CONCLUSION

In this conclusion, we turn first to the analysis of the differences between Machen and McIntire. What lies underneath their differences? Machen was self-consciously Reformed and Presbyterian in outlook. And McIntire was broadly evangelical in theology but narrowly fundamentalist in posture. The confessionalism of the former was almost foreign to the latter, who had a tolerant attitude toward dispensationalism and stressed certain points of personal morality. Moreover, the denominational conservatism of Machen was incongruous with the interdenominational character of McIntire’s fundamentalist ecclesiology.

Therefore, Machen differed from McIntire in his confessionalism and denominational loyalty. It can be said that they represent two traditions of American Presbyterianism respectively – one tradition of which was called New School in the nineteenth century; while the other was known as Old School in the nineteenth century. Yet Marsden claimed that the two traditions were not incompatible but were rather two approaches to the same tradition.326 One tradition he described:

The more subjective, less authoritarian, concept of Presbyterianism, closely associated with nineteenth century revivalism and twentieth century “fundamentalism” with their strong emphases on the visible signs of faith, especially a conversion “experience” and a “separated

McIntire and his associates represented this tradition of the New School. Marsden described the other tradition:

The more objective and authoritarian conception, closely associated with the European Reformed tradition with its strong emphasis on the place of the objective Standards and often associated with exacting scholarship.  

Machen and his associates represented this tradition of the Old School.

Also Marsden suggests a parallel between New School attitudes and those of twentieth-century fundamentalists by the career of McIntire. Three points can be enumerated for the specific program for which McIntire and his associates fought. First, they tolerated of the doctrine of dispensational premillennialism which the majority in the church considered incompatible with the Westminster Confession of Faith. Second, they continued to operate the Independent Board, rather than forming an official denominational mission board. Third, they adopted by the General Assembly a statement that total abstinence from all that may intoxicate is “the only true principle of temperance” – precisely the statement first adopted by the New School General Assembly of 1840.

Besides these programs there are some more characteristics which suggest a continuation of distinctly New School traditions within the fundamentalist wing of Presbyterianism. Among them are McIntire’s

---
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claim to represent “American Presbyterianism” which is a former New School term, his avid anti-Communist patriotism, his zeal for revivalism and legalistic reforms, his emphasis on interdenominational cooperation, and his lack of concern for strict Presbyterian polity.329

Now to view the differences between Machen and McIntire from another perspective, it can be said that the former belongs to conservatism,330 and the latter fundamentalism.331 Marsden advocates that it should be made clear that the anti-modernist movement in Presbyterianism was a coalition of both fundamentalists and conservatives.332 And he states regarding the confusion arising from the use of the term “fundamentalist”:

Some of the confusion arises because the meaning of the term “Fundamentalist” has changed. Initially the term was used primarily to designate simply the organized opposition to Modernism. The contribution of Benjamin B. Warfield to the original Fundamentals ... is a clear example of the absence of any distinction between Fundamentalists and conservatives at the early stages of the movement. Beginning around the time of the Scopes trial in 1925 the term came increasingly to designate religious obscurantism, sawdust-trail revivalism, and oppressively strict moralism. Since about the 1930’s this later designation, usually

---

330 In this context conservatism is defined as the tradition of American Presbyterian Church that follows the Old School tradition which can also be characterized as confessionalism.
331 In this context fundamentalism is defined as the tradition of American Presbyterian Church that follows the New School tradition.
332 Marsden, “New School Heritage,” 144.
derogatory, has become the overwhelmingly dominant one. It is therefore misleading to continue to use the term to designate the entire historical movement of organized opposition to Modernism.333

Because of this confusion deriving from the defining of the term "fundamentalist", there was much debate regarding whether Machen was a fundamentalist or not as mentioned above. Also, Ahlstrom writes on the use of the term "fundamentalist":

Accordingly I exclude Jonathan Edwards, Charles Hodge, and J. Gresham Machen as well as contemporary theologians like Van Til, Berkouwer, Carnell, et al., who are frequently referred to as Fundamentalists, or even so refer to themselves. To my mind, a person is not a Fundamentalist if he speaks to the issues, is aware of the problems, is well-informed, and is in communication with those from whom he dissents.334

In contrast, McIntire did not deny but affirmed that he was a fundamentalist.335 He stated:

We are a fundamentalist. We are not ashamed of that word, and when people speak of us as a fundamentalist we own the word....

A fundamentalist is a Christian. He believes in the fundamentals of the faith which are under attack in this hour and have been for the
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335 For the evaluation of others about McIntire, see Marsden, “New School,” 310-11; and Hutchinson, History, 265-66.
last fifty years.  

Therefore, it may be said that Machen took conservative positions, while McIntire took fundamentalist positions.

Third, the differences between Machen and McIntire should be viewed from the perspective of organizationism or movementism. McIntire was a very ambitious man. He may be said to have had the desire to control the organizations of the PCA, including the denomination itself. He criticized Machen and his associates. He called them a "machine."  

McIntire’s concern was that the PCA, Westminster Seminary, and the Independent Board were all controlled by Machen and his associates. He complained in a letter to his friend that Machen was gaining too much power. In each of the three organizations – the PCA, Westminster Seminary, and the Independent Board – McIntire and his associates were “in a minority and had little hope of official sanction for their distinctive opinions. The best the minority could hope for was toleration. And often they felt that it was toleration without respect.” Yet Marsden also states that “it is often observed that subsequent history has indicated that Carl McIntire has never been content in any organization which he did not control.”

Morton writes concerning the definition of the term "organizationism":

---
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The implementation of strategy requires organization and leadership. The requirement of loyalty to particular organizations and leaders as a test of Christian fellowship is organizationism, or the degradation of principles and ideals from a place of ultimacy to a subordinate position. To regard constructive criticism of leaders and of their strategy as attacks upon “the cause” constitutes organizationistic movementism.\textsuperscript{341}

And Hutchinson explains the mentality of movementism and McIntire’s practice of movementism:

The mentality of movementism involves dedication to what is held to be a holy cause under divinely-appointed leadership, often narrowed down to one extremely gifted man. Significant differences of opinion are looked upon with suspicion, and more and more of the originally enthusiastic adherents are alienated from the movement until finally only the slavish followers of the leadership remain. There can be little doubt that movementism has vitiated the ministry of Carl McIntire who has looked upon himself as Dr. Machen’s successor; or that it has captivated the Twentieth Century Reformation Movement, so that to McIntire and his followers everything is viewed in terms of the Movement. Everything is subject to the organizational success of the Movement.\textsuperscript{342}

Furthermore, Morton advocates that Machen also practiced

\textsuperscript{342} Hutchinson, History, 294-95.
organizationism or movementism. He states:

As a man of principle Machen opposed the organizationism of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. It is therefore somewhat surprising that there is evidence which indicates that Machen himself is the father of organizationistic movementism among the separatists. Representative of this evidence is that, for instance, from the “disruption” or reorganization of Westminster Theological Seminary early in 1936 and that provided in certain recollections of Machen by J. Oliver Buswell, Jr.\textsuperscript{343}

According to Samuel G. Craig, a member of the Independent Board and the editor of \textit{Christianity Today}, in January 1936, the “disruption” of Westminster Theological Seminary was precipitated by the Faculty action, in which an incipient organizationistic movementism played a role. Craig observed:

... it was a growing tendency on the part of certain of the Faculty and Trustees, after the Independent Board had been organized, to insist that the interests of the Seminary (and even the interests of Conservatism in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.) be identified in the first instance with those of the Independent Board and later with those of its offspring, the Presbyterian Constitutional Covenant Union – a tendency that culminated in the Faculty’s communication which is, in effect, a demand that the Seminary identify its interests with these two organizations, not indeed

officially but none the less really.\textsuperscript{344}

And Morton states that Buswell provided insight into the nature of organizationistic movementism as Machen practiced it. Buswell said:

This turn is quite similar to the doctrines of prelacy. True, none of our Bible Presbyterian men would profess to believe in the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, but nevertheless, in the case of the great Dr. Machen, there was a tendency on the part of his followers to regard him as a prelate (preferred) and to regard any disagreement with him of any kind whatsoever as a personal attack upon a God-given leader, and thus an attack upon the cause itself.\textsuperscript{345}

And Morton gives more evidence of it.\textsuperscript{346} Therefore, it may be said that Machen also was imperfect in spirit of movementism.

Now we turn to the connection between the differences between Machen and McIntire and the division of the PCA in 1937. In the space of six months after Machen’s death, all three institutions – the PCA, Westminster Seminary, and the Independent Board – were divided. Immediately following the Assembly in May, 1937, fourteen ministers and three elders withdrew to form the Bible Presbyterian Synod.\textsuperscript{347}

\textsuperscript{346} Morton, “Origins,” 125. Buswell said: “By letter and by personal conference I vigorously defended the right of Carl McIntire to publish his own paper in his own way. Finally Dr. Machen said to me, ‘I had thought that it would be possible for you and me to belong to the same church, but now I see that it is impossible.’ And he invited me to leave the Church!” Cf. \textit{Christian Beacon} 1 (Nov. 5, 1936) 4; Buswell to Machen, Dec. 4, 1936, 2, Machen Archives; and Hutchinson, \textit{History}, 295.
majority of the denomination, which was to be called the Orthodox Presbyterian Church\textsuperscript{348} later, was faithful to Machen's position. This division was crucial for establishing the OPC's identity. By affirming its loyalty to Calvinism, Presbyterianism, and Christian liberty, it had preserved Machen's original vision for the denomination. Therefore it may be said that the differences between Machen and McIntire were fully reflected in the division of the PCA. The split resembled the 1837 division between Old and New School Presbyterians, in which similar issues – Calvinism, personal behavior, and interdenominational cooperation – motivated the Old School to expel New School Presbyterians who advocated revivalism and social reform.\textsuperscript{349} Mark A. Noll speaks regarding the significance of the 1937 division in relation to this matter:

The division of 1937 certainly helped clarify the self-identity of those who remained as the OPC. They were antiliberal and antipluralist with their departed brethren, but they were also Reformed in an Old School way not congenial to the mores or the doctrinal emphases of American fundamentalism. If the Westminster standards did not permit dispensationalism, neither would they. If the Bible did not condemn all drinking, neither would they.\textsuperscript{350}

Moreover, Marsden admits that the contest for control of the Independent Board, raised by McIntire and his associates, was the most

\textsuperscript{348} Further reference to the Orthodox Presbyterian Church will be abbreviated to the OPC.
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important factor of the 1937 division.\textsuperscript{351} Therefore, the matter of the relationship between Machen and McIntire, with Machen’s death, can be regarded as an important factor of the division. And there were involved a crisis in leadership and personal antagonisms. Marsden writes regarding personal antagonisms raised by the matter of the Independent Board:

The emotion generated by the disruption of the institution which Machen had founded and strenuously defended was intense. Carl McIntire claimed that at one point in the meeting [of the Independent Board which met on May 31, 1937] one of the women associated with the Westminster group “turned to the majority of the Board and declared, ‘The death of Dr. Machen is on your hands.’ The Westminster group and other women nodded assent,” added McIntire.\textsuperscript{352}

Nevertheless, McIntire claimed that he was Machen’s successor.\textsuperscript{353} He has been a champion for faith as a fundamentalist vigorously opposing liberalism. It should be pointed out that McIntire can claim to be Machen’s successor in terms of opposition to modernism, defense of the inerrancy of the Bible, defense of the Biblical truth, the desire for the purity of the church, and so on.

Marsden argues that in America there are three meanings to being “Reformed”: doctrinalist, culturalist, and pietist. The first group meant by the word “strict adherence to Christian doctrine as contained in the
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infallible Scriptures and defined by the standards of the Westminster Assembly." In the second community, a "Reformed" Christian is one who has a convinced view of the relationship of Christianity and culture. He is to "affirm the lordship of Christ over all reality, see Christian principles as applicable to all areas of life, and view every calling as sacred." One trait of the third type of being "Reformed" is that "it is tolerant of diversity to the point of keeping close fellowship with persons of other traditions." He continues:

The operative tests for fellowship among the Reformed in such communities are those of the broader American evangelical-pietist tradition - a certain style of emphasis on evangelism, personal devotions, Methodist mores, and openness in expressing one's evangelical commitment. To be "Reformed" in this setting means to find in Reformed theology the most biblical and healthiest expression of evangelical piety.354

Marsden also states that "the supernaturalist or fundamentalist party among the Reformed included major elements of Old School or doctrinalist heritage as well as the successors to New School evangelicalism."355

For over two decades the mainline churches in America such as the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the United Methodist Church, the Episcopal Church, and the United Church of Christ underwent serious membership
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declines. For example, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) lost over 1.2 million members from 1966 to 1987, and the membership of the United Methodist Church decreased from over 10.6 million in 1970 to under 9.2 million in 1986. Analysts note that one important reason for the decline is the nebulous doctrinal identity of the churches. In other words, the mainstream churches adopted a policy of doctrinal pluralism and blurred their theological identities in a quest for inclusiveness and relevance to the increasingly secular American culture. The roots of this nebulous doctrinal identity lie in the fundamentalist–modernist controversy of the 1920s. The churches in the 1920s chose to allow for diverse doctrinal views in order to preserve the unity of the church. Adherence to doctrinal pluralism has left the churches devoid of a clear theological voice, because the doctrinal diversity in the churches made it difficult for them to articulate clearly their beliefs.\footnote{Longfield, \textit{Presbyterian Controversy}, 3-4.}

Also, many young adults left the churches of their parents into secular lifestyles due to the nebulous identity. Churches cannot hold their children when it is difficult for them to enunciate a clear statement of faith distinct from the vision and world-view of the culture.\footnote{Ibid., 232.} Longfield concedes that Machen was right in stressing the importance of doctrines by writing that “it appears that Machen’s fears about the secularization of the church without distinct doctrinal boundaries were well founded.” In the Presbyterian Church, the mainstream churches were determined to eschew...
theological discussion and accept doctrinal pluralism to further their mission. This solution worked for a time in encouraging the unity and vitality of the church. However, in the long run, it was an important reason for the current identity crisis of the church and helped to undermine the foundation of the church’s mission to the world. And Longfield suggests that the contemporary mainstream churches affirm a normative middle theological position with clear boundaries. He states that “if the mainstream churches are to resolve their identity crises, they will have to do so on the basis of a biblical and creedal faith that is distinct from the values and norms of the surrounding culture.”

In relation to this, Harold J. Ockenga writes concerning the fundamentalist movement that “the movement was unable to crack social problems. The influence of fundamentalism was reduced to inconsequential splinter groups that had no great social prophetic message.” He criticizes it that “there was no interest in the United Nations, in efforts for world peace, in the improvement of labor relations, or in the solving of the race conflict.... a basic indifference to human suffering and a silence concerning social injustices was noticeable.” Furthermore, he states that neo-evangelicalism differed from liberalism by maintaining the doctrines of orthodoxy, which it held in common with the fundamentalist movement. Neo-evangelicalism found itself diverging from fundamentalism as well, by applying consistently Christian doctrine
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to personal and social ethics.\textsuperscript{360}

Therefore, the doctrinal aspect is very important, on the one hand, and the common theological features between Machen and McIntire belonging respectively to the Old and New School as “the two leading American patterns of being Reformed” should be more emphasized rather than stressing the differences between them.\textsuperscript{361} Yet, on the other hand, the Christian church should not neglect fulfilling the social and cultural responsibility. In America, the Puritan commonwealth was the oldest major Reformed community which combined ideally strong elements of each of the above mentioned three types of doctrinalist, culturalist, and pietist.\textsuperscript{362} Also, George Marsden states concerning the difference of the cultural view between the Old and New School:

The Old School was most characteristically doctrinalist, while the more innovative New School combined pietist revivalism with a culturalist emphasis, inherited from the Puritans, looking for a Christianization of American life.\textsuperscript{363}

Especially, Machen is unique in this matter. He stood for the influence being exerted on society by ideas. So he emphasized the importance of doctrine. Through this way, he wanted to recover the traditional culture through reformation. He sought not only to preserve the Christian tradition, but also to address social and political issues through this way. In this aspect he is indeed unique among those
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protagonists in the fundamentalist-modernist controversy. While the Reformed Presbyterians were fully committed to making America a Christian nation by both the power of reason and evangelical witness and social reform, Machen worried about doctrine and civil liberty. Although Machen held to the Calvinistic belief concerning the church's role in culture that the church was called to transform the culture, he severely limited his opportunities to influence church and culture by leaving the PCUSA and separating himself from the vast majority of Presbyterians.\footnote{Longfield, *Presbyterian Controversy*, 224-30.}

Also, being influenced by Thornwell, especially in terms of the doctrine of the spirituality of the church, he thought that secession was the honorable solution to the irreconcilable differences of principle. Once he judged that the PCUSA had become apostate, he worked for a way to establish a new church.\footnote{Ibid., 225.}

However, in view of the successive developments of American church history in which is found the emergence of the evangelical movement, the importance of the common features that both Machen and McIntire share, including opposition to liberalism, should be emphasized. When considering the fact that such evangelical scholars as Gary Dorrien argue for the remaking of evangelical theology to broaden the constituency to include even Roman Catholicism, it is very obscure to determine the specific standard by which to judge whether one is the evangelical or the liberal.\footnote{Dorrien, *Remaking of Evangelical Theology*, 153-83.} In fact, there are many progressive evangelicals who are
difficult to distinguish them from liberals theologically or doctrinally. Therefore, at this juncture, the importance of the common doctrines in which Reformed and Presbyterian Christians share, as can be found in the case of the differences between Machen and McIntire, should be emphasized so that it may cover some minor differences to strive not only for the unity but for the purity of the church as well.

Stanley J. Grenz writes that “Bloesch’s characterization of the essence of the movement as doctrine plus experience is a step in the right direction. However, I would assert that we ought to place the two dimensions in the reverse order.” In other words, he stresses the importance of experience over doctrine. Yet it seems to be very dangerous. In light of Machen’s thought, it is a beginning (a step) into liberalism. Doctrine should be the foundation of experience. Doctrine should be the standard. If experience goes first before doctrine, it will lose the standard which can judge whether it is right experience or not. It is like Schleiermacher’s theology which argues that the source of religion is located in man’s feeling of absolute dependence on the eternal. However noble it may be, it cannot be right. If the evangelical movement does not give the first priority to traditional doctrines of historic Christianity, it will soon lose its proper characteristic.

Here we should consider the relationship between Reformed Theology and evangelicalism. Historically speaking, Reformed Theology

---

is derived from the Colloquy of Marburg (1529) in which was manifested the differences of thought between Martin Luther and Ulrich Zwingli, especially concerning the view of the Lord’s Supper. The main characteristics of Reformed Theology are the centrality of God and Christocentricity. Especially its one important distinguishing feature is man’s absolute dependence on God’s sovereignty for salvation. Furthermore, it is characterized by pluriformity. It has possessed creative vitality sufficient to encompass diversity within an over-all consensus. As a result, various types of theology are included in it. Especially, Princeton Theology was a revival of Reformed Theology which occurred in the 19th century in America. Princeton Theology, spearheaded by Charles Hodge, B. B. Warfield and other Princetonians, followed and adapted the scholastic Calvinism of Francis Turretin.

Also, the churches that emerged from the German Reformation adopted the name evangelisch (evangelical) as a means of stressing Luther’s emphasis on the gospel and in order to distinguish them from the Roman Catholic church. By virtue of this historical background, all Protestant churches may claim the term evangelical. Moreover, the Reformation heritage bequeathed to evangelicalism the great mottos: sola Scriptura, sola gratia, sola fide. As a result, the emphases on the authority of the Bible and the sole salvific work of Christ leading to salvation by grace through faith alone have characterized evangelicals wherever they have been found since the sixteenth century. Thus, evangelicalism is a much broader term than Reformed Theology. Within
its theological boundary are included Lutheranism, Arminianism, Pentecostalism, etc.

However, Grenz does not take into consideration that there were in American church history divisions caused by the Great Awakenings. Also, there were the Old Side in the 18th century, and the Old School in the 19th century, which exerted the great influence in the church and culture and society in general. Therefore, the American church history should be viewed not only from the perspective of evangelicalism, but also from the perspective of Reformed theology. Hence the importance of doctrine should be more emphasized in view of Grenz's viewpoint. In this regard, the causes of divisions which occurred in American church history need to be noted.

New evangelicalism share the orthodox doctrines with fundamentalists. Fundamentalists are the noble people. However, their strategy was wrong. Neo-evangelicals wanted to apply the biblical doctrine to personal and social ethics. Neo-evangelicals showed a willingness to face societal problems such as social injustice and racial conflict. Neo-evangelicalism is different from fundamentalism, liberalism, and neo-orthodoxy. However, today some people among neo-evangelicals abandoned some orthodox doctrines, especially biblical inerrancy. Thus conservative evangelicals do not use the name “neo-evangelical” any more to refer to themselves.⁶⁸

In the Korean Presbyterian church, there were the fundamentalist-

⁶⁸ Ockenga, “From Fundamentalism,” 36-46.
liberal controversies in both the 1930s and the 1950s. And there were three tragic divisions in a decade because of the problems of Shinto shrine worship, liberal theology, and WCC in 1952, 1953 and 1959 respectively. Both Machen and McIntire had a great influence on the Korean Presbyterian church through the missionaries of the OPC and the BPC and through the Korean leaders of the church. Especially, Machen exerted an immeasurable influence through Hyung Nong Park and Yune Sun Park, two great theologians in terms of Reformed Theology, in particular the tradition of the old Princeton Theology.

There have been so many divisions which arose from issues less than those of apostasy in church history. Therefore, through these lessons of history, we are reminded to commit always to both purity and unity of the church in today’s situation in which we are facing many false gospels or false religions. Edmund P. Clowney writes:

Christ calls his scattered sheep to the unity of his Spirit. We must heed his voice and buy up the opportunity. Spiritual revival for the church is revival by the Spirit of him of whom it was said, “The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up” (John 2:17). To order the fellowship of the saints by the Word of Christ is to build the holy temple of the Lord and to edify the body of Christ. The riches of biblical revelation concerning the church come from the Lord who “loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle,
or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish’’ (Eph. 5:25-27).

It is time for the true bride to hear the voice of the bridegroom. The path where he calls may seem impassible, blocked by the rubble of tradition and the walls of rebellion; but Christ calls his church. He will be answered, not in the weary tones of political opportunism, but in ardor of jealous love.369
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