy. For him, science should and can be the impartial criterion in public education.

This paper will look into William Jennings Bryan as a fundamentalist and the Scopes trial which is the most important event for both him and American fundamentalists. We are going to cover Bryan’s bio, the context of the Scopes trial, the events leading up to the trial, Bryan’s portrayal as fundamentalist in the trial, and then finally the aftermath of the trial.

II. Bio of William Jennings Bryan

William Jennings Bryan was born in Salem, Illinois, on March 19, 1860. His father, Silas Bryan, was a literate and pious attorney who also served as a judge. His mother, Mariah Jennings Bryan, homeschooled Bryan in order to develop his belief in the Bible and he remained faithful to his faith as a Presbyterian until his death.³

Even when he was an undergraduate at Illinois College, he was recognized as an orator because of his euphonious voice and sense of the dramatic. He earned his bachelor’s degree in 1881 and a law degree in 1883 from Union College of Chicago. He married Mary Baird, his college fellow, in 1884 and began his career as a lawyer in Jacksonville, Illinois. Mary Bryan also studied law and passed the bar and collaborated with him.⁴

In 1887 the Bryans moved to Lincoln, Nebraska, where he was

³ Anne Janette Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”* (Detroit, MI: Omnigraphics, 2006), 111.

⁴ Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 111.

elected to represent Nebraska in the U.S. House of Representatives. Bryan was re-elected as a congressman in 1892 and became “a vocal champion of a variety of liberal political causes” such as reform of personal income tax system, government ownership of railroads, federally insured bank accounts, women’s suffrage, unionization, and passage of a corporate income tax.⁵ Although his ideals were not realized during his life, he never gave up realizing them. As a result, just as Paolo Coletta points out, many of Bryan’s innovations were instituted after his death. In particular Franklin Roosevelt’s “New Deal” program owed much to Bryan.⁶

After his service in Congress during two terms, Bryan ran for a U.S. Senate seat in Nebraska. But he did not get it because at that time senators were not elected by citizens’ vote but by the state legislative bodies. However, Bryan did not give up and began to write in periodicals and deliver speeches in town halls and churches around the country. Hearing his speeches touching ordinary working Americans’ lives, many people became his life-long supporters.⁷

In 1896 Bryan was named a delegate to the Democratic National Convention, gave a closing speech on the silver standard, and gave the audience a strong impression with his eloquent and powerful speech. Finally, he was named the party’s presidential nominee and ran for the presidency, which ended up losing election by 600,000 votes. While running for presidency two more times, he insisted that the government should take a larger role in addressing social issues. Although he never won the presidential election, his Democratic idea

5 Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 112.

6 Paolo E. Coletta, *William Jennings Bryan Political Puritan, 1915-1925* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1969), 292-93.

7 Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 112.

became influential on the intervention of government in prospering the working class.⁸

It was Bryan's deep religious conviction that guided his actions throughout his long public career. In 1913, he was appointed to be Secretary of State by President Woodrow Wilson. But he had different opinions with Wilson and other administration officials over the issue of entry into World War I. Bryan consistently objected to participating in the war because of Christian concern for blood spilled by "brother against brother."⁹ Even when German submarine torpedoed American luxury cruise ship *Lusitania* on May 7, 1915, Bryan did not agree to participate in the war. After all, Bryan resigned his office on June 8, 1915 because he found he and Wilson differed irreconcilably. However, once the United States entered World War I against Germany in 1917, he supported his country.¹⁰

Bryan was also a leading supporter of the Eighteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which was also known as the Prohibition Amendment. This law banned the transaction of alcoholic beverages from 1920 until 1933. It gained a widespread support of voters in the Bible Belt and other rural areas. But urban Americans defied the law while relatively much more rural Americans supported it.¹¹

While Bryan was regarded as progressive in the political issues, his attitude to the religious issues was very conservative, that is, fundamental. Because of Bryan's progressiveness in politics, William Smith contends that "he had more in common with the advocates of the Social Gospel than with the Fundamentalist."¹² When people

8 Johnson, *The Scopes "Monkey Trial"*, 113.

9 Johnson, *The Scopes "Monkey Trial"*, 113.

10 Johnson, *The Scopes "Monkey Trial"*, 114.

11 Johnson, *The Scopes "Monkey Trial"*, 114.

asked about how he could hold on to these two different attitudes simultaneously, he answered as follows:

People often ask me why I can be a progressive in politics and a fundamentalist in religion. The answer is easy. Government is man-made and therefore imperfect. . . if Christ is the final word, how may anyone be progressive in religion? I am satisfied with the God we have, with the Bible and with Christ.¹³

When Bryan moved to Florida for health problem, he had an opportunity to get involved in Chautauqua lecture circuit which was itinerant program for adult education especially rural area in the United States. One of his favorite topics on the Chautauqua circuit was the danger of evolutionary theory. From then on, he consistently opposed the teaching of evolutionism in public schools. The primary reason of his objection to evolutionism was his concern that evolutionism would threaten children's faith in God. But he was also concerned that it would contribute to the acceptance of eugenics, or the so-called "natural selection" of the "fittest" humans.¹⁴ If eugenics is widely accepted, he thought, acts of horrible evil might take place in this world. As he feared, 20 years later, the execution of six million Jews in Holocaust was rationalized by the eugenic ideas of Nazis.¹⁵

Bryan continued to encourage the state governments to enact laws prohibiting teaching evolution in public schools. He argued that since

12 Willard H. Smith, *The Social and Religious Thought of William Jennings Bryan* (Coronado Press, 1975), 167.

13 Smith, *The Social and Religious Thought*, 18.

14 Johnson, *The Scopes "Monkey Trial"*, 114.

15 Johnson, *The Scopes "Monkey Trial"*, 114.

ordinary citizens paid for the fund with which public schools were operated, they had the right to choose what their children learned at public school. If a majority of people were against the evolution, teachers of public schools should not teach what citizens did not want them to teach. This contention of Bryan’s received many American communities, especially those in the South and the Midwest.¹⁶

When Tennessee lawmakers decided to pass the Butler Act in 1925, he expressed great satisfaction. But the law became the incentive to the long battle over the teaching of evolution in public schools and reached its peak in 1925 in the inactive town of Dayton, Tennessee.¹⁷

III. Context of the Scopes Trial

1. Bishop Ussher’s Calculation of Creation Date

In the 1920s many American fundamentalists were influenced by a creation timeline authored by Bishop James Ussher, a prominent seventeenth-century theologian in the Church of Ireland. As a result of his investigation of the dates shown in Middle Eastern history, including the reigns of ancient Babylonian kings, and the ages of the patriarchs in the Old Testament, he concluded that the creation occurred on Sunday October 23, 4004 B.C. The fact that some versions of the King James Bible, including the one on the judge’s desk at the Scopes trial, included Ussher’s calculation in its appendix

¹⁶ Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 114-15.

¹⁷ Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 115.

shows how much influential his dating of creation was to American believers.¹⁸

However, scientists after nineteenth century believed that the earth is far older than Ussher had claimed. From his study of fossils, French anatomist Georges Cuvier argued that the history of the earth is lengthy as for some species to become extinct. Nineteenth century French scientist, Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, argued that “species could undergo genetic changes if their environments changed around them.”¹⁹ He also went on to argue that “animals were capable of passing beneficial traits along to their offspring.”²⁰

2. Charles Darwin and Survival of the Fittest

As a passenger on HMS Beagle from 1831 to 1836, Darwin travelled to South America and the Pacific islands, collecting thousands of specimens of animals and plants. In particular, he learned that the finches in the Galapagos islands, which he thought were from different families because of their different appearance, were all from the same family. From this kind of investigations, he conceived the theory of evolution by natural selection. The gist of this theory in his work *The Origin of Species by Natural Selection* (1859) was “survival of the fittest,” which meant that animals would change gradually over the long period of time because the “fittest” in any given environment – those with genetic traits that gave them a survival advantage over their contemporaries – would leave more offsprings.

¹⁸ Peter J. Bowler, *Monkey Trials and Gorilla Sermons: Evolution and Christianity from Darwin to Intelligent Design* (Reprint.: Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 34.

¹⁹ Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 8.

²⁰ Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 8.

On the other hand, other members of the species without these important genetic traits would be at a competitive disadvantage and would gradually be extinct.²¹

Many nineteenth-century Christians felt threatened by Darwin’s theory of evolution because his theory seemed like a challenge to the biblical notion that merciful God created animals and people. They thought that Darwin’s evolutionary theory regarded the world as a cruel place in which individuals contested against each other to be the “fittest” without intervention of God. They were also offended by Darwin’s contention that human beings had descended from anthropoid ape, probably in Africa.²²

While some liberal Christians attempted to reconcile the evolution and Biblical teaching, fundamentalists disagreed with this effort because Darwin’s evolutionary theory, to them, was challenging the authority of the Bible and Genesis account of creation and was blasphemous to God and insulting to human being.²³ However, many scholars were trying to find the “missing links” which can prove the development of the human species.²⁴

3. Social Darwinism

Charles Darwin’s notion of the “survival of the fittest” influenced eugenic idea that human race, through selective breeding of people, should accomplish “master race” by sterilizing disable people, alcoholics, and the mentally retarded people. Among representative

²¹ Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 9.

²² Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 9.

²³ Tony J. Hayes, “William Jennings Bryan and the Scopes Trial” (MA Thesis, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1996), 16.

²⁴ Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 10.

supporters was George W. Hunter who argued that those people are “parasites.”²⁵

Hundreds of families such as those described above exist today, spreading disease, immorality, and crime to all parts of this country. The cost to society of such families is very severe. Just as certain animals or plants become parasitic on other plants or animals, these families have become parasitic on society. They not only do harm to others by corrupting, stealing, or spreading disease, but they are actually protected and cared for by the state out of public money. Largely for them the poorhouse and the asylum exist. They take from society, but they give nothing in return. They are true parasites.²⁶

This idea was widely supported at the turn of the twentieth century and contributed, whether directly or indirectly, to the brutal genocide of the Nazis during World War II.²⁷

Meanwhile, Darwinism extended its effect on American and European societies. The notion of “survival of the fittest” became the rationale of the success of the rich and the educated. “Social Darwinism allowed the wealthy few to rationalize their accumulation of vast fortunes, even as they paid their workers subsistence wages and used violence and intimidation to keep union organizers out of their factories.”²⁸ The gap between the factory owners and their laborers was not closed in late 19th century and early 20th century.

²⁵ George William Hunter, *A Civic Biology* (Woodstock, GA: American Book Company, 1914), 263.

²⁶ Hunter, *A Civic Biology*, 263.

²⁷ Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 12.

²⁸ Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 12.

Reform movement arose to object to the exploitation of workers and reformers strived to sway the distorted public opinion.²⁹

Bryan was one of the leaders of this reform movement. As a renowned politician, he championed many reformative values such as women’s suffrage, the right of workers to organize their unions, the termination of monopolies, and debt remission for poor farmers. Although he failed to become president at three elections, Bryan was nicknamed “The Great Commoner” and beloved by millions of followers.³⁰

What is interesting is the fact that Bryan combined his political liberalism with his conservative Christianity. While some may think that this combination is somewhat inconsistent, there is, as Lawrence Levine states, a clear coherence of thought that can be witnessed throughout his life.³¹

Interestingly enough, Clarence Darrow was widely known as a legal champion of laborers because he defended union leaders in many remarkable cases such as that of Eugene Debs and the Pullman rail workers in 1894, the Woodworkers’ Union in 1898, and the murder trial of a radical Socialist union leader named William “Big Bill” Haywood in 1908.³²

Although Bryan and Darrow contested against each other as proponents of different thoughts, it is true that they shared much with each other in that both of them were much interested in defending the poor and weak such as laborers, farmers, women, etc.

²⁹ Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 13.

³⁰ Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 13.

³¹ Lawrence W. Levine, *Defender of the Faith* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), 364.

³² Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 13.

IV. Events Leading up to Trial

1. The ACLU Declares to Challenge the Butler Act

When Tennessee lawmakers established the Butler Act, national opinions were sharply divided. Antievolution League and the WCFA (World's Christian Fundamentals Association) provided support to lawmakers while the National Education Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science, and ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union) aided the opponents of the law. Small town and rural weeklies usually supported the law while most big city and statewide daily papers opposed it. In addition, even ordinary people could be found on either side of the two positions. Protestant denominations were also divided into two, with Southern Baptists and Presbyterians supporting antievolution efforts and Northern Baptists, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, and Methodists expressing their opposition.³³

In particular, among the opposing groups, the ACLU was the one and only organization actively involved in legal challenge to the law. This organization was founded by Roger Baldwin when he was provoked by the Espionage Act and the Sedition Act devised by President Woodrow Wilson's Justice Department intending to crush "disloyalty" to the war effort during the World War II. The ACLU concluded that the Butler Act "violated both freedom of speech and the rights of labor for teachers" and decided to launch a test case

³³ Edward J. Larson, *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate Over Science and Religion* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 2006), 132.

against the Butler Act at its own expense and advertised in Tennessee newspapers in order to search a defendant.³⁴ “We are looking for a Tennessee teacher who is willing to accept our services in testing this law in the courts. ... Distinguished counsel have volunteered their services. All we need now is a willing client.”³⁵

2. Daytonians Scheme to Invite the Trial to Put Dayton on the Map

Having heard about the ACLU’s advertisement on the challenge against the Butler Act, all large cities, such as Memphis, Nashville, and Knoxville, did not respond to the suggestion. Interestingly, the only response came about in the unexpected sleepy village, Dayton, Tennessee, where a small group of people, led by George Rappleyea, manager of the local mines, gathered together and plotted to bring the test case to their small village. The plotters of Dayton thought that the test case would enhance a national, or maybe worldwide, interest and it would boost not only its publicity but also economy. They discussed who would become the defendant, and asked a young man named John T. Scopes if he was willing to help their plot and received his consent.³⁶

Although, after a long time, Scopes did not even remember if he had really taught evolution in his biology class, he volunteered to be involved in the test case because he was convinced that the Butler law was a threat to freedom and he had little to lose as a young, single teacher who just arrived in town and probably would not stay there for long. Scopes went to the local constable and “confessed”

³⁴ Jeffrey P. Moran, *The Scopes Trial: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2002), 24.

³⁵ Larson, *Summer for the Gods*, 83.

³⁶ Moran, *The Scopes Trial*, 24–25.

that he had taught a class about evolution from George W. Hunter's *A Civic Biology*, which was, after all, the officially approved biology textbook for the public schools of Tennessee.³⁷

As soon as Scopes admitted to stand trial, the local newspapers reported that “a Tennessee man had been arrested for teaching evolution and a major court case was in the making.”³⁸ The Associated Press immediately picked up the issue, and nationwide papers were covering it. Full of hope that the trial would boost the economy of the town and draw the interest of the nation and the world, the civic boosters prepared for the trial of the century: they painted the main courtroom, set up overflowing seatings on the courthouse lawn, established loudspeakers at public places across the town, printed promotional brochures, cleaned the county jail in case of rush of criminals.³⁹

3. The “Great Commoner” Volunteers to Prosecute

When the test case was planned and prepared at Dayton, Tennessee, William Jennings Bryan was participating in the WCFA's convention as a main speaker in Memphis, Tennessee. Having heard that the new law would be challenged and feared that the case would be lost by local attorneys, the WCFA's convention decided to do something dramatic: “In order to secure for the state law a just and adequate hearing,” the convention unanimously resolved, “We name as our attorney for this trial William Jennings Bryan and pledge to him whatever support is needful to secure equity and justice and to conserve the righteous law of the Commonwealth of Tennessee.”⁴⁰

³⁷ Moran, *The Scopes Trial*, 25.

³⁸ Lienesch, *In the Beginning*, 142.

³⁹ Lienesch, *In the Beginning*, 142-43.

Bryan did not seem to expect that the case would be complicated because of the issue of creation versus evolution. In last May, he asserted, “it is the easiest case to explain I have ever found.”⁴¹ He did not anticipate that the evolution issue would enter the case although he considered bringing prominent ministers and scientists to dispute against evolution. He thought that the “real issue” was “the *right* of the *people* speaking through the legislature, to control the schools which they *create* and *support*” (author’s emphasis).⁴² Antievolutionists were pleased with Bryan’s involvement in the trial, because they anticipated that the case would be a great opportunity not to discuss the constitutionality of the law but to muffle the voice of evolution in public education with the help of the most eloquent opponent of evolution. Bryan’s entry on the scene had an amazing effect: one newspaper reports, “people all over the country are becoming interested in the trial.”⁴³

4. Darrow Joins the Defense Attorney Team

Just like the prosecution team, the defense team also was composed of renowned people as to attract people’s interest: Clarence Darrow, the most famous trial lawyer in the States, Dudley Field Malone, who had served as an Undersecretary of State when Bryan had been Secretary; and Arthur Garfield Hays, attorney for the ACLU.⁴⁴ Since Darrow knew that the case would be tried less in the courtroom than in the press, just like the way the antievolutionists intended,

⁴⁰ Lienesch, *In the Beginning*, 143.

⁴¹ Robert W. Cherny, *A Righteous Cause: The Life of William Jennings Bryan* (Tulsa, OK.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994), 175.

⁴² Cherny, *A Righteous Cause*, 175.

⁴³ Lienesch, *In the Beginning*, 144.

⁴⁴ Cherny, *A Righteous Cause*, 175.

he also conceived of the case “as a chance not only to test the constitutionality of a foolish state statute, but also to confront Bryan and derail the antievolution movement, which he considered a dangerous threat to individual liberty and free thought.”⁴⁵ Darrow described the Butler Act not only as “foolish” and a product of “ignorance and bigotry,” but also as a dangerous legal precedent because it allowed one particular religious sect – Christian fundamentalists – to limit the constitutional right of every citizen, even other Christians.⁴⁶ Therefore, it was certain that there would be a fiery duel of debate between the prosecution team and the defense team because both attempted to exploit the trial as a golden opportunity to invigorate their own side and quash the other side.

V. Bryan the Fundamentalist in the Scopes Trial

Bryan was not a typical fundamentalist in that his political opinion was progressive rather than conservative all his life.⁴⁷ However, in the contemporaries’ eyes, he was the symbol of the fundamentalism because he had been in the vanguard of the antievolution movement, accusing the evolutionism as threatening not only Christianity but also morals in the United States.

As an antievolutionism activist, Bryan participated in the prosecution of the Scopes trial and he acted not only as a critic of Darwinism but also an apologist of Christianity. Since he was not theologically trained, he was not able to successfully defend the

⁴⁵ Lienesch, *In the Beginning*, 144.

⁴⁶ Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 52-53.

⁴⁷ Smith, *The Social and Religious Thought*, 167.

fundamentalist claims during the trial. However, it is laudable that he steadily pointed out the “problems in the modernist position which the liberals tended to gloss over” and “tried to defend the conservative position with a logical consistency.”⁴⁸ In this section, we are going to investigate Bryan’s fundamentalist characteristics shown in the trial.

1. Bryan’s Fundamentalism Appears in his Biblical Literalism

Fundamentalism is difficult to define because it has been defined and used in a number of ways in Christian history. However, it can be defined as a general sense. Fundamentalism finds its root from the Scripture itself, the Reformation, Protestant orthodoxy, and evangelical revivalism and opposes evolutionary theories, liberal theology, and biblical criticism. Five points of fundamentalism, although there is not a list of doctrines all fundamentalists unanimously agree with, are the verbal inerrancy of Scripture, the divinity of Jesus Christ, the virgin birth, a substitutionary theory of the atonement, and the physical and bodily return of Christ.⁴⁹ Among the five, biblical inerrancy seems to be the most treasured. In his definition of fundamentalism, James Barr suggests that fundamentalists lay an exceptional stress on the biblical inerrancy and infallibility as “the absolutely essential foundation and criterion of truth.”⁵⁰

Likewise, *The Fundamentals*, the series of the tracts from which

⁴⁸ Smith, *The Social and Religious Thought*, 171.

⁴⁹ F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (3rd ed.: New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2005), 650.

⁵⁰ James Barr, “Fundamentalism,” in *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, eds., E. Fahlbusch and G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999–2003), 2: 363–65.

the term fundamentalism was derived also clarifies that biblical inerrancy and infallibility are fundamental and the Scripture was verbally inspired: “The Bible plainly teaches that its words are inspired, and that it is the Word of God” (his emphasis).⁵¹ According to J. L. Brand, biblical literalism, otherwise called verbal inspiration, which usually goes beyond the traditional doctrine of biblical inerrancy, is the characteristic of fundamentalism.⁵² Therefore, biblical inerrancy or biblical literalism is surely the criterion by which we can identify one as fundamentalist.

For Bryan, the Scripture is so divinely inspired that it is necessarily free from error and has an infallible authority concerning what God has said and done. He also asserts that the Scripture is verbally inspired:

Orthodox Christians believe in plenary inspiration; that is, that all of the Bible was given by inspiration. They believe in verbal inspiration; that is, that the words used in the original manuscripts were the actual words of God as spoken by holy men of God “as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.”⁵³

In the famous Darrow’s interrogation of Bryan, Darrow asked the well-worn questions of an ordinary skeptic: Did Jonah stay inside a whale for three days? How could Joshua lengthen the day by making the sun stand still? Where did Cain get his wife? Strictly speaking, those questions are not related with the case because these questions

⁵¹ R. A. Torrey, A. C. Dixon, eds., *The Fundamentals: A testimony to the Truth*, 2:51.

⁵² D. G. Benner and P. C. Hill, *Baker Encyclopedia of Psychology & Counseling* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999), 481.

⁵³ William Jennings Bryan, *Seven Questions in Dispute* (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2003), 18.

are not concerning human evolution. However, those questions are, in fact, related with it because they challenge biblical literalism. Darrow intended to make the best use of these questions as a device to debunk ignorance and anti-intellectualism of Bryan, a representative of American fundamentalists.⁵⁴

DARROW: Don't you know there are any number of civilizations that are traced back to more than 5,000 years?

BRYAN: I know we have people who trace things back according to the number of ciphers they have. But I am not satisfied they are accurate.

DARROW: You are not satisfied that there is any civilization that can be traced back five thousand years?

BRYAN: I would not want to say there is, because I have no evidence of it that is satisfactory.

[. . .]

DARROW: Don't you know that the ancient civilizations of China are six or seven thousand years old at the very least?

BRYAN: No; but they would not run back beyond the creation, according to the Bible six thousand years.

DARROW: You don't know how old they are, is that right?

BRYAN: I don't know how old they are, but possibly you do.

[Laughter.] I think you would give the preference to anybody who opposed the Bible, and I give the preference to the Bible.

[. . .]

DARROW: Do you know of any record in the world, outside of the story of the Bible, which conforms to any statement that it is 4,200 years ago or thereabouts, that all life was wiped off the face of the earth?

⁵⁴ Gary B. Ferngren, ed., *Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 295.

BRYAN: I think they have found records.

DARROW: Do you know of any?

BRYAN: Records reciting the flood, but I am not an authority on the subject.

One may think that Bryan was not a supporter of biblical literalism because in the trial he did not stick to rendering “day” in the Genesis creation account necessarily as a twenty-four-hour day: “It would be just as easy for the kind of God we believe in to make the earth in six days or in 6 million years or in 600 million years.”⁵⁵ However, it should be noted that, in spite of this concession concerning the dating of the Creation, he basically was supportive of literal interpretation of the most Bible passages. Likewise, in the Scopes trial, he thought that he was protecting the word of God against the greatest atheist or agnostic in the United States, that is, Clarence Darrow, by sticking to the biblical literalism.⁵⁶ For example, when he was asked about the Flood, he accepted the biblical view that every life on earth but fish and those aboard Noah’s ark had perished in the Flood in 2348 B.C. Furthermore, he confidently affirmed that no civilization could be traced to an earlier date than the Flood.⁵⁷ When Darrow kept bring forth insulting and abusive questions toward Bryan, when Stewart continually tried to stop the proceedings, Bryan did not escape Darrow’s challenge but tried to answer all questions with all his biblical knowledge because, for him, the Bible, literally interpreted, was superior to reason and was the center of his religious

⁵⁵ Carl F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation, and Authority* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1999), 6:145.

⁵⁶ Ferngren, *Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction*, 296.

⁵⁷ Cherny, *A Righteous Cause*, 180.

authority, doctrine, and pietistic life. That is to say, he surely was a fundamentalist.⁵⁸

2. Bryan’s Fundamentalism Appears in his Antipathy to (False) Science and Evolution

According to Cherny, anti-intellectualism was “a feature of American revivalism,” and fundamentalists were not certainly free from this bent.⁵⁹ Fundamentalist thought was identified as a species of “anti-intellectualism” reflecting a “generally prejudiced mind.”⁶⁰ Above all, the rural South and the conservative Protestant became stereotyped in the United States as anti-intellectual and fearful of any forms of scientific thought.⁶¹

Therefore, people easily regarded Bryan as the stereotype of the fundamentalists. However, anti-intellectualism is not to be applied to Bryan in that his criticism did not target science *itself* but the *wrong* science, especially evolutionism. Bryan asserted, “It is not scientific truth to which Christian object for true science is classified knowledge and nothing can be scientific unless it is true.”⁶²

It is true that Bryan expressed his antipathy to science: “Science is a magnificent material force, but it is not a teacher of morals. It can perfect machinery, but it adds no moral restraints to protect society from the misuse of the machine.”⁶³ He also stated, “Science

58 C. Allyn Russell, “William Jennings Bryan: Statesman-Fundamentalist,” in *Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* ed. Martin E. Marty (New York, NY: K.G. Saur, 1993), 82.

59 George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (2nd ed.; New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2006), 212.

60 Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 212.

61 James W. Fraser, *Between Church and State* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), 125.

62 Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 213.

63 William Jennings Bryan, *The Last Message of William Jennings Bryan* (Whitefish,

has made war so hellish that civilization was about to commit suicide; and now we are told that newly discovered instrument of destruction will make the cruelties of the late war seem trivial in comparison with the cruelties of wars that may come in the future.”⁶⁴

However, according to Bryan’s understanding, it is in war that science brought about its negative and destructive result to the world: “In war, science has proven itself an evil genius; it has made war more terrible than it ever was before. … Science has taught [man] to go down into the water and shoot up from below, and to go up into the clouds and shoot down from above, thus making the battlefield three times as bloody as it was before; but science does not teach brotherly love.”⁶⁵ Therefore, it should be noted that Bryan’s attack was targeting the wrong, misused, and falsely-directed science apart from the Bible, not the good, well-used, and correctly-directed science helped and guided by the Bible.

Religion is not hostile to learning; Christianity has been the greatest patron learning has ever had. But Christians know that “the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom” now just as it has been in the past, and they therefore oppose the teaching of guesses that encourage godlessness among the students.⁶⁶

In fundamentalist view, a model of bad science was Darwinism, i.e., evolution: “Evolution is not truth; it is merely hypothesis – it is millions of guesses strung together.”⁶⁷ According to Marsden,

MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2006), 66.

⁶⁴ Leslie H. Allen, *Bryan and Darrow at Dayton* (New York, NY: Arthur Lee, 1925), 195-96.

⁶⁵ Allen, *Bryan and Darrow at Dayton*, 195.

⁶⁶ Bryan, *The Last Message of William Jennings Bryan*, 19.

evolutionism was based on a philosophical tradition that, especially since Kant, was willing to see perception as an interpretive process.⁶⁸ Hence they were more open to speculative ideas and resulted in functioning as opposing Christianity. Therefore, biblical teaching should direct its energy and correct people’s distorted mind.

Science needs religion to direct its energies and inspire with lofty purpose those who employ the forces that are unloosed by science. Evolution is at war with religion because religion is supernatural; it is, therefore, the relentless foe of Christianity, which is a revealed religion.⁶⁹

What is worse, Bryan was worried that connection between biological evolution and evolutionary philosophies would be a greater threat to society. In his view, evolutionary social views would lead to social Darwinism and then to anti-progressive politics and finally to war.⁷⁰

On the other hand, in fundamentalist view, good science was based on a “Baconian” model of perception, which was taken as normal or commonsense for all people. Almost all their apologetic and interpretation of Scripture relied on this foundation.⁷¹

In travelling all over the country for Chautauqua lecture circuit, his lecture was focused on the criticism of evolutionism and the defense against the criticism of the Bible. Although science itself was not the enemy of Christianity, bad science such as naturalistic

⁶⁷ Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 213.

⁶⁸ Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 215.

⁶⁹ Bryan, *The Last Message of William Jennings Bryan*, 66.

⁷⁰ Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 215.

⁷¹ Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 215.

evolutionism was surely recognized by Bryan, the fundamentalist, as a threat not only to the traditional beliefs and the future civilization. It is certain that this notion filled Bryan's mind before and during the Scopes trial.

3. Bryan's Fundamentalism Appears in his wish for Semi-Christendom.

Bryan's fundamentalism is to be found in his wish that America would make a semi-Christendom. He believed that America was founded upon Christian belief in the Bible. Therefore, the United States was supposed to be sustained by Christian belief and values. Because of that, he was very worried about the apostasy of American society: "Right or wrong, there is a deep and widespread belief that something is shaking the fundamentals of the country, both in religion and morals. It is the opinion of many that an abandonment of the old-fashioned faith and belief in the Bible is our trouble in a large degree. It is my own belief."⁷² Although he did not believe that all Americans should have Christian belief, his wish for America was not very different from the wish for Christendom. So his wish for America could be called as wish for Semi-Christendom.

Since America was built upon the Christian values, America should be sustained by a majority of believers in the United States. But, he deplores the gloomy situation in which Christian people cannot teach bible to children. They pay the expense of the teacher, expecting them to teach what they believe is true, but the reality is that the teachers are teaching their children that Bible is a lie just as a minority wishes.⁷³ He argued that Christian people, as a

⁷² Fraser, *Between Church and State*, 123.

⁷³ Allen, *Bryan and Darrow at Dayton*, 65-66.

majority, should claim their right, stating, "Those who pay taxes have a right to determine what is taught; the hand that writes the pay check rules the school."⁷⁴

This kind of lament in Bryan's heart led him to antievolution movement, and his basic idea was that public education should be controlled by the will of the majority of taxpayers. So he encouraged the law makers to enact the antievolution law by giving lectures and distributing pamphlets, and his activity finally saw its fruit called the Butler law in the State of Tennessee.

It is not probable that Bryan directly influenced Butler the legislator or the process of establishment of the Butler law. However, there is a letter which shows the possibility that Bryan was an indirect contributor of banning the teaching of evolution in Tennessee. In his letter to Bryan, W. B. Mann, a Nashville lawyer, informed Bryan that a couple of Bryan's lectures had been published and distributed to the members of the state legislature, including John Washington Butler. Mann suggested that those pamphlets possibly caused Mr. Butler to read and think deeply on antievolution law and prompted him to introduce the bill. Russell states, "Admittedly, this link between Bryan and Butler was a tenuous one, but it shows at least that Bryan did contribute to the general atmosphere out of which the Butler Law arose."⁷⁵

Bryan believed that if Christianity should not become the religious or moral criterion of American society, the future of its civilization would be hopeless. He stated, "In the countries where other religions and philosophies prevail, except where they have borrowed from

⁷⁴ Fraser, *Between Church and State*, 123.

⁷⁵ C. Allyn Russell, "William Jennings Bryan: Statesman-Fundamentalist," 88.

Christianity, they have made no progress in 1500 or 2000 years.”⁷⁶ So he concluded that Christianity is the only hope that could promise America an “unending progress toward higher things with no limit to human advancement or development.”⁷⁷

In order to realize the dream of semi-Christendom, he had to encourage fundamentalist comrades to act for the dream. He claimed that every bad law and every bad condition was the result of indifferent Christian citizenship lacking in virtue. Therefore, if a Christian believes in Christ’s wisdom and his saving power, he or she has to apply Christ’s “code of morals” to “every problem.”⁷⁸ Jesus Christ is the name that enables the host of righteousness to attack “the brutishness that endangers government, society and civilization .”⁷⁹

VI. Aftermath of the Scopes Trial

1. Ongoing Debate in Public School

Although the Scopes trial seemed to end with the victory of the antievolution movement, their victory was not final, but the beginning of a series of the ongoing clashes. On January 17, 1927, the Tennessee Supreme Court overturned John Scopes’ conviction on the grounds of the technicality although it avoided issuing a ruling about the constitutionality of the Butler Act. In 1928 the state of

⁷⁶ Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 134.

⁷⁷ Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 134.

⁷⁸ William Jennings Bryan, *In His Image* (New York, NY: Fleming H. Revell, 1922), 245-46.

⁷⁹ Bryan, *In His Image*, 246.

Arkansas passed a law prohibiting the teaching of evolution in public school classrooms. However, in some 30 years, the antievolution law was challenged in court by Susan Epperson, a biology teacher, and H. H. Blanchard, a parent of two high school students. Finally, on May 17, 1967, the Tennessee state legislature repealed the Butler Act. In 1968, the United States Supreme Court, ruling in the case *Epperson vs. Arkansas*, struck down all remaining state antievolution laws as being in violation of the Establishment Clause in the Bill of Rights. In 1987, ruling in the case of *Edwards vs. Aguillard*, the United States Supreme Court barred the inclusion of creation science in public school curricula because it is a violation of the Establishment Clause in the Bill of Rights. In 1990, some creationists began the Discovery Institute which is a leading force in the “Intelligent Design” movement in Seattle, Washington. In October, 2004, a school board in Dover, Pennsylvania, mandated that district science teachers read a statement about intelligent design before beginning any instruction on evolutionary theory. On September 26, 2005, the pro-intelligent design actions issued by the Dover Board of Education were challenged about the legality in the case *Kitzmiller et. al. vs. Dover Area School District et. al.* In November 7 of the same year, the Kansas state board of education issues a statement encouraging public school teachers to challenge the theory of evolution and offer students optional self-study on intelligent design. In November 8 of the same year, all eight members of the Dover, Pennsylvania, school board that supported the adoption of a policy mandating the reading of a statement about Intelligent Design in high school biology class lost their seats in school board elections; they were replaced by a slate of candidates who ran on an anti-ID

platform. On December 20 of the same year, federal district court judge John E. Jones III, in the *Kitzmiller* case, rules that intelligent design does not meet established scientific criteria; mention of intelligent design in public schools therefore violates the Establishment Clause in the Bill of Rights.⁸⁰

Bearing in mind a chain of events in relation to the legislations of the antievolution laws, it is clear that opinions on the issue are still sharply divided, as some school officials are trying to impose restrictions on teaching evolution while other are ridiculing them. Reflecting this situation, surveys of public opinion consistently reveal that Americans remain nearly evenly split between the supporters of human evolution and supporters of God's creation of human.⁸¹

2. Decline of Antievolution Movement

When Judge Raulston gave Scopes a verdict that he was guilty and should pay 100 dollars of fine, fundamentalists including Bryan were satisfied with their victory. Bryan anticipated that verdict of guilty would surely function as an impetus to bolster antievolution movement. However, the situation got more unfavorable to the fundamentalists.⁸² The bottom line is that while they won legal victory at the court, they met with a psychological defeat at Dayton.⁸³

After 1925, evangelicals and fundamentalists became wary of being involved in social issues and reluctant to speak up their own thoughts. Moreover, as most historians state, fundamentalists never recovered

⁸⁰ Johnson, *The Scopes "Monkey Trial"*, 227-29.

⁸¹ Ferngren, *Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction*, 297.

⁸² Fraser, *Between Church and State*, 125.

⁸³ David F. Wells and John D. Woodbridge, eds., *The Evangelicals: What They Believe, Who They Are, Where They Are Changing* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1977), 217.

their credibility after the Scopes trial of 1925. The trial proved to be the biggest disaster of all time for fundamentalists in terms of the reputation and social relations. While Bryan was one of the most important leaders of antievolution movement, he showed in the trial that he did not have the least knowledge of geology, comparative religion, and ancient civilization. This fact not only disappointed the fundamentalists but also reinforced their stereotype of fundamentalists.⁸⁴ As a result, the antievolution movement declined and did not recover its morale until the intelligent design movement came on the scene.

3. Fundamentalists Ridiculed

Indeed, American fundamentalism stepped back from the public stage for almost half a century after the trial by avoiding being involved in legislation and political issues. For many historians, at least through the 1970s, the Scopes trial was recognized as the watershed that made fundamentalists withdraw from the plaza to the margins of society.⁸⁵

The most fatal result of the Scopes trial was the fact that fundamentalists lost their reputation at the sacrifice of their frothy victory at the trial. For the previous five years before the trial, Bryan had been the nation’s major opponent of any criticism of the Bible, especially criticism related to the creation account in Genesis. However, the trial found him actually knowing little or nothing about those of whom he had been so critical.⁸⁶ Darrow’s cross-examination

⁸⁴ Alister E. McGrath, *Evangelicalism & the Future of Christianity* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1995), 35.

⁸⁵ Fraser, *Between Church and State*, 125.

⁸⁶ Cherny, *A Righteous Cause*, 180.

of Bryan made a fool of not only Bryan but also Christian fundamentalism itself by implication – “if not in the eyes of the Dayton audience, at least on the national stage.”⁸⁷

If Bryan had had some other fundamentalist comrade to advise him on how to cope with Darrow’s challenge, Darrow’s villainous interrogation could not have made him look that deplorable. However, although Bryan was supposed to have his fundamentalist supporters with him during the trial, any of them did not come to support him and volunteered to become witnesses, leaving Bryan alone at war. That was one of the reasons why Bryan faced with Darrow’s cruel and inescapable hook and fell prey to it without any substantial counterattack.

While technically the verdict of the “Bible-reading mountaineers” who constituted the jury favored Bryan’s side, the verdict of the public went strongly against him.⁸⁸ Bryan was misquoted, ridiculed, and disparaged in the nationwide newspapers and magazines by journalists such as H. L. Mencken, Frank R. Kent, Dudley Nicholas, Heywood Broun, etc.⁸⁹ Mencken’s cynicism is to be apparently found in the following:

Bryan was a vulgar and common man, a can undiluted. He was ignorant, bigoted, self-seeking, blatant and dishonest. His career brought him into contact with the first men of his time; he preferred the company of rustic ignoramuses. It was hard to believe, watching him at Dayton, that he had traveled, that he had been received in civilized societies, that he had been a high officer of

⁸⁷ Fraser, *Between Church and State*, 125.

⁸⁸ C. Allyn Russell, “William Jennings Bryan: Statesman-Fundamentalist,” 89-90.

⁸⁹ Wells and Woodbridge, *The Evangelicals*, 215-16.

state. He seemed only a poor clod like those around him, deluded by a childish theology, full of an almost pathological hatred of all learning, all human dignity, all beauty, all fine and noble things. He was a peasant come home to the dung-pile. Imagine a gentleman, and you have imagined everything that he was not.⁹⁰

Before and during Darrow’s famous cross-examination of Bryan, Stewart, the prosecutor, raised objections more than ten times. He did so firstly because he realized that (1) Bryan was not a pertinent expert on the Bible and that (2) Bryan was being ridiculed by Darrow’s minutely devised questions. But Bryan did not realize that Darrow’s cross-examination would make himself look burlesque if he might not provide persuasive answer to every question that a skillful and cunning lawyer prepared. So Bryan silenced the young prosecutor’s voice and demanded the right to answer Darrow’s interrogation. After all, Bryan’s unconvincing response to Darrow’s question contributed to fix the prejudice that fundamentalists believe literally and blindly in the Bible, ignoring any scientific evidence, and drastically proliferated the sneer and ridicule among the public in spite of his impressive death, which his supporters called “martyrdom” at Dayton just after the trial.⁹¹

VII. Conclusion

William Jennings Bryan was as faithful to his Christian fundamental

⁹⁰ H.L. Mencken, *A Religious Orgy in Tennessee: A Reporter’s Account of the Scopes Monkey Trial* (Hoboken, NJ: Melville House, 2006), 109.

⁹¹ Johnson, *The Scopes “Monkey Trial”*, 147.

belief as he could all his life. He lived his life as a statesman, orator, evangelist, social reformer, and antievolutionism activist according to his thought which is composed of political progressivism and Christian fundamentalism. In particular, his Christian fundamentalism drew much attention because his objection to biological evolutionism and sociological evolutionism was very influential upon American fundamentalists. Above all, his dedication to biblical inerrancy and infallibility, especially biblical literalism, played an important role in leading him to propagating the creationism shown in Genesis and disputing Darwinism in the Scopes trial. What is more, his ideal for advancing semi-Christendom in the United States functioned as a driving force to speak up his logic that the majority of tax-payer should have the right to control the content of public education in the United States.

Although he was very ambitious to facilitate the legislation of the antievolution law not only in the state of Tennessee but also in other states and to give a blow to evolutionism and its champions in the Scopes trial, and the verdict was brought in just as he had expected, the final outcome turned out to be the opposite: the Scopes trial was a fatal blow to fundamentalists, not to Darwinists.

It is regrettable that if Bryan had had theological, geological, and scientific professionals to help him, he could have been better prepared not only in terms of passion but also in terms of knowledge for Darrow's interrogation and could have shown the rationality and logic of Christianity revealed in the Scripture as a persuasive apologist. It is regrettable that the Scopes trial is remembered almost always when people mock the fundamentalists' anti-intellectualism and ignorance. It is very hard to discern if Bryan's wish for

Semi-Christendom was right and if the antievolution law such as the Butler Act is still worth fighting for. However, it is certain that conservative Christians, whether he or she is fundamentalist or evangelical, have to be prepared enough not only in terms of passion but also in terms of knowledge to protect the *fundamentals* in the midst of various kinds of attacks on Christian doctrines and values in modern society. In order to achieve this purpose, conservative churches are required to make an effort to help people, working in a variety of areas such as politics, science, technology, education, business, art, equipped with both Christian worldview and academic excellence. Conservative Christians should let the world know that Christianity is not a religion of intellectual suicide but rather a belief system holding on to biblical truth while interacting with the achievement of the modern scholarship.

[Bibliography]

- Allen, Leslie H. *Bryan and Darrow at Dayton*. New York, N.Y.: Arthur Lee, 1925.
- Benner, D. G. and P. C. Hill. *Baker Encyclopedia of Psychology & Counseling*. 2nd ed.; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1999.
- Bowler, Peter J. *Monkey Trials and Gorilla Sermons: Evolution and Christianity from Darwin to Intelligent Design*. Reprint. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Bryan, William Jennings. *In His Image*. New York, NY: Fleming H. Revell, 1922.
- _____. *Seven Questions in Dispute*. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2003.
- _____. *The Last Message of William Jennings Bryan*. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2006.
- Cherny, Robert W. *A Righteous Cause: The Life of William Jennings Bryan*. Tulsa, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994.
- Coletta, Paolo E. *William Jennings Bryan Political Puritan, 1915-1925*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1969.
- Fahlbusch, E. and G. W. Bromiley. *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999-2003.
- Ferngren, Gary B., ed. *Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.
- Fraser, James W. *Between Church and State*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000.
- Hayes, Tony J. "William Jennings Bryan and the Scopes Trial." MA Thesis, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1996.
- Henry, Carl F. H. *God, Revelation, and Authority*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1999.
- Hunter, George William. *A Civic Biology*. Woodstock, GA: American Book Company, 1914.

- Johnson, Anne Janette. *The Scopes “Monkey Trial.”* Detroit, MI: Omnigraphics, 2006.
- Larson, Edward J. *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America’s Continuing Debate Over Science and Religion.* New York, NY: Basic Books, 2006. 역본: 라슨, 에드워드 J. 『신들을 위한 여름: 종교의 신과 과학의 신이 펼친 20세기 최대의 법정 대결』. 한유정 역. 서울: 글항아리, 2014.
- Levine, Lawrence W. *Defender of the Faith.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Lienesch, Michael. *In the Beginning: Fundamentalism, the Scopes Trial, and the Making of the Antievolution Movement.* Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Marsden, George M. *Fundamentalism and American Culture.* 2nd ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Marty, Martin E., ed. *Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism.* New York, NY: K.G. Saur, 1993.
- McGrath, Alister E. *Evangelicalism & the Future of Christianity.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1995.
- Mencken, H.L. *A Religious Orgy in Tennessee: A Reporter’s Account of the Scopes Monkey Trial.* Hoboken, NJ: Melville House, 2006.
- Moran, Jeffrey P. *The Scopes Trial: A Brief History with Documents.* Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2002.
- Smith, Willard H. *The Social and Religious Thought of William Jennings Bryan.* Coronado Press, 1975.
- Torrey, R. A., and A. C. Dixon. *The Fundamentals: A testimony to the Truth.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2003.
- Wells, David F., and John D. Woodbridge, eds. *The Evangelicals: What They Believe, Who They Are, Where They Are Changing.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1977.

[초록]**스콧스 “원숭이” 재판에서의 근본주의자 윌리엄 제닝스 브라이언**

김창훈

(향상교회, 부목사, 신약신학)

본 논문은 소위 스콧스 “원숭이” 재판이 미국 사회 안에서 보수 기독교의 평판에 끼친 영향과 그 재판에서의 한 기독교 근본주의자, 윌리엄 제닝스 브라이언의 역할에 대해 탐구한다. 이 재판은 1925년에 ACLU(미국시민자유연합)에 의해 기획된 시범 케이스 재판으로서 새롭게 제정된 버틀러 법을 도전하는 것이 목적이었다. 버틀러 법은 모든 테네시주의 공립학교에서 진화론을 가르치지 못하게 하는 법이었다. 미국 근본주의자의 대표로서 성경의 무오성과 성경 문자주의를 중시하였던 브라이언은 재판에서 기독교 근본주의와 창조론을 옹호하고 생물학적, 사회적 다윈주의를 반대하기 위해 최선을 다했다. 하지만 그는 클래런스 대로우의 전략적인 심문에 답할 준비가 잘 되어 있지 못했다. 브라이언은 신학적, 지리학적, 과학적 전문가의 도움이 필요했지만, 그는 아무런 도움을 받지 못했고 시합장에서 외로운 싸움을 싸웠다. 그가 대로우의 심문에 답할 때 보인 합리성과 논리성의 부족, 그리고 과학에 대한 그의 부정적인 태도는 미국 사회로 하여금 근본주의자들은 반지성적이고 무식한 자들이라는 인식을 갖게 했다. 근본주의자들은 법정에서는 법적 승리를 거두었다. 하지만 그들은 데이턴 시(市)에서 심리학적 실패를 마주하게 되었다. 결국 이 재판은 보수적 기독교의 평판에 있어서는 재앙이었음이 드러났다. 스콧스 재판 이래로 복음주의자들과 근본주의자들은 사회 이슈들에 관여하기를 꺼리게 되었으며 그들이 미국의 대중들로부터 신뢰를 회복했는지는 여전히 확실하지 않다. 따라서 스콧스 재판에서의 윌리엄 제닝스 브라이언은 기독교 보수주의자들이 공적인 영역에서 기독교 교리와 가치를 옹호하는데 있어서 아무리 신중하고 지혜로워도 지나치지 않다는 것을 우리에게 가르쳐준다.

키워드: 원숭이 재판, 스콧스 재판, 윌리엄 제닝스 브라이언, 반진화론 운동, 근본주의자, 근본주의