

THE SECOND COMING OF PAISLEY:
MILITANT FUNDAMENTALISM AND ULSTER POLITICS
IN A TRANSATLANTIC CONTEXT

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of History

by

Richard L. Jordan

B.A. University of Southern Mississippi, 1998

M.A. University of Southern Mississippi, 2002

December 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABBREVIATIONS	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
The Importance of Militant Fundamentalism to Ian Paisley	4
The Historiography of “The Troubles”	12
2. THE TRANSATLANTIC BACKGROUND TO FUNDAMENTALISM	17
Reformation and Puritanism	20
The Plantation of Presbyterianism into the American Colonies	23
The Legacy of The First Ulster Awakening	26
Colonial Revivalism	27
Nineteenth-Century Revivalism	30
Liberalism, Darwinism, and Modernism	31
Dispensationalist Millennialism	36
<i>The Fundamentals</i>	39
3. THE TWENTIETH-CENTURY REFORMATION: THE GOSPEL OF MILITANT FUNDAMENTALISM	45
The Presbyterian Schism	46
Princeton, Foreign Missions, and J. Gresham Machen	50
Schism Within Schism	54
Separation: The Bible Presbyterian Church	56
The American Council of Christian Churches	59
The Cold War	62
The International Council of Christian Churches	66
Militant Fundamentalism and Joseph McCarthy	71
Militant Laymen	74
Defending America From Communist-Bloc Clerics	81
The Fellowship of Militant Fundamentalists	85
4. THE THEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL BIRTH OF ULSTER PROTESTANTISM	92
The Reformation in Scotland	92
The Plantation of Scottish Presbyterianism Into Ulster	95
Divisions Within Ulster Presbyterianism	103
Economic and Political Competition in Ulster	104
Henry Cooke and the Revival of '59	108

5. A FUNDAMENTAL DEFENSE OF ULSTER PROTESTANTISM: THE DEVELOPMENT OF PAISLEYISM	114
James Kyle Paisley and American Fundamentalists	120
The Ordination of the Reverend Ian Paisley	122
The Genesis of Free Presbyterianism in Ulster	126
Paisley’s Introduction to American Militant Fundamentalism	132
Maura Lyons and the Fethard-on-sea Boycott	134
The Campaign Against Ecumenism and Protestant “Apostasy”	137
Militant Fundamentalism in Ulster	148
6. THE CRUSADE AGAINST O’NEILL AND ECUMENISM	160
The Political Background to Paisleyism: The Northern Ireland Statelet 1922 – 1963	162
O’Neillism	165
The 1916 Easter Rising	180
Paisley, Ramsey, and the Whore of Babylon	186
The General Assembly and “Martyrdom”	191
7. CIVIL RIGHTS FOR THE GREEN, THE BLACK, AND THE ORANGE	202
The Early Civil Rights Movement in Northern Ireland.	202
The American Civil Rights Movement	211
The American Influence on the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Movement.	215
Militant Fundamentalism and the Orange Order.	218
The Crusade Against O’Neill and Ecumenism Continues	222
Paisley and British Militants	227
8. PAISLEY, THE ELIJAH OF ULSTER.	230
The International Fellowship Consolidates.	238
9. CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE IN ULSTER	250
The Second Jailing	266
10. THE SECOND COMING: PAISLEY IN THE AGE OF AMILLENNIAL POLITICS	271
Paisley’s First Political Foray	272
The National Union of Protestants	274
The First Year of “Trouble”.	282
The Second Coming: Paisley and Democratic Unionist Politics.	285
The Second Coming: Paisley and Militant Fundamentalism.	303
The Second Coming: Paisley the Amillennial Politician	311
WORKS CITED	318
VITA.	340

ABBREVIATIONS

ACCC	American Council of Christian Churches
BCPCC	British Council of Protestant Christian Churches
CDU	Campaign for Democracy in Ulster
CSJ	Campaign for Social Justice
DCAC	Derry Citizens' Action Committee
DUP (UDUP)	(Ulster) Democratic Unionist Party
FCC	Federal Communications Commission
HUAC	House Un-American Activities Committee
IBPFM	Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions
ICCC	International Council of Christian Churches
ICR	Irish Christian Relief
IEC	Irish Evangelical Church
IRA	Irish Republican Army
NCC	National Council of Churches
NICRA	Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association
NILP	Northern Ireland Labour Party
NUP	National Union of Protestants
PCA	Presbyterian Church in America
PUP	Protestant Unionist Party
RUC	Royal Ulster Constabulary
SDLP	Social Democratic and Labour Party
UCDC	Ulster Constitutional Defence Committee
UDA	Ulster Defense Association
UPA	Ulster Protestant Action
UPV	Ulster Protestant Volunteers
UUP	Ulster Unionist Party
UVF	Ulster Volunteer Force
VUPP	Vanguard Unionist Progressive Party
WCC	World Council of Churches

ABSTRACT

On August 1, 1946, the Reverend Ian Paisley was ordained as the minister of the Ravenhill Evangelical Mission Church in Belfast, Northern Ireland. From his new pulpit, the young evangelist embarked on a six-decade crusade attacking Irish theological and political issues and espousing militant fundamentalism and premillennial pessimism: Paisley confronted the liberal, modernist, and ecumenical trends within Irish Protestantism, the attempted political rapprochement between protestant Unionists and catholic nationalists in Northern Ireland, and the Northern Irish civil rights movement. Paisley also opposed the Irish Republican Army and any move towards the political reunification of Ireland.

In 1971, Paisley and his political allies formed the Democratic Unionist Party (DUP) to articulate his political agenda. Paisley and his party were successful, becoming the prominent protestant political organization in Northern Ireland. In May 2007 Paisley became the First Minister of the Northern Ireland statelet. But as Paisley and the DUP grew in popularity, Paisley offered political solutions that compromised his Calvinist and premillennial religiosity.

The Reverend Ian Paisley's career and transformation, however, did not take place solely within the context of Irish history, religiosity, and politics. During the 1950s and 1960s, Paisley made alliances with militant fundamentalists in North America. The most important was the Reverend Carl McIntire, a minister whose public protests and attacks on fellow Christians Paisley emulated. Paisley's aggressive crusade twice landed him in jail, for which McIntire and North Americans portrayed Paisley as a "martyr" for their version of Bible Protestantism. International support not only bolstered Paisley's prestige in Northern Ireland, but also his own sense of destiny as a Protestant "prophet." This dissertation traces Paisley's transformation from a premillennial fundamentalist crusader into an amillennial politician.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

On October 4, 1969, an enthusiastic crowd watched the Reverend Ian Paisley christen the new Martyrs Memorial Free Presbyterian Church in east Belfast, Northern Ireland. The approximately seven thousand Christians in attendance were either members of the new church, belonged to Northern Ireland's twenty-nine Free Presbyterian congregations, or were supporters of the Reverend Paisley who attended other Protestant denominations. The new church, the largest in the British Isles, illustrated the growth that the Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster enjoyed since the denomination began as a single congregation in 1951, as well as the growing religious and political influence Paisley exerted over the province's protestant community.¹ The appearance of non-Free Presbyterians was important - they represented the support within Ulster Protestantism for the Calvinist and evangelical Christianity Paisley espoused and for the preacher's Unionist and Loyalist politics.²

A small number of attendees were not Irish, and their presence was even more significant.

Two British Baptists - the Reverends Brian Green from London and Jack Glass of Glasgow,

¹ *Protestant Telegraph*, "7,000 See Church Opened," 11 October 1969; and Bob Jones, Jr. to John R. Rice, no date, Fundamentalism Files, Bob Jones University. Within his letter, Jones not only reported the opening of the new church, but the threatening attitude of the British Army – Jones accused the Army of preventing many worshippers from attending. But Jones was upbeat: that day 150 men and women gave themselves to God and became "saved".

Throughout this dissertation, descriptive terms such as Protestant, Catholic, and Presbyterian will be capitalized when referring to Christian denominations or clergymen – i.e. the Catholic Church or a Protestant minister – and in lower case when designating cultural groups – i.e. Ulster presbyterians or the catholic community.

² In Northern Ireland, Loyalists proclaim a conditional loyalty to the British crown (as long as the royal family remains Protestant), but can oppose the British government; their British identity is essentially Imperial. Unionists support the political union between Great Britain and Northern Ireland and are loyal to Westminster. There is also a class distinction: Loyalists tend to be working-class, while Unionists are primarily from the upper and middle-classes. Complicating these identities, a working-class Loyalist can also be a Unionist, but upper and middle-class Unionists rarely consider themselves Loyalists.

Scotland - represented the influence and fellowship that Paisley held within Great Britain's community of fundamentalist preachers. Even more important was the presence of two leaders of America's militant fundamentalist community - the Reverend Carl McIntire of New Jersey and Dr. Bob Jones, Jr. from Greenville, South Carolina. Paisley and his four visiting allies maintained a common bond of militant fundamentalist religiosity, an adherence to traditional Calvinism, a belligerent rejection of Christian modernism and ecumenism, and hostility towards the Roman Catholic Church. Militants argued for complete separation from Christians who did not share their theology; this "apostate" group included moderate fundamentalists and "New Evangelicals,"³ as well as clerics and theologians who argued for a liberal version of Christian theology and joined ecumenical groups such as the World Council of Churches (WCC).⁴

Calvinism was a central tenet within militant fundamentalism in contrast to the Arminian theology of most moderate fundamentalists and New Evangelicals who took the Arminian position towards salvation. In addition, Paisley and the British and American militants were premillennialists who shared an expectation of the imminent Second Coming of Christ and urged a Christian revival in preparation for it. These militants used revivalism not to convert the entire world to the Kingdom of God nor to promote a social gospel, but to prepare the "Elect" for Heaven. While God's grace alone saved the Elect, the Holy Ghost could work through evangelists to bring them closer to God. These militants thus saw themselves as God's chosen messengers to the Elect and only the Elect; they did not associate with Christians they believed

³ Many New Evangelicals consider themselves fundamentalists.

⁴ The World Council of Churches was formed in August 1948 as an ecumenical forum to eliminate the differences between various Christian denominations.

to be apostate. This eschatology, combined with their Calvinist theology, influenced their political and religious views.⁵

The five militant preachers who gathered in east Belfast in 1969 exemplified the historical, cultural and theological relationships between British, Irish and American Protestantism. From the sixteenth century on, several centuries of emigration - which began in Scotland, continued through Northern Ireland, and ended in North America – built a transatlantic connection. The plantation of Scottish and English Calvinism into the American colonies established a Reformed basis for American Protestantism, while the arrival of revivalism from the British Isles helped evangelism become the core of American religious and national culture. Therefore, revivalism created a theological bridge spanning England, Scotland, Northern Ireland, and the United States. Revivalism not only helped imbed English and Scottish Calvinism in the American colonies, it also shaped the fundamentalism that Americans formulated in the late nineteenth century and that travelled back to Northern Ireland in the 1920s.⁶

The presence of Irish, American, and British militants in Belfast that Sunday in 1969, testified to the Martyr's Memorial Free Presbyterian's position as the bastion of militant fundamentalism in Ireland. The new church represented both the relationship between Paisley,

⁵ Bob Jones, Jr., *Fundamentals of Faith: A Series of Chapel Messages on the Bob Jones University Creed* (Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1964), 5-56; Carl McIntire, *The Testimony of Separation* (Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1952); and Ian R.K. Paisley, *Christian Foundations* (Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1971) and *For Such a Time as This: Recollections, Reflections, Recognitions* (Belfast: Ambassador Publications, 1999), 12-49. The Bob Jones University Press edition of *Christian Foundations* is a reprint of the original published in Northern Ireland in 1959.

⁶ George Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism: 1870-1925* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 4-6; Ernest Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970), ix-xix; and David N. Livingstone and Ronald A. Wells, *Ulster-American Religion: Episodes in the History of a Cultural Connection* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), 7-10.

McIntire, and the Bob Jones family, and the nexus for three –and-a-half centuries of Irish, British, and American political and religious controversies. All five clergymen personified a transatlantic tradition that opposed Christian liberalism and modernism as well as civil rights, communism, and the Roman Catholic Church. They argued in favor of a political and Knoxian form of Calvinism and agreed that religious leaders could enter the political arena if the state failed to protect “Bible Protestantism.”⁷

THE IMPORTANCE OF MILITANT FUNDAMENTALISM TO IAN PAISLEY

The opening of Martyrs’ Memorial marked a crossroad between the radical evangelicalism that defined Paisley’s early career and the new political activism that shaped the following four decades. Employing memories of the Reformation and perceived visions of Roman Catholic repression, Paisley’s sermons routinely referred to Martin Luther, the theologies of John Calvin and John Knox, and the cultural and theological connections between Calvinist Scotland, Protestant Ireland, and fundamentalist America. In the 1950s, Paisley took these images, his Calvinism and revivalism, and formulated them into a crusade against what he perceived as apostasy in Irish Protestant churches.⁸ In the 1960s, Paisley carried this religious crusade into the political arena when he opposed Prime Minister O’Neill’s Northern Ireland government and the catholic civil rights movement, forming the movement dubbed “Paisleyism,” Northern Ireland’s indigenous militant fundamentalism. Paisley contested O’Neill’s efforts to modernize Northern Ireland’s economy, which required a rapprochement with Ulster’s catholic community.

⁷ *Protestant Telegraph*, “Ulster Needs Deliverance,” 13 June 1970. To Paisley and like-minded militant fundamentalists, “Bible Protestants” are those Christians who base their faith and practice on a literal interpretation of scripture. John Knox, an important figure in the Scottish Reformation, is briefly discussed in pages 92-95.

⁸ *Protestant Telegraph*, “Were the Reformers Right in Separating From the Church of Rome at Reformation? By Ian R.K. Paisley,” 22 October 1966, “The Pope’s Pedigree,” 28 October 1967, and “John Knox,” 12 December 1970.

Paisley attacked “O’Neillism” as a political form of ecumenism and civil rights as both a Roman Catholic and communist front.⁹ From the spring of 1969 on, however, Paisley focused less and less on promoting premillennial fundamentalism and attacks against Protestant apostasy, and more and more on building a political career that included a constituted political party and seats in the provincial, British, and European parliaments. Paisley moved from opposing the liberal Unionist administration of Prime Minister Terence O’Neill and catholic civil rights, into promoting Loyalist politics.¹⁰

A fundamentalist background was important in the development of Paisleyism.

Fundamentalism arose during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries out of the theological and cultural differences alienating traditional, small-town America from the rising power and the new morality of the urban, industrializing United States. To fundamentalists, traditional Protestantism meant a literal interpretation of the Bible as the sole and inerrant Word of God, a premillennial expectation of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ, and an adherence to revivalism and evangelicalism. Objecting to liberal and modernist theology, and to the new culture

⁹ The policies of the O’Neill administration sought to improve the economy of Northern Ireland, which required a rapprochement with the province’s catholic community. Because catholics suffered discrimination in public sector jobs and protestant-controlled companies, O’Neill needed to elevate the economic status of Ulster’s catholic population, in order for his plans to work. An example of discrimination towards catholics was Harland and Wolff shipyards, where out of 10,000 employees, 100 were catholic. The program, which became known as “O’Neillism,” will be discussed at length in Chapter Six (E.A. Aunger, “Religion and Occupational Class in Northern Ireland,” *Economic and Social Review* 7 (1980): 26).

¹⁰ Steve Bruce, *God Save Ulster!: The Religion and Politics of Paisleyism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989); and Ed Moloney, *Paisley: From Demagogue to Democrat?* (Dublin: Poolbeg, 2008).

In the 1960s, Loyalists opposed both the liberalism of the O’Neill administration and catholic civil rights while supporting the political union between Northern Ireland and the United Kingdom. In the 1970s, Loyalist politics expanded to include opposition to British government policy. Loyalists detested Westminster’s efforts to involve Ulster’s catholic community and the Republic of Ireland into a political settlement in Northern Ireland, and thought British security policy ineffective.

developing within urban America, fundamentalism defended the conservative tenets of American Protestant churches and the Protestant basis of American society.¹¹

In the 1920s, William Patterson Nicholson introduced U.S.-style fundamentalism to a wide segment of the protestant community in Northern Ireland. Nicholson's crusades took place during the contentious years that saw the partition of Ireland and the founding of the Northern Ireland statelet as a devolved province of the United Kingdom. The formation of a protestant state in Ulster caused substantial violence between the catholic and protestant communities, and accordingly, fundamentalism became associated with sectarianism. Nicholson's fundamentalism also inspired some Ulster protestants to question the liberalism and modernism popular amongst Ulster's clergy and academics, especially within the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. In the 1920s, Presbyterian fundamentalists instigated a major heresy trial in the Presbyterian General Assembly and joined with Baptists and independents that separated from mainstream denominations.¹²

The Irish Evangelical Church was one such separating body. Its evangelical activities during the 1930s and 1940s influenced a cross-section of Northern Ireland's fundamentalist community to withdraw from Protestant churches. Prior to the Second World War, Ulster separatists had few outlets to expand their community, and accordingly they worked together to oppose liberalism and modernism. After the War, the growth of Presbyterian gospel halls and small independent congregations gave fundamentalists a wider community and more outlets to evangelize. The new conditions enabled militant fundamentalists to organize a larger fellowship,

¹¹ Marsden, 1980, 1-61. Fundamentalists opposed the loosening of public morality, liberal intellectual ideas, and the cultural influences that arose out of Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and Jewish immigration.

¹² Livingstone and Wells, 101-137.

but also allowed them to question other fundamentalists with whom they disagreed on theological grounds.¹³

Paisley's transformation from a predominately religious crusader into a full-fledged politician was, of course, influenced by Northern Ireland's unique history and sectarian relationships. Paisley's crusade would have developed in a different manner, however, if American militant fundamentalism had not been injected into his theology, his style of protest, and his self-image as a "martyr" and "prophet."¹⁴ Starting in the 1950s, Paisley copied the Reverend Carl McIntire's style of public protest as well as McIntire's propensity to attack vehemently anyone who failed to follow his lead. McIntire's targets included fellow fundamentalists who he perceived as weak in their opposition to Christian ecumenism and liberalism, Christian clergymen suspected of communist and socialist sympathies, and even the U.S. government, whose Cold War policies struck McIntire as passive.¹⁵

In the mid-1960s, a growing relationship with American militant fundamentalists enabled Paisley to visit the United States, trips that changed Northern Irish history. From April 1965 through the spring of 1968, Paisley made yearly speaking tours of the U. S. and witnessed the social changes that the American civil rights movement, supported by effective federal government action, imposed on American society. Paisley spoke during the volatile period when the American South was forced to eliminate segregation in public facilities, integrate schools, and grant African-Americans the right to vote. When Martin Luther King was assassinated in April 1968 and a week of intense racial violence exploded within American cities, Paisley was

¹³ Steve Bruce, *Paisley and Politics in Northern Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 20-21.

¹⁴ To militant fundamentalists, Paisley became a martyr because of his jailing in 1966, and a prophet in the 1970s after he began making political proclamations.

¹⁵ James Morris, *The Preachers* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973), 189-231.

attending the annual Bob Jones Bible Conference. It is no coincidence that when the Northern Ireland civil rights movement hit the streets of Ulster four months later, Paisley led the most vigorous counter-demonstrations. The defiance toward catholic civil rights marked the most radical element within Paisleyism.¹⁶

After twelve months of contentious civil rights marches and Paisleyite counter-demonstrations, sectarian street fighting erupted in Londonderry, Belfast, and other major cities in Northern Ireland. The violence resulted in the deployment of British Army units onto the streets of Ulster and Westminster's direct involvement in provincial security and communal affairs.¹⁷ In the fall of 1969, the political situation in Northern Ireland and the deterioration of communal relations enhanced the significance of the opening of Martyr's Memorial Church and redirected Paisley's crusade towards a stronger involvement in the political process.¹⁸ As British Army operations grew and sectarian street fighting continued, and as the new Irish Republican Army campaign unfolded, Paisley and his militant supporters were increasingly convinced that the policies of both the Unionist and British governments were incapable of maintaining public order. In addition, Paisley believed that British efforts to mediate the catholic – protestant political divisions threatened to increase catholic political power and lead to unification with the Republic of Ireland. The prospects of a united Ireland convinced Paisley to mobilize supporters into promoting political actions that took on the aura of a Protestant revival:

¹⁶ *The Fellowship News*, "Bible Conference Notes," 27 April 1968.

¹⁷ Tim Pat Coogan, *The Troubles: Ireland's Ordeal, 1966-1995 and the Search for Peace* (London: Hutchinson, 1995), 60-82; and Jonathan Bardon, *A History of Ulster* (Belfast: The Blackstaff Press, Limited, 1992), 664-672.

¹⁸ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Dr Paisley Held in Custody for 3 Hours by British Army," 27 September 1969.

The irrevocable damage done ...must not continue – you the electorate can play your Role in delivering Ulster from the fate that our enemies have in store for us. The Loyalist motto - For God and Ulster – is most explicit; our faith is in God to maintain us, personally and rationally. Cast your vote for the Loyalist cause, and by so doing contribute to the Deliverance of Ulster.¹⁹

But combining religion and politics compromised Paisley's premillennial theology. No longer was the primary focus of his crusade to prepare the Elect for the Second Coming and therefore to demand that the Northern Irish government and Protestant churches follow God's commandments. Instead, Paisley focused on constitutional politics. Paisley's political agenda included four primary concerns: the organization of a new Northern Ireland government, the political relationship between the province and Westminster, the efforts of the British government to bring catholic political parties and the Republic of Ireland into the local political settlement, and the campaign against Irish Republican Army violence. Another indication of Paisley's move towards amillennial politics was subtle: in the early 1970s, Paisley and his supporters began considering a future with Paisley as the political leader of the Ulster protestant community.²⁰

As Paisley became increasingly involved within the political process, he took on the public persona of an amillennial politician who would compromise his theology for political gain. If he had adopted political amillennialism during the 1950s and 1960s, it would not have been

¹⁹ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Ulster Needs Deliverance," 13 June 1970.

²⁰ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Exclusive Interview with the *Observer*," 9 May 1970 and "Dr. Paisley Acceptable as Prime Minister," 16 October 1971 (The October 1971 article cites the *Spectator*, which argued that because Paisleyism was such a popular force, Ulster protestants, in the future, would demand Paisley as their prime minister); Bruce, 2007; and Patrick Mitchel, *Evangelicalism and National Identity in Ulster 1921-1998* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003). In his interview with the *Ballymena Observer*, Paisley was asked how a Protestant clergyman could be involved in politics. He replied, "(a minister) should be a Christian in his home, in his business, in society and in politics. Politics is a very important part of society. In normal times I do not think that a Christian minister should stand as a Member of Parliament, but when the situation is such as it is in Ulster today, when the very heritage of our Protestantism is at stake, Protestant ministers, I feel, should be giving a lead to their people."

possible for Paisley to develop into Northern Ireland's leading militant fundamentalist, to attack Irish fundamentalists who did not follow separatism, or to develop the bond with Carl McIntire and Bob Jones University. But the chain of events that transpired during the 1960s made the transition possible in the following decade: Paisley would not have moved towards amillennial politics if sectarian street fighting had not broken out in August 1969 and the British Army deployed onto the street of Ulster.

Without the onset of civil rights activism and O'Neillism, Paisley's campaigns would have remained religious in focus and the advent of Free Presbyterianism would have been a minor historical incident that linked the Calvinism and revivalism of the British Isles with the militant fundamentalism that emerged in North America.²¹ Even more important, it is possible to argue that the communal fighting would not have taken place if Paisley had chosen to ignore the Northern Ireland civil rights movement and that civil rights activists would not have radicalized if Paisleyite activities had not made it difficult for Terence O'Neill to implement political and economic reforms. Without Paisleyism, it is safe to say, the "Troubles" would have unfolded very differently – if they unfolded at all. Without the influence of American militant fundamentalism, there would have been no Paisleyism.

Yet from 1969 on, Paisley embarked on a political career that saw him slowly compromise his premillennial, militant fundamentalism. Paisley formed the Ulster Democratic Unionist Party (DUP) in September 1971,²² and devoted increasing attention to political negotiations and to campaigning, and less to his crusade against Protestant apostasy. Paisley's attacks on the British government, the Ulster Unionist Party, and the Catholic Church took on a secular and political

²¹ To Free Presbyterians, however, such a scenario would have been of immense historical and theological importance.

²² Better known as the Democratic Unionist Party.

tone. Throughout the extensive negotiations and political campaigns during the following two decades, Paisley and the DUP took a hard-line stance: they would not negotiate with Sinn Fein, they refused to allow moderate catholic politicians to sit as equals in a power-sharing government, and rejected a role for the Republic of Ireland in the Northern Ireland government.²³ In the late 1990s, however, Paisley moderated. When the Democratic Unionist Party accepted a power sharing agreement with the Social Democratic and Labour Party (SDLP)²⁴ and agreed to consider an executive that included Sinn Fein, Paisley compromised the DUP's political principles. In May 2007, the conversion to amillennial politics was complete when Paisley agreed to become Northern Ireland's First Minister, and the DUP formed an administration with Sinn Fein as its junior partner.²⁵ Paisley paid a high price for his political actions: he was "asked" to resign as the Moderator of the Free Presbyterian Church, ending a fifty-six year career as the church's only moderator.²⁶ There is no doubt that the crusading preacher of the 1950s and 1960s would have violently opposed the First Minister Paisley of 2007. Many Free Presbyterians in Ulster felt betrayed, but retained their adherence to the Paisleyite premillennial and militant fundamentalism of the past.²⁷

This dissertation explains the process that took the Reverend Ian Paisley from a premillennial preacher to an amillennial politician. Chapter Two traces the plantation of

²³ *Protestant Telegraph*, "U.D.U.P. Election Manifesto," 23 June 1973, "DUP Says No to Power-Sharing," April 1980, and "A Short History of the D.U.P. by David Calvert," 20 June, 11 July, and 8 August 1981. Sinn Fein is the political party associated with the Irish Republican Army.

²⁴ The Social Democratic and Labour Party is the predominately catholic political party that represents moderate constitutionalism. The SDLP worked for the unification of Ireland through the political process.

²⁵ *The Burning Bush*, "Power Sharing with Murderer – Right or Wrong?," July 2007.

²⁶ *The Burning Bush*, "Press Statement from the Presbytery of Ulster," and "Presbytery Statement of Rededication Following the Election of a New Moderator," September 2007.

²⁷ Email from the Reverend Ian Foster, March 2008.

Calvinism, Puritanism, and revivalism into North America and the theological developments and controversies that culminated in fundamentalism. Chapters Three and Four explain the onset of militant fundamentalism, the politico-religious crusade of Carl McIntire, and the influence of both on Paisley's early preaching. Chapters Five and Six follow Paisley's expansion from a militant preacher into a crusader against O'Neillism and the Northern Ireland civil rights movement. Chapters Seven, Eight, and Nine examine the Northern Ireland civil rights movement and Paisley's prominent role in creating an atmosphere that led to sectarian violence. Chapter Ten traces Paisley's transformation into an amillennial politician.

THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF "THE TROUBLES"

The Northern Ireland "Troubles" has been one of the most extensively studied conflicts in modern history. Many historians described Ulster's sectarian strife as economic class warfare and viewed the communal divide as a racial, multi-national, and ethnic conflict between two competing cultures; the religious divide was considered largely cultural, and theology therefore inconsequential.²⁸

Political historians asserted that Northern Ireland's system of pseudo-democracy drove the sectarian struggle: Northern Ireland contained two competing communities that employed their own nationalist myths for their own political aspirations. According to this theory, Paisleyism and Unionist dissent were a reaction to Terence O'Neill's policies. Only after O'Neill could not introduce meaningful reforms did the civil rights movement begin direct-action protests. When Paisley counter-demonstrated, the civil rights movement exploded into violence.²⁹

²⁸ Anders Boserup, "Contradictions and Struggles in Northern Ireland," *Socialist Register* (1972): 174; and John Darby, *Conflict in Northern Ireland: The Development of a Polarised Community* (Dublin: Gill and MacMillan Books, 1976).

²⁹ JR Archer, "The Unionist Tradition in Ireland," *Eire-Ireland* 15 (1980): 47-53; David Gordon, *The O'Neill Years: Unionist Politics, 1963-1969* (Cork: Athol Books, 1969), 7-9; and

Sociologists developed a deprivation theory: as the education of catholics increased following the Second World War, catholics better comprehended their disadvantages in relation to the protestant community and were more willing to consider violence in an attempt to end discrimination. Since the catholic middle class generally shunned radical activism until the late 1960s, it was working-class activists who led the radicalization of the civil rights movement. The protestant working class also suffered a sense of deprivation in relation to the protestant middle and upper classes. An understanding of this economic gap inspired protestant working-class extremists to form paramilitary organizations and to follow Paisley in an attempt to protect their percentage of protestant privileges.³⁰

While Marxist historians also asserted that the deprivation of the working class created the civil rights movement, they argued that the British and Northern Ireland governments manipulated the economic and social condition of the protestant and catholic working classes in order to maintain power. The British government supported the policies of the Ulster Unionist Party to benefit British capitalists. In addition, Unionist policies were designed to deter the protestant and catholic working classes from uniting and threatening the protestant ascendancy's political control of the Northern Ireland state.³¹ But as the violence expanded in the 1970s,

Arend Lijphart, "The Northern Ireland Problem: Cases, Theories, and Solutions," *British Journal of Political Science* 5 (1975): 92-94.

³⁰ Auger, 26; and Derek Birrell, "Relative Deprivation as a Factor in Conflict in Northern Ireland," *Sociological Review* 20 (1972): 321-325.

³¹ Paul Bew, Peter Gibbon, and Henry Patterson, *The State in Northern Ireland: Political Forces and Special Classes* (London: Serf, 1995); Michael Farrell, *Northern Ireland: The Orange State* (London: Pluto Press, 1976); and Liam Paor, *Divided Ulster* (Hardmonsworth: Penguin, 1970).

historians began to look at the “Troubles” as an internal conflict over political power, contradicting the core Marxist theory.³²

During the initial years of sectarian violence, scholars generally presented the conflict in secular terms. In these accounts Paisley appeared as a religious oddity and only one of numerous antagonists. Paisley had a role, but he appeared as the voice of a militant protestant fringe that simply acerbated the core tension between British imperialism and Irish catholic nationalism. In the 1980s, historians began a broader analysis of Paisley’s role. Several biographies examined Paisley’s career and tried both to explain the meaning behind his religious crusade and to assess his effect on the civil rights movement. Ed Moloney, Andy Pollak, and Patrick Marrinan argued that Paisley’s religious bigotry instigated communal violence, while Clifford Smyth took a position sympathetic to Paisley and contended that Paisley articulated the anxiety of the protestant community. Steve Bruce, a sociologist at Queen’s University in Belfast, took a more sophisticated look at Paisleyism as the legitimate voice of a substantial segment of the protestant community. Bruce argued that while Paisleyism might appear bigoted to catholics, Paisley’s religious and political outlook developed out of a sincere concern to defend Bible Protestantism and the political union between Northern Ireland and Great Britain.³³

These studies noted, but did not explain fully, Paisley’s relationship with American militant fundamentalism. For instance, Bruce briefly examined Paisley’s alliance with militant fundamentalists in America, particularly with Bob Jones University. A number of scholars,

³² ATQ Stewart, *The Narrow Ground: Aspects of Ulster, 1609-1969* (London: Faber and Faber, 1977).

³³ Steve Bruce, *No Pope of Rome!: Anti-Catholicism in Modern Scotland* (Edinburgh: Mainstream Publications, 1985) and *God Save Ulster!*; Patrick Marrinan, *Paisley: Man of Wrath* (Dublin: Anvil Books, 1973); Ed Moloney and Andy Pollak, *Paisley* (Dublin: Poolbeg Press, 1986); and Clifford Smyth, *Ian Paisley: Voice of Protestant Ulster* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, Limited, 1987).

including Dudley Owen Edwards, mentioned the Paisley – McIntire fellowship, but presented this relationship as essentially peripheral to Paisley’s activities and crusade in Northern Ireland. Only Martha Abele MacIver’s dissertation on the influence of John Knox and John Calvin on Paisley’s politics looked at the Bob Jones connection in any depth and linked Paisley and McIntire. MacIver argued that Paisley, the Jones family, and McIntire shared the same apocalyptic worldview, adhered to traditional Calvinism, and all saw the Roman Catholic Church as the enemy of Protestant freedom. F. Eugene Scott, however, illustrated that Paisley’s belligerent style followed a strategy established in the 1950s by Carl McIntire and Billy James Hargis – a combination of American revivalism, confrontation, and political evangelism. Only in the 1990s, did the focus of Paisley scholarship shift from Paisley’s religious activities in the 1950s and 1960s to his political career and leadership of the Democratic Unionist Party.³⁴

With the exception of Bruce and MacIver, historians and sociologists who studied Northern Ireland limited their sources to those available in the British Isles: government records, parliamentary debates, and local media were important sources, while interviews were a consistent source of information. In addition, Paisley’s published sermons articulated his religious views, while the manifestos of the DUP explained the party’s platform. These writers made little use of the American sources that intimately connected Paisley to American militant

³⁴ Bruce, 1989: Owen Dudley Edwards, *The Sins of Our Fathers: The Roots of Conflict in Northern Ireland* (Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1970), 44-49; Martha Abele MacIver, “Militant Protestant Political Ideology: Ian Paisley and the Reformation Tradition” (Ph.D. diss., Department of Political Studies, University of Michigan, 1984), 263; and F. Eugene Scott, “The Political Preaching Tradition in Ulster: Prelude to Paisley,” *Western Speech Communications* (Fall 1976): 249-259. See also: Martha Abele MacIver, “Ian Paisley and the Reformed Tradition,” *Political Studies* 35 (September 1987): 359-379. Paisley’s connection with McIntire and the Jones family was also briefly mentioned in Don Abbott, “Ian Paisley: Evangelism and Confrontation in Northern Ireland,” *Today’s Speech* (Fall 1973): 49-55. For additional information on Billy James Hargis and Hargis’ relationship with militant fundamentalists see pp. 86-89.

fundamentalists.³⁵ For instance, the archives of Bob Jones University, along with the publications of the International Council of Christian Churches (an international fellowship to which Paisley and the Free Presbyterian Church belonged), the *Christian Beacon* (the mouthpiece of Carl McIntire's Bible Presbyterian Church), and numerous other militant fundamentalist newspapers were largely, although not entirely, ignored.³⁶

More recent scholarship has taken a closer look at Paisley's move from a premillennial crusader into an amillennial politician. Ed Moloney expanded his earlier work with Andy Pollak to include a discussion of Paisley's deteriorating relationship with the Free Presbyterian Church in Ulster. Moloney, using privileged information about Free Presbyterian proceedings, briefly explored the reasons that Paisley compromised his earlier militancy in order to accept power sharing with Sinn Fein. Moloney did not attribute the reversal to a changed theology, but cited Paisley's egotism, his desire to join the British establishment, and a long-term political plan. While Steve Bruce and Patrick Mitchel contend that Paisley's political ascent might have compromised his theology, they do not adequately explain the connection between American militants and Paisley's militant fundamentalist crusade and political career. This dissertation makes extensive use of American sources and newly available archives, such as the Carl McIntire collection held at Princeton Theological Seminary. It uses these new sources to articulate the important role that American militant fundamentalism played in shaping Paisley's theological and political viewpoints.³⁷

³⁵ David Bloomfield, *Political Dialogue in Northern Ireland: the Brooke Initiative 1989-92* (London: MacMillan Press, 1998); and Graham Walker, *A History of the Ulster Unionist Party: Protest, Pragmatism and Pessimism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004).

³⁶ Steve Bruce and Martha MacIver were the only scholars to research the archives at Bob Jones University.

³⁷ Bruce, 2007, 163-166; Patrick Mitchel, "Unionism and the Eschatological 'Fate of Ulster,'" in *Protestant Millennialism, Evangelicalism and Irish Society, 1790-2005*, Crawford

CHAPTER 2 THE TRANSATLANTIC BACKGROUND TO FUNDAMENTALISM

When the Reverend Ian Paisley preached his first sermon to Martyr's Memorial Free Presbyterian Church his message painted an image of the long transatlantic history of Calvinism, revivalism, and Bible Protestantism. Paisley derived much of his Christian faith from the connection between British and North American culture and religiosity that began with Puritan emigration and culminated in American militant fundamentalism. Paisley's family history supplemented his theology: James Kyle Paisley, Ian's father and a preacher who espoused an anti-Catholic, anti-modernist, and anti-liberal message, pushed his son towards theological militancy. Kyle Paisley's family came from an evangelical Church of Ireland and Orange Order background and resided in a contentious area evenly divided between catholic and protestant. The family's religious and political traditions inspired Kyle to join the Ulster Volunteer Force in 1912, to adopt staunch Loyalism and Unionism, and to develop an antagonism towards the Catholic Church.³⁸

Kyle Paisley's parents' devout Protestantism influenced their son to become "saved" at age seventeen while attending a YMCA meeting. After this experience, the young man believed that he was divinely destined for the Lord's work. Kyle Paisley joined the Baptist church within months of his conversion and took to itinerant preaching until called to lead a small, independent group that met in the Omagh Orange Hall in Grangemore. His ministry quickly expanded, and he began preaching to a wide range of Ulster's Protestantism including independents, Baptists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists. Kyle Paisley's tent-meeting ministry and his willingness

Gribben and Andrew R. Holmes, eds. (Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave, 2006), 226; and Moloney, 2008, 499-516.

³⁸ Bruce, 1989, 27-30 and Ian R.K. Paisley, *My Father and Mother: A Loving Tribute by Their Younger Son* (Belfast: Martyrs Memorial Publications, 1976).

to preach to diverse, but conservative churches indicate an early path towards revivalism and non-denominationalism separatism.³⁹

In October 1918, Kyle Paisley became the pastor of a small Baptist congregation in Armagh, whose members embraced the new fundamentalist doctrine. The twelve-member church espoused Biblical infallibility and the divinity of Christ, as well as the Reformed doctrines of salvation through God's Grace and God's Covenant with the Righteous. Over the next decade, Paisley built the congregation from a dozen to fifty-four members, and his Armagh ministry served as a stepping stone. In May 1928, Kyle Paisley moved to the larger Hill Street Baptist Church in Ballymena, a city that lay in the heart of Ulster's Bible belt.⁴⁰

Like many evangelicals in Ulster, Kyle Paisley was influenced by the fundamentalism of W.P. Nicholson, introduced to Northern Ireland during Nicholson's crusades of the 1920s.⁴¹ The elder Paisley did not agree with the entire doctrine that the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland professed, and within five years he broke with them over what he saw as a tolerance for modernism. English Baptists, who were in communion with their conservative Irish brethren, were extremely active in adopting ecumenical ideas and there were concerns that the Baptist Missionary Society supported liberal missionaries. Copying Nicholson, Kyle Paisley preached a strong, uncompromising message against ecumenism and liberalism, which was not universally popular within his congregation. Not every member of his church accepted the decision to leave the Baptist Union or Kyle Paisley's attacks on several church congregants he charged with

³⁹ Moloney, 2008, 3-6.

⁴⁰ Bruce, 1989, 27-30; Moloney, 2008, 7-8; and Paisley, *My Father and Mother*. Ballymena maintains a temperate reputation for its Presbyterian churches and its devout Puritan and evangelical morality. It is no coincidence that the 1859 Ulster Revival began near the town.

⁴¹ Nicholson's ministry in Northern Ireland is discussed in Chapter Five.

immorality.⁴² One member owned the land under a pub, while another had numerous affairs with local women. Refusing to heed a demand from the Baptist Union to repudiate his accusations, Kyle Paisley led a minority into a new church, the Waveney Road Tabernacle.⁴³ The new congregation drew up a Reformed and premillennial statement of faith, adopted from the confession written by the famed nineteenth-century evangelical preacher Charles Haddon Spurgeon:

We the undersigned, banded together in fraternal union, observing with growing pain and sorrow the loosening hold of many upon the truths of Revelation, are constrained to avow our firmest belief in the verbal inspiration of all Holy Scripture as originally given. To us, the Bible does not merely contain the Word of God, but is the Word of God. From beginning to end, we accept it, believe it, and continue to preach it... We hold and maintain the truths generally known as ‘the doctrines of grace.’ The electing love of God the Father, the propitiatory and substitutionary sacrifice of His Son, Jesus Christ, regeneration by the Holy Ghost, the imputation of Christ’s righteousness, the justification of the sinner (once for all) by faith, his walk in newness of life and growth in grace by the active indwelling of the Holy Ghost, and the priestly intercession of our Lord Jesus, as also the hopeless perdition of all who reject the Saviour... Our hope is the personal pre-millennial return of the Lord Jesus in glory.⁴⁴

The new church also issued its “covenant” with God, employing the legacies of the Israelites, the Reformation, and Scottish Calvinism:

As God providentially raised up Elijah, we believe He is now calling out a faithful remnant to maintain a testimony, free from compromise against every opposition of the enemy. To maintain a Testimony, to the super nationalism of modernism, and the deception of fanaticism, and the formality of a dead and defunct orthodoxy.⁴⁵

⁴² A puritan influence can be attributed to Kyle Paisley’s Scottish-born wife, Isabella Turnbull, who was born into a Covenanter background and who despised modern things, such as cinemas and lipstick. Although raised in a Reformed Presbyterian household, Turnbull became a staunch Baptist while still a teenager. After immigrating to Northern Ireland, she occasionally preached in the Lurgan Baptist Church.

⁴³ Beggs, 5-15; Bruce, 1989, 28-30; Moloney and Pollak, 7-18; Paisley, *My Father and Mother*; and Joshua Thompson, *Century of Grace, The Baptist Union of Ireland: A Short History 1895-1995* (Belfast: Baptist Union of Ireland, 1995), 107-112.

⁴⁴ Beggs, 18.

⁴⁵ Beggs, 17.

With this declaration and covenant, the Waveney Road church committed itself to a separatist and fundamentalist path. Kyle Paisley, in turn, inspired his son to the same course, continuing the transatlantic legacy of Calvinist, revivalist, and anti-Catholic militant fundamentalism that was born during the Reformation.⁴⁶

REFORMATION AND PURITANISM

The political and theological roots of militant fundamentalism in general and fundamentalism in particular began with the ministries of Martin Luther and John Calvin, and with the English Reformation. The same can be said for Paisleyism, a debt that the Reverend Ian Paisley consistently acknowledged:⁴⁷

...the Reformers knew from personal experience that Rome turned the Pardon of God into a Profanity...⁴⁸
As Protestants, we must remember the past. What happened when Rome ruled supreme?...historians, both Roman and Reformed, call this period the 'Dark Ages.'⁴⁹

In the 1520s, Martin Luther advocated the doctrine of justification by faith alone, as Christians were saved through God's grace – salvation was a gift of God. In France and the Swiss cantons John Calvin argued for the supremacy of the church over secular authority, and the predestination of the Elect. From the Swiss Alps and the Holy Roman Empire, Protestant ideas swept into central and northern Europe. Although the culture, economics, and politics of western and central Europe in general were affected when western Christianity split into the Roman Catholic Church and the churches comprising Protestantism, the split had a unique and profound effect on Great Britain and Ireland. In the 1530s, Henry VIII established the Church of England

⁴⁶ Paisley, *My Father and Mother*, 5-7.

⁴⁷ Ian R. K. Paisley, *The Battle of the Reformation: Why It Must Be Fought Today* (Belfast: Puritan Publishing Company, Inc, 1967).

⁴⁸ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Were the Reformers Right in Separating from the Church of Rome at Reformation?," 22 October 1966.

⁴⁹ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Protestants Remember!," 16 July 1966.

and altered the religious and political outlook of Henry's three realms: England founded a church that mixed Catholic rituals, Lutheran ideals, and Episcopal authority; Scotland attached itself to a Presbyterian form of Calvinism; while Ireland divided between the Roman Catholicism of the indigenous Irish and the Anglicanism of the landed elite. The Act of Supremacy (1534) made the English king the head of the church in England, although Henry's religiosity retained the basic tenets of Catholicism. Two years later, the Irish parliament declared Henry the head of the Church of Ireland, making support for a Protestant monarchy a tenet of Irish Protestantism. Over the next six decades, English Protestantism advanced during the reign of Edward VI, turned back towards Rome under Mary Tudor, but re-confirmed its Protestant nature through the evangelical settlement of 1559 and the Latitudinarianism of Elizabeth I.⁵⁰

During the Tudor period and through the seventeenth century, a movement within the English church sought to eliminate Catholic influences, to promote a more aggressive and emotional preaching, and to reform the Anglican ministry. These people were derisively called "Puritans." A diverse group whose common bond was a devotion to Calvinism and dislike for the episcopal system, Puritans favored the Presbyterian system or independent Congregationalism - Puritans were found within the Anglican and Presbyterian churches as well as in separatist sects such as the Baptists and the Brownists.⁵¹ The movement gained influence during the reign of Edward VI when the English church adopted many Reformed practices. Although Puritans objected to the "Elizabethan Settlement," which they considered "Popery," it

⁵⁰ AG Dickens, *The English Reformation* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1965); Alan Ford, *The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590-1641* (New York: Peter Lang, 1987); and Wallace MacCaffrey, *The Shaping of the Elizabethan Regime 1558-1572* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968).

⁵¹ Prior to 1620, many of the separatists and Independents in England were known as Brownists, named after Robert Browne. Browne consistently criticized the practices of the Church of England as unscriptural and sought to form a new church. In the seventeenth century, many Brownists became Congregationalists.

was not until the early Stuart period that a minority within Puritanism became disillusioned with the English Church and chose separation over reform. Hard-line Puritans objected when James I allowed William Laud and his party to impose Arminian tenets on the church, in direct contrast to the Calvinist principle of predestination.⁵²

Puritans pursued a political agenda to assert their religious viewpoint. However, Puritan efforts to use the English parliament to promote their agenda failed, as did attempts to introduce Presbyterianism into the Church of England. Puritans also opposed the foreign policy of the Stuart dynasty: James I refused to provide military support for Protestants on the Continent and made diplomatic and marriage overtures to France and Spain. Many Puritans viewed these Stuart policies as treasonous and a sign of the End Times, which drove a wave of Puritan emigration to the Netherlands and subsequently to the American colonies. When Charles I used repression to support Laud's policies, a larger Puritan exodus took place in the 1630s.⁵³

When the first thirty-five Puritans set sail for the Virginia colony in 1620, they left the British Isles to escape religious persecution and to establish the Kingdom of Heaven on American soil. The Puritans were blown off course to Massachusetts Bay and landed at the wrong colony, where they established an intolerant theocracy that inflicted the persecution they had suffered as Dissenters in the British Isles on those colonists who dared dissent from Puritan

⁵² Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1964), 13-101; and Mark A. Noll, *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992), 32-35. See also Christopher Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (London: Allen Lane, 1993). Arminianism argues that any Christian could achieve salvation through free will, although some Arminians believe that if a Christian fell back into sin, God could withdraw grace at his pleasure.

⁵³ Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 127-134; and Thomas Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War 1621-1624* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 1-36.

teaching. The Puritans did not see the hypocrisy in the paradox. Even those few seventeenth-century thinkers who advocated religious toleration espoused only a limited acceptance of contrary beliefs, and Puritan ideals did not embrace the separation of Church and State. Out of the Puritan settlement grafted their traditions of godly covenant, reform, revivalism, and personal faith onto the trunk of colonial religious devotion. The “New England Way” combined predestination, an experiential test for sainthood, and separatism.⁵⁴

THE PLANTATION OF PRESBYTERIANISM INTO THE AMERICAN COLONIES

Beginning in the late seventeenth century, Ireland witnessed its own exodus to the American colonies. Most Irishmen who emigrated were presbyterians who left because of the laws enacted against Dissenters in Ireland and the economic restrictions that limited Irish prosperity. Irish wool had to be sold to England, while there were limitations on the export of Irish livestock. Cattle disease and crop failures in the early eighteenth century accelerated the exodus to the American colonies. Although small groups of Ulster-Scot presbyterians left for North America in the late seventeenth century, larger groups set sail in 1718.⁵⁵ Driven out by high rents, excessive tithes, Ulster’s poor harvests, and high corn costs, these emigrants were enticed by America’s free land, and the low taxes and tithes in the colonies.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Ahlstrom, 127-155; Francis J. Bremer, *The Puritan Experiment: New England Society from Bradford to Edward* (Hanover: University of New England Press, 1995), 1-47. On September 6, 1620, 102 passengers boarded the *Mayflower* in England to sail to the American colonies. Thirty-five were Puritans who had been living in Leiden, the Netherlands; the other sixty-seven emigrants were either relatives of the Puritans or non-separatists, such as Miles Standish.

⁵⁵ The term “Ulster Scot” is used in the British Isles to describe those Scottish presbyterians who, beginning in the sixteenth century, immigrated to Northern Ireland. Some of these migrants eventually left for the American colonies where in the nineteenth century – after the influx of several million Irish catholics - they adopted the moniker “Scotch-Irish.”

⁵⁶ Bardon, 1992, 175-179; and R.J. Dickson, *Ulster Emigration to Colonial America 1718-1775* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966), 1-59.

The English colonists in New England, proponents of an intolerant Puritan Congregationalism, practiced discrimination towards these impoverished Irish newcomers. Financial status played an important role in the acceptance the new Irish colonists received and the choice of destination. Those who had sufficient finances and were quickly able to establish prosperous households could settle in any colony, including New England. Most emigrants, however, paid for their passage as indentured servants, which limited their choices. The indigent found their best economic and religious opportunity in the middle colonies of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York where cheap labor was required. The Ulster presbyterians mixed well in the central region, which contained many English radicals who held an animosity towards the Church of England, the English government, and the rigidity of Puritan rule in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The political and economic discrimination and the religious persecution they had suffered in Ireland meant that the new immigrants shared this hostility towards the English government and to the established state churches. Because of their experiences in England and Massachusetts, the English presbyterians of the middle colonies welcomed the Irish influx.⁵⁷

Since presbyterians were most numerous in the middle colonies and since Philadelphia was its largest and most important city, the first colonial presbytery was formed in the city of brotherly love in 1706. Within a decade, enough churches existed so that two additional presbyteries, Long Island (New York) and New Castle (Delaware), were founded and the Synod of Philadelphia formed. But theological differences divided the young Synod. Wary of Deism, the Philadelphia presbytery demanded that its clergy publicly subscribe to the Westminster

⁵⁷ Marilyn J. Westerkamp, *The Triumph of the Laity: Scots-Irish Piety and the Great Awakening, 1625-1760* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 136-164.

Confession of Faith.⁵⁸ Some ministers, however, argued that the Confession should not rival scripture in importance and demanded that subscription be voluntary and private. To reconcile these differences, subscription to the Westminster Confession was demanded, but the manner and style left to personal conscience.⁵⁹

Despite these efforts at reconciliation and compromise, the Philadelphia Synod continued to confront divisive issues. An influx of itinerant “New Light” preachers from Ireland and Scotland called for revival. “New Lighters” still professed the Calvinist doctrine of Election, but they believed that Christians could prepare themselves for election. In addition, the itinerant New Lighters did not use the standard Presbyterian method of preaching, where consecutive Biblical verses were examined until a chapter was finished; instead they spoke as the Spirit moved them. These practices were well suited to revivalism.⁶⁰ Itinerant preachers did not seek permission from the local pastor when entering a new area, which violated denominational protocol. Wary of New Light theology and alarmed by the growth of Deism in the colonies, “Old Light” ministers in the Philadelphia Synod demanded a strict subscription to the Westminster Confession from newly ordained ministers and the preaching of traditional Reformed doctrine.

⁵⁸ The Westminster Confession of Faith, drawn up by the English parliament in alliance with Scottish covenanters, became a standard doctrine of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and of Ulster Presbyterians. The Confession professes belief in: the Trinity; the Atonement and Resurrection of Jesus; double predestination (the idea that God not only predetermines who will be saved, but who will be damned); and the argument that the Pope is the Antichrist foreseen in Revelation.

⁵⁹ Ahlstrom, 267-272; and James H. Smylie, *A Brief History of the Presbyterians* (Louisville: Geneva Press, 1996), 43-46.

⁶⁰ “Old Light” Presbyterians argued for a strict definition of God’s Grace - salvation came only to the Elect, and human effort could not affect His decision – and an uncompromising subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith.

To maintain denominational unity, the Synod agreed to another compromise: while subscription became the official policy of the Synod, enforcement was left up to the individual presbyteries.⁶¹

THE LEGACY OF THE FIRST ULSTER AWAKENING

Ulster emigrants introduced American Presbyterianism to the tradition of revivalism. As a defining characteristic of the identity of the Ulster Scot laity and because it had an impact on colonial Presbyterianism, it is necessary to look briefly at Ulster revivalism. The emotionalism inherent in a revival created a “born-again” experience or an emphasis on a personal relationship with God. Revivalism was most popular amongst the laity, but did attract some younger itinerant Presbyterian ministers. In 1625, Ulster’s first revival broke out in County Antrim at Six-Mile-Water near Belfast, when James Glendinning preached against the sinfulness of his flock. The participation of local and Scottish-born pastors was vital to the spread and success of the revival, and within eight years emotional Christianity spread across Ulster and into western Scotland. But the local Presbyterian hierarchy and the English crown opposed the Six-Mile-Water Revival. The revival ended when Charles I restricted the movement of Presbyterian preachers but it established within Ulster a tradition of revivalism and enthusiasm, as well as opposition to the church authority.⁶²

In the 1660s, itinerant preachers reappeared in western Scotland where they spoke to large outdoor gatherings. Many went to Ulster as traveling missionaries, where these “conventiclers” conducted open meetings – reintroducing revivalism - and showed an acute militancy in their

⁶¹ Peter Brooke, *Ulster Presbyterianism: The Historical Perspective 1619-1970* (New York: St. Martins Press, 1987), 93-103; R.F.G. Holmes, *Our Irish Presbyterian Heritage* (Belfast: Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1985); and Smylie, 48-56.

⁶² Westerkamp, 15-42.

public confrontations with secular authority.⁶³ Although local Presbyterian ministers and presbyteries disapproved of their methods and the Irish Presbyterian church would not adopt revivalism into church practice, the local laity supported the emotional meetings. Marilyn Westerkamp argues that the conventiclers' meetings were a continuation of the revivals that took place from 1625 through 1633. Through their confrontational style and the theology they espoused, conventiclers can be seen as the forerunners of the political preachers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, most notably Henry Cooke and Ian Paisley.⁶⁴

COLONIAL REVIVALISM

Revivalism and itinerant preaching – despite their popularity amongst the Presbyterian laity - shattered church unity in the American colonies. In the 1720s, an Irishman, William Tennett, led the New Lights and argued for a more emotional style of preaching. Tennett established a private seminary – the Log College in Neshaminy, Pennsylvania - to educate ministers willing to profess a more moral and enthusiastic ministry. Log College ministers espoused a fire-and-brimstone form of preaching, warning sinners of God's wrath and arguing that regeneration came through stages: New Lighters believed that the Holy Ghost “prepared” the Elect through revival.⁶⁵

Through their support for itinerancy, the New Lights and the Log College prepared the laity for the Great Awakenings of the 1730s and early 1740s and for the important preaching tour of

⁶³ Conventiclers held secret religious meetings, unauthorized by the Scottish General Assembly.

⁶⁴ Westerkamp, 43-73.

⁶⁵ E. Brooks Holifield, *Theology in America: Christian Thought from the Age of the Puritans to the Civil War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 92-101; and Westerkamp, 143-165. Two-and-one-half centuries later the Reverend Ian Paisley used the same emotional preaching style and scriptural authority to profess a similar argument. During one sermon, William Tennett preached from Deuteronomy 29, a book of the Bible that Paisley has employed to warn against ecumenism (*The Revivalist*, “The Armagh Manifesto,” October 1965 and “Ecumenical Evangelism,” November 1965).

the Englishman George Whitefield. Arriving in Philadelphia in November 1739, Whitefield drew large crowds and was instrumental in increasing the popularity of emotional piety amongst the laity. By the mid-1700s, lay New Light supporters in the middle colonies who supported the New Lights and revivalism became a majority, while the congregations adhering to Old Light Presbyterianism witnessed a deep decline in membership.⁶⁶

A number of differences began to differentiate the American from the Ulster church. Irish Presbyterian ministers received the *regium donum* and thus were not financially dependent on the laity, as were American ministers. Perhaps that is why American Presbyterianism officially supported revivalism and became what Marilyn Westerkamp describes as a denomination of the laity – in which the laity had as much influence on church theology and practices as the clergy.⁶⁷ But in the late eighteenth century, the most significant point of difference between Ulstermen and Americans was the question of political involvement. While Ulster Scots in America were a major driving force behind American rebellion, the same was not true in Ireland. The number of presbyterians in Ireland who supported the American revolutionaries fell as the American Revolution progressed into an alliance with Catholic France.⁶⁸ As Ireland moved towards rebellion in 1798, however, the Synod of Ulster took a stronger interest in politics. In contrast, the newly formed General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America moved towards an apolitical stance and backed the First Amendment of the American Constitution. American presbyterians supported the principles of the separation of church and state and religious tolerance; the Presbyterian Church in the United States rarely intervened in

⁶⁶ Westerkamp, 136-213.

⁶⁷ The *regium donum* was a stipend that the Irish administration paid to Presbyterian ministers.

⁶⁸ James G. Leyburn, *The Scotch-Irish: A Social History* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989).

politics. For instance, the General Assembly revised its interpretation of the Westminster Confession to fit the new United States Constitution, and civil magistrates could no longer confer with any Presbyterian authority for advice.⁶⁹

Becoming apolitical made it easier for American Presbyterianism to concentrate on religious matters such as expanding its membership, spreading the gospel, and opening new congregations during the American move westward. The constant migration and the sparse population of the new territories made it difficult for Presbyterians to provide an adequate supply of educated ministers and to build sufficient churches. This enabled rival small denominations to form many of the new congregations: Presbyterians faced a particular challenge from the rapid growth of the Methodist and Baptist churches, two organizations well-adapted to frontier expansion.⁷⁰ Methodists and Baptists attracted independents wary of organized religion and open to the revivalist argument that a conversion experience was available to all who put their faith in Jesus Christ. Facing the reality of their dwindling numbers, the Presbyterian Assembly and the Congregational Union (the descendants of New England Puritans) agreed to the Plan of Union to work together to plant new churches.⁷¹

⁶⁹ Smylie, 62-67. Gary North provides a conservative account of these events in *Crossed Fingers: How the Liberals Captured the Presbyterian Church* (Tyler TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1996), 99-115. North is the founder of the Institute for Christian Economics, an educational organization that promotes the concept of a Christian, free market economy.

⁷⁰ By 1829, the Methodist Episcopal Church had become America's largest denomination.

⁷¹ George M. Marsden, *The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience: A Case Study of Thought and Theology in Nineteenth-Century America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 6-17. Under the Plan of Union of 1801, Presbyterian and Congregational churches (outside New England) could employ both the others ministers and denominational rules, if such cooperation was necessary to establish or maintain a church on the frontier.

NINETEENTH-CENTURY REVIVALISM

The expansion westward coincided with a recurrence of revivalism, most notably the Cane Ridge Revival that began in Kentucky in August 1801. Mark Noll argues that these gatherings resembled the Scottish and Irish evangelistic gatherings of the previous two centuries, creating another transatlantic bridge. Revival fervor spread throughout the Southeast and into western New York during the 1820s. Because the movement westward was an ideal scenario for itinerant preaching, Methodists were the main proponents of camp meetings and circuit riding as a means to evangelize. The revivalism on the frontier and the American propensity for individual piety inspired new denominations in rural areas. The Disciples of Christ wanted devotion to be based on the New Testament, while the Cumberland Presbyterian Church - founded in 1810 from congregations and ministers expelled from the Kentucky Synod for revivalism - argued for a liberal form of subscription and a more Arminian conception of predestination. Cumberland Presbyterianism conformed more easily to the conditions of the frontier than traditional Presbyterians.⁷² The new sect was better able to employ the less-educated clergy of rural areas and made salvation available to a wider section of the church. Through the work of New Light ministers, however, the Presbyterian General Assembly was able to maintain a role in the evangelization of the western United States.⁷³

In the early 1800s, revivalism increased in importance and popularity, but at the same time compromising Calvinist theology. Beginning in 1824 with small meetings, Charles G. Finney's preaching sparked revivals, during which he argued that Christian had to act for salvation, contradicting the Calvinist tenet of the total depravity of humanity. Finney, a New School

⁷² The Cumberland Presbyterian Church believed in predestination, but in a form that showed God's love for all humanity.

⁷³ Noll, 167; and Smylie, 68-73.

Presbyterian, professed an emotional semi-Arminian message, where believers could hasten the Second Coming: moral business practices, slave emancipation and a just society would quicken Christ's return. Finney's theology, however, maintained a Calvinist foundation.⁷⁴

Dwight L. Moody continued Finney's revivalist legacy. Born in 1837, he moved to Chicago a year before the revival of 1857-1858 erupted at Fulton Street in New York. Moody became a well-known street preacher, opened his own Sunday school, and took part in missionary work amongst Union soldiers during the Civil War. However, it was not in the United States but in Scotland and England where Moody made his name; he became a transatlantic "prophet" during a series of revivals that began in the late 1860s. Employing innovative techniques, such as the gospel singing and the harmonium playing of Ira Sankey, and speaking to large auditoriums in a forceful, charismatic speaking style, Moody was successful because his theology, which blended the Calvinistic doctrine of election with the demand that each individual make a personal choice for Christ, appealed to middle-class British evangelicals. While Moody's fame ensured that his subsequent revivals in America were well attended, his real success came through the support he received from a wide spectrum of American denominations. Moody's revivalism helped to form a bond between the evangelicals within America's diverse churches.⁷⁵

LIBERALISM, DARWINISM, AND MODERNISM

In spite of revivalism, American Protestantism faced a challenge in the 1830s as American Presbyterianism suffered schism; the New Light - Old Light controversy reemerged into a battle

⁷⁴ Garth M. Rosell, "Charles G. Finney: His Place in the Stream of American Evangelism," *The Evangelical Tradition in America*, in Leonard I. Sweet, ed. (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1980), 131-147.

⁷⁵ James F. Findlay, Jr., *Dwight L. Moody: American Evangelist 1837-1899* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), 28-135.

pitting a liberal New School theology against the conservatism of the Old School;⁷⁶ liberal and ecumenical Christianity became a contentious issue. In 1837, Presbyterians split into two denominations after New School ministers were expelled from the General Assembly. Old School Presbyterians insisted that the Assembly employ sanctions to maintain the basic tenets of Calvinism. American Presbyterianism divided over church authority, financial support for independent missionary and educational agencies, revivalism and abolition.⁷⁷

The liberal New England theology espoused by Nathaniel Taylor - the first professor of the new Yale Divinity School - brought the divisions out into the open. New Schoolers supported Taylor's form of Pelagianism, which argued that original sin did not taint human nature; humans only committed sins when they were acts of free will. In addition, Christians could - with the help of the Holy Spirit - employ reason to find salvation, and an individual could escape damnation with a conversion experience and a sin-free lifestyle. New School revivalism harmonized well with Taylor's argument; Old School focus on divine sovereignty, the Election of the saved, and total depravity, however, clashed sharply with Taylor's theology.⁷⁸

In 1869, New and Old School Presbyterians in the North agreed to a compromise: Northern Presbyterianism reaffirmed the authority of the Westminster Confession, while accepting that New Schoolers did not have to make a public affirmation of faith. The compromise on sanctions would be important in future schisms, as it would be difficult for conservatives to enforce church

⁷⁶ New School Presbyterianism modified Calvinism to deny original sin and add the regenerating work of the Holy Ghost, with revivalism, moral reform, and interdenominational cooperation. Old School Presbyterianism retained orthodox Calvinism and a strict adherence to the Westminster Confession of Faith.

⁷⁷ The Presbyterian Church (USA) split again in 1861 over slavery and the federal union, when Southern Presbyterians formed the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. Southern Presbyterians renamed themselves the Presbyterian Church in the United States after the Civil War, while Northern Presbyterians became the Presbyterian Church in the USA.

⁷⁸ Marsden, 1970, 48-58.

doctrine. The reunited church also accepted the experiential conversion theology of the New Light. The Old School in the North and the South effectively abandoned sanctions as the means to assert church authority.⁷⁹

The influence of revivalism and evangelicalism temporarily deterred the growth of religious indifference and sects such as Deism and Unitarianism: liberal and “enthusiastic” Presbyterians were less inclined to adopt modernist ideas. But this agreement on evangelism did not prevent future splits within both the Northern and Southern denominations nor would it block indefinitely the introduction of ecumenical activity and modernist ideas. In the middle of the nineteenth century, potentially divisive issues such as inter-denominational unity, missionary work, and support for the Social Gospel were left for future generations to work out.⁸⁰

In the following decades, the United States witnessed a social transformation that was intimately connected to religious issues. Industrialization, urbanization, and immigration altered the rural and protestant culture of the United States, most dramatically with the massive immigration of Irish Catholics. Small-town Americans were alarmed by the growing urban populations and the economic and cultural power of the large cities. The rise of the city came at the same time as biblical criticism and theological modernism fragmented America’s major Protestant denominations. Theological differences thus paralleled demographic changes.

An influx of Germanic Biblical scholarship shook the foundations of Protestant denominations. Higher criticism arrived in the U.S. in the early nineteenth century, creating

⁷⁹ Samuel S. Hill, *Southern Churches in Crisis Revisited* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999), 58-79; Marsden, 1970, 199-229; and Donald G. Matthews, *Religion in the Old South* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 38-52.

⁸⁰ Richard Carwardine, *Transatlantic Revivalism: Popular Evangelicalism in Britain and America, 1790-1865* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978), 3-18; Bradley J. Longfield, *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 132-161; North, 99-147; and Smylie, 68-103.

minor controversies, but it was in the 1870s that conflict with traditionalists erupted into open battle. Protestant academics, who studied in Germany, brought home a critical evaluation of the Bible that questioned the authorship and dating of various Biblical texts and employed the historical method to reexamine the life of Jesus Christ. Higher criticism by itself, however, did not shake the traditional, evangelical beliefs of many Americans. New School revivalists had already weakened American orthodoxy as they sought to accommodate evangelical ideals with urban secularization, in an attempt to promote moral reform and interdenominational cooperation. Such ideals made defending Biblical infallibility difficult, and German-trained academics, such as Charles Briggs, found a receptive audience for the new critical methods. While these academic ideas were generally contained within Northern seminaries⁸¹ and scholarly journals, they faced intense opposition from both conservative and liberal theologians. By the end of the nineteenth century, however, the higher critical method was firmly rooted in academic theology.⁸²

The controversy over higher criticism overlapped with the upheavals associated with Darwin's theories of evolution and natural selection. Darwin's *Origin of Species* deepened the Protestant "crisis of faith" that connected the liberal Christianity of the early nineteenth century with the modernist Christianity of the late 1800s. Liberal Christians argued that human ability could build the kingdom of God on Earth and believed in interdenominational cooperation, but still respected the authority of the Bible. German Biblical criticism, which doubted scripture, and Darwinism further eroded belief in orthodox Christianity and evangelical fervor in the U.S.

⁸¹ with the exception of Princeton.

⁸² Ahlstrom, 774-779; Marsden, 1970, 241-244, and George M. Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1991), 7-36; and North 148-196.

dropped after the Civil War. Until the mid-1870s, however, Americans ignored, accommodated to Darwinism, or rejected evolution and natural selection as unproven.⁸³

Many Christians argued that Darwinism posed no threat to Christian beliefs; evolution bore witness to the divine plan for humanity. They interpreted evolution to mean improvement, and argued that through Christian action, human beings could improve both themselves and their world. Henry Ward Beecher, the brother of Harriet Beecher Stowe, is an example of a liberal preacher who argued that science and human efforts to improve morality would bring on the Kingdom of God.⁸⁴ The combination of an optimistic embrace of evolutionary theory with higher critical readings of the Bible helped produce the Social Gospel. Sydney Ahlstrom argues that the Social Gospel is a unique American contribution to Christianity, and because many liberals thought American capitalism and idleness were evil, society could be saved through human collective action. The new evangelicals attempted to dispense their message through old-fashioned preaching and with pamphlets, but found direct action such as home visitations and urban missions, more effective.⁸⁵ The concept that Christian activists from various denominations could work together to intervene in the social order came to fruition in the early twentieth century. In 1909, liberals representing America's major churches created the Federal Council of Christian Churches as an ecumenical organization to actively support the Social Gospel.⁸⁶

⁸³ Ahlstrom, 779-781; William R. Hutchinson, *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), 76-87; Edward J. Larson, *Summer of the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate Over Science and Religion* (New York: Basic Books, 1997), 11-30; James R. Moore, *The Post-Darwinian Controversies: A Study of the Protestant Struggle to Come to Terms with Darwin in Great Britain and America 1870-1990* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 346-351; and Noll, 369-373.

⁸⁴ Marsden, 1991, 17-25 and 1980, 26-29.

⁸⁵ Ahlstrom, 785-795; and Hutchinson, 165-174.

⁸⁶ Marsden, 1991, 27-32.

The dispute between conservative, liberal, and modernist Christians often centered within universities and seminaries.⁸⁷ Liberals and modernists increasingly controlled the larger theological schools, especially in the northern states. For American Presbyterianism, however, Princeton Theological Seminary became the main battlefield for the conservative – modernist conflict. At the denomination’s oldest institution, Old School academics rose to the defense of traditional Calvinism and several times charged modernist colleagues with heresy, while New Schoolers opposed “Hyper-Calvinism,” which included traditional reformed tenets such as double predestination. By the late nineteenth century, theological divisions within American seminaries caused a great uneasiness within the ranks of conservative Calvinists, who perceived that a considerable number of young clerics were turning from traditional theology.⁸⁸

DISPENSATIONAL PREMILLENNIALISM

The battle between conservative and both liberal and modernist interpretations of Christianity quickly became entangled with the question of millennialism. In Britain, conservatives responded to liberal Christianity with dispensational premillennialism, an important innovation that was exported to North America and became an important forerunner to fundamentalism.⁸⁹ Dispensationalism argues that God divided history into seven eras, or dispensations, each with a different plan of salvation. In the nineteenth century, Christianity entered the church age, or sixth era, during which Christians were to prepare for the Second Coming of Christ, the seventh and final era. Dispensationalism became popular in the United

⁸⁷ Marsden, 1970, 142-181 and 1991, 36-39.

⁸⁸ Marsden, 1970, 82-87 and 142-181; and North, 60-64. The concept of Hyper-Calvinism became important to militant fundamentalists, such as Paisley and Bob Jones Jr, as their political activities grew. Starting in the 1970s, Paisley and Jones attacked the opponents of their evangelical and political efforts as Hyper-Calvinists. This correlates with the liberals of the nineteenth century who saw their opponents as Hyper-Calvinists; to liberals, any Calvinist who opposed the Holy Ghost’s work on salvation was “Hyper.”

⁸⁹ Sandeen, ix-xix, 101-102 and 194-351.

States due to John Nelson Darby's seven missionary trips to North America and the annual Prophetic and Bible Conferences that began in 1875. Dispensationalist ideas were not new, but Darby organized them into a newer, coherent system.⁹⁰ In the 1830s, Darby helped to found the Plymouth Brethren movement in England and Ireland; the sect sought to purify the church with independent congregations, open membership, and no formal clergy. Darby's preaching and dispensationalism appealed to both Baptist and Presbyterian Calvinists, exemplifying the shared theological worldview between both groups.⁹¹

The dispensationalist movement was rooted in millennialism. Puritans, who believed that Stuart despotism, the monarchy's cavorting with Catholicism, and the Thirty Years' War, signaled the imminent return of Christ, brought millennialism to the American colonies. Stuart policies and Anglican bishops were threatening to return England to the Anti-Christ, and Puritan preachers, such as Jonathan Edwards and Cotton Mather, preached about the Second Coming. Paul Boyer argues that England's colonization of North America took place in an eschatological context. As the call for revival grew in the colonies, many Americans believed that millennialism and the experiential conversion experience were intimately connected. After the American Revolution, the connection was enthusiastically accepted on the frontier. The millennial movement was especially strong amongst Calvinists, independents, and separatists, who believed that the world was nearing the End Times. They argued that the Book of

⁹⁰ Paul Boyer, *When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy Belief in Modern American Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 87-90; and Sandeen, 59-80.

⁹¹ Nathan O. Hatch, "Millennialism and Popular Religion in the Early Republic," in *The Evangelical Tradition in America*, 113-130; Marsden, 1991, 39-44; and Timothy P. Weber, "Premillennialism and the Branches of Evangelicalism," in *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*, Donald Dayton and Robert Johnston, eds. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1991), 5-21. Weber mentions other premillennial verses: *Matthew* 24; *1 Thessalonians* 4; *2 Thessalonians* 2; and numerous from *Revelation*. Various passages in the Bible prophesied this divine plan, for example Daniel chapters 7-11, and Ezekiel chapters 37-39.

Revelation revealed that Roman Catholic tyranny, Protestant apostasy, and the ideas inspired by the Enlightenment and the French Revolution were hastening Christ's return to Earth.⁹²

After the Civil War, the millenarian movement grew, and soon became tangled in the debates over the Social Gospel, the proper interpretation of the Bible, and the compatibility of science and orthodoxy. Those Christians who adopted liberal or modernist interpretations were moving from a premillennial and Calvinistic expectation of the coming Kingdom into postmillennialism - the idea that before Christ's return, Christians would establish God's kingdom; following the Second Coming, Christians would rise to heaven. The postmillennialist theology accorded with the social and political activism of the Social Gospel. Premillennialists, in contrast, believed that Jesus would return unexpectedly to Earth and true believers would ascend to heaven, after which Christ would return to initiate the one thousand years of God's Kingdom on Earth, with a period of tribulation and a second rapture. Many revivalists and New School Presbyterians maintained a premillennial position, although postmillennialism became quite popular, dominating many Protestant seminaries. At the same time, many conservative, Old-School Presbyterians espoused amillennialism, the belief that the world was already experiencing the one thousand-year kingdom, but that this millennium was coming to an end.⁹³

In the 1880s, Moody helped found both the summer Bible conferences in Northfield, Massachusetts and the Chicago Bible Institute to train students for overseas missionary work. These conferences followed the legacy of the annual Niagara Bible Conference, most likely the first in the United States and one dominated by pre-millenarian, dispensationalist Calvinists.⁹⁴

⁹² Boyer, 56-79.

⁹³ Boyer, 90-100; Marsden, 1980, 49-54; and Sandeen, 3-132.

⁹⁴ Findlay, 339-387. The Niagara Bible Conferences were attended primarily by evangelical dispensationalists. Held annually from 1876 to 1891, the Niagara Conferences produced the Niagara Creed, a premillennial proclamation.

Moody's Bible conferences and the Chicago college helped to create a pool of pre-millenarian activists for the fundamentalist battles of the early twentieth century against modernists and proponents of the social gospel. George Marsden makes the argument that it was within these evangelical Bible conferences, Bible studies, and Bible schools that fundamentalism was nourished.⁹⁵

In the mid-nineteenth century, premillennialism gained greater acceptance amongst Protestant conservatives as the growing urbanization and anti-intellectualism prompted a more pessimistic outlook for humanity. It was this combination of theological conservatism, premillennial pessimism, and revivalist anti-intellectualism that coalesced around prophetic, Bible conferences that bred fundamentalism.⁹⁶

THE FUNDAMENTALS

The trauma and upheaval of the 1910s pushed modernism and traditional Protestantism into direct confrontation. Many Americans perceived that in urban areas, public life was growing more risqué and personal morality seemed to be on the decline. A growing fear of catholic and Jewish immigration and of communism also marked American culture.⁹⁷ Fundamentalists and conservatives blamed the intensity of the world war and German atrocities on German Biblical criticism, atheism, secularization, and social Darwinism. The trauma of the First World War reinvigorated premillennials; the war and the social and cultural changes of its aftermath seemed to be an omen of the End Times. Conservative Calvinists disliked the Christian progressives who united in an inter-denominational effort to better social conditions. Conservative

⁹⁵ Marsden, 1980, 62-63; and Sandeen, 132-136.

⁹⁶ Marsden, 1970, 190-198 and 245-249; and Sandeen, 132-136.

⁹⁷ Dale T. Knoebel, *America for the Americans: The Nativist Movement in the United States* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1996); and Richard Powers, *Not Without Honor: The History of American Anti-Communism* (New York: Free Press, 1995).

Presbyterians viewed the conflict between traditional Christianity and modernism as an attack on Presbyterian religiosity and way of life. In response, evangelicals – premillennialists, revivalists, and conservatives - united in a non-denominational effort to save orthodox Christianity. The first efforts of this coalition predated the First World War; in 1910 the first of a twelve-volume series of articles containing conservative and millenarian ideas was published and three million copies were mass-mailed throughout the United States. *The Fundamentals* shaped the basic tenets of conservative and premillennialist ideas into a coherent theological system. These basics included the affirmation of Jesus Christ’s virgin birth, divine nature, bodily resurrection and Second Coming; the doctrine of Christ’s death as blood atonement for the sin of humanity; the belief in eternal salvation through faith in the grace of God; the depravity of man; and the inerrancy and divine inspiration of scripture.⁹⁸ In 1919, William Bell Riley of the First Baptist Church, Minneapolis, Minnesota, formed the World Christian Fundamentals Association as an interdenominational, premillennial organization to fight modernism within Protestant denominations.⁹⁹

After the First World War, the new fundamentalist alliance continued its attack on modernism. Fearing the growth and influence of the fundamentalist movement, liberal clerics counter- attacked during denominational meetings and from their pulpits. Harry Emerson Fosdick summed up their concern in May 1922 when he preached his famous sermon “Shall the

⁹⁸ *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to Truth* (Los Angeles: The Bible Institute of Los Angeles, 1917).

⁹⁹ Louis Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement* (The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1963), 1-20; Larson, 11-59; and Marsden, 1980, 118-130. The World Conference on Christian Fundamentals was held in late May 1919, while William Bell Riley, the minister of the First Baptist Church in Minneapolis, Minnesota formed the World Christian Fundamentals Association (a dispensationalist-premillennialist group) the same year. The Northern Baptist Convention organized its own Fundamentalism convention in 1920 to oppose modernism within the denomination.

Fundamentalists Win?” to the First Presbyterian Church in New York City. Considered the most influential preacher in the United States during the period because of his radio broadcasts, Fosdick, a Baptist but associate pastor at the church, brought the controversy into the public arena. Fosdick argued that liberals were tolerant because they were willing to compromise as a means to reconcile the divisions between the various Protestant churches, while fundamentalists were intolerant because they maintained a rigid and old-fashioned theology. The sermon was first published within three major Christian journals, and afterwards as a pamphlet, mailed to thousands of American clergymen. Fosdick’s message resonated with the modernists of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,¹⁰⁰ who had kept a low public profile since the denomination’s heresy trials of the late nineteenth century. The publicity given to the sermon necessitated a conservative rebuttal; Clarence Edward Macartney of the Arch Street Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia fired the first shot and in “Shall Unbelief Win?” argued that liberalism was a stepping stone towards atheism.¹⁰¹

Increasingly, the fundamentalist – modernist battle became centered on evolution. William Jennings Bryan best expressed the position of conservatives and fundamentalists on evolution when he gave the James Sprunt lectures at Union Theological Seminary in Richmond, Virginia in October 1921.¹⁰² Bryan, from rural Illinois, was a populist layman, two-term Congressman, and three-time candidate for President, who came out of the Cumberland Presbyterian tradition. Bryan was not a dispensationalist premillennialist. He originally advocated the Social Gospel and belonged to the Federal Council of Churches, and tacitly accepted evolution until the devastation of the First World War changed his perspective. Bryan withdrew from the Federal

¹⁰⁰ The official name of the mainstream Northern Presbyterian church.

¹⁰¹ Longfield, 3-27 and Sandeen, 249-250.

¹⁰² This seminary not to be confused with Union Theological Seminary in New York, also a Presbyterian institution.

Council and argued that evolutionary science not only threatened Christian tenets, but also human progress. According to Edward Larson, Bryan argued that Darwinism led to the militarism that helped to cause the First World War. But what shocked Bryan and conservative Christians into action was the teaching of evolution in American universities and high schools.¹⁰³

The fundamentalist - modernist debate over evolution came to a head during the Scopes trial. The trial was important to the survival of fundamentalism and how American Protestants viewed the theological concept. Historians, however, have been divided on the trial's impact. George Marsden and Joel Carpenter have argued that the trial painted fundamentalism as an ignorant and a rural concept to many moderate Christians. Edward Larson, however, has shown that the trial did not universally discredit fundamentalism, that many moderate Christians disliked the hostile atheism of Clarence Darrow, and that only during the 1930s did the national press portray the trial as an evolutionist victory. But taken together, Marsden, Carpenter, and Larsen show that as fundamentalist fervor ebbed, the theology lost much of its moderate, conservative, and middle class support.

As the movement split between conservatives and stricter fundamentalists, fundamentalists lost a series of denominational battles with liberals and modernists.¹⁰⁴ But at the same time that fundamentalism lost the respect of seminary-educated clerics within the larger denominations, it grew in strength amongst the evangelical clerics and the laity of America's Protestant churches. Fundamentalism, in essence, became the theology of individuals and independent pastors.

¹⁰³ William Jennings Bryan, *In His Image* (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1922); Larson, 31-59; and Longfield, 54-76.

¹⁰⁴ Within the Presbyterian Church in America, fundamentalists lost the following important battles: Dr. J. Ross Stevenson's Plan of Organic Union (1920) was supported by the Assembly (Stevenson was President of Princeton Theological Seminary); seven cases against liberal ministers were voted down in the Assembly (1924); a vote against the Auburn Affirmation was not affirmed in 1925; and the Board of Foreign Missions, which supported modernist missionaries, was upheld in the 1930s.

Summer Bible conferences were organized frequently, fundamentalist radio programs flourished, and new Bible colleges were founded. For instance, after Bob Jones, Sr. opened his first college in Lynn Haven, Florida in 1927, he used the radio extensively to promote his new school. By the late 1930s, they were over four hundred evangelical radio broadcasts in the United States.¹⁰⁵

Fundamentalism not only survived within every American Protestant denomination, after the 1920s it became more dynamic and influential. Carpenter asserts that the survival of American fundamentalism can be credited to the development of two competing branches, one evangelical and inclusive and one militant and separatist.¹⁰⁶

After the embarrassing setback of the Scopes trial, fundamentalists split into three interconnected groups: conservatives, Arminians (i.e. Holiness and Pentecostal), and separatists. Conservative evangelicals attacked their brethren who professed a literal fundamentalist doctrine not based on traditional Calvinism, while those who remained within their churches took a position against others who argued for separatism. Militant separatists took the theological stance that the Bible forbade fundamentalists to have fellowship with “apostates,” and that a true Christian church must expel apostates from its membership. If expulsion proved impossible, then true Christians must separate into their own churches. It was these separatists who became militant fundamentalists during the 1930s. As separatists began to dominate militant - fundamentalist discourse, militant fundamentalism became a grassroots movement of

¹⁰⁵ Carl Douglas Abrams, *Selling the Old-Time Religion: American Fundamentalists and Mass Culture, 1920 – 1940* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2001), 11-39; and Larson, 197-246.

¹⁰⁶ Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), xii-xiii, 33-56, and 237 and “The Fundamentalist Leaven and the Rise of an Evangelical United Front,” in *The Evangelical Tradition in America*, 257-288; Marsden, 1991, 36-39; 1980, 5-24, 56-88 and 185-194; James Robinson, *Pentecostal Origins: Early Pentecostalism in Ireland in the Context of the British Isles* (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2005), 68-89; and Marsden, 1991, 36-39 and 1980, 5-25, 56-88 and 185-194.

independent churches and preachers who argued for separation and a strict premillenarian position. Decentralized organizations of like-minded militants formed in the 1930s, most notably the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec, the General Association of Regular Baptists Churches, and the Independent Fundamental Churches of America. In addition, the emergence of nationally-known fundamentalist preachers - William Bell Riley of Minnesota, J. Frank Norris of Ft. Worth, Texas, John Roach Straton of New York, and Mark Matthews of Seattle among the most important - gave the movement direction. An even more militant leadership emerged in 1937 when the Bible Presbyterian Church and the Reverend Carl McIntire began a crusade against Protestant apostasy, the Roman Catholic Church, and communism.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁷ Carpenter, 1997, 1-25 and Gaspar, 1-20. To militant fundamentalists, apostates are Christians who do not adhere to strict fundamentalist theology. The historiography on the leading fundamentalist preachers on the 1920s and 1930s is limited to their inclusion in the general accounts of the fundamentalist movement. See Carpenter, Gaspar, Marsden, and Wacker – all cited within this study. There is also: Barry Hankins, *God's Rascal: J Frank Norris and the Beginning of Southern Fundamentalism* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996), while fundamentalist universities have issued two general studies; George W. Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America* (Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University, 1973) and C. Allyn Russell, *Voices of American Fundamentalism: Seven Biographical Studies* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976).

CHAPTER 3
THE TWENTIETH-CENTURY REFORMATION:
THE GOSPEL OF MILITANT FUNDAMENTALISM

In the 1930s, the concerns of the fundamentalist community in the U.S. transcended theology and refocused on politics and social mores. Within militant fundamentalism, national and international politics and a defense of American capitalism rivaled the defense of Bible Protestantism. While communism had worried militants during the inter-war period, the onset of the Cold War created a morbid fear of the Soviet Union and the expanding ecumenical movement that militants believed appeased communism.¹⁰⁸ A coalition of Christian “patriots,” fundamentalist associations, and independent preachers led the American response. The most vocal voice that arose was that of the Reverend Carl McIntire. McIntire’s crusade began as a defense of fundamentalist Protestantism against ecumenism, Christian liberalism, and the Roman Catholic Church, but after the Second World War it took on an ideological component that was unique to North America. From the 1940s on, McIntire crusaded against what he perceived as the weakness of American foreign policy towards the Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China. McIntire also campaigned against communist infiltration of the U.S. government and military as well as Protestant churches.¹⁰⁹ To understand McIntire’s crusade, it is necessary to examine the factors that drove McIntire to split from both mainstream Presbyterianism and from

¹⁰⁸ World Conference on Faith and Order Collection, Box 1, Folder 10, University of Chicago Special Collections. After the First World War, the idea of church unity became a worldwide movement. In August 1920, the Faith and Order Preparatory Conference was held in Geneva, Switzerland and the First World Conference on Faith and Order seven years later in Lausanne. The conference, initiated by the Episcopal Church General Convention, saw eighty churches from forty nations discuss unity and ecumenism. In Ireland, Protestant clerics and academics formed the United Council of Christian Churches and Religious Communion to discuss social issues (1923) and the Irish Christian Fellowship Conference (1929) to discuss doctrine and to encourage clerics to visit and preach in the churches of other denominations.

¹⁰⁹ Marsden, 1991, 100-109.

conservative fundamentalists who had left the Presbyterian Church, and for McIntire to assert his views publicly. Accordingly, to comprehend how McIntire and American militant fundamentalism influenced Paisley's ministry, it is necessary to analyze McIntire's early career, his style of protest, and the developing relationship between both men. Through McIntire's international network, Paisley gained valuable friendships, which were important in shaping Paisley's ideas and raising Paisley's stature in the British Isles.

THE PRESBYTERIAN SCHISM

Although most American denominations experienced the fundamentalist controversy, it hit Presbyterianism the hardest. As previously mentioned, the Princeton Theological Seminary took the lead in the mid-nineteenth century in defending traditional conservative Presbyterianism, although some professors held a view on creation and Biblical inerrancy that differed from the Westminster Confession. Princeton's conservatives were influenced by James McCosh, imported from the Free Church of Scotland in 1868 to be the institution's president. McCosh brought with him Scottish common sense rationalism, which argued that science and scripture could be reconciled through reason and philosophy. But the Scotsman also saw a need to compromise with orthodox Calvinism as a means to combat Darwinism and Biblical criticism. The imported philosophy established a middle ground at Princeton in contrast to Presbyterianism's other, more liberal seminaries. To militant fundamentalists, proponents of Germanic higher biblical criticism and modernism increasingly corrupted these institutions, which were all located in the American north. The most important Presbyterian college affected was the Union Theological Seminary in Manhattan, maintained by the liberal Presbytery of New York.¹¹⁰

¹¹⁰ Livingstone and Wells, 10-30.

During the last two decades of the nineteenth century, the conflict within the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. erupted into open battles. There were a number of heresy trials, the most important being that of Dr. Charles Briggs, the Professor of Biblical Theology at Union Theological. Brought to trial in 1891 for asserting modernist concepts,¹¹¹ Briggs attacked Princetonian Old School Presbyterianism as a new version of medieval scholasticism and as a doctrine that contradicted Calvinism. Briggs published his theological ideas in three books published in the 1880s: *Biblical Study: Its Principles, Methods and History*, a history of higher criticism; *American Presbyterianism: Its Origin and Early History*, which argued against church authority (specifically the use of church authority to sanction modernists) and the concept of subscription; and *Whither? A Theological Question for Our Times*, which called for a modernist revision of Presbyterianism that accepted evolution and promoted ecumenism. Throughout his works, Briggs argued that liberals and the New Theology were the true defenders of the Bible and the Westminster Confession.¹¹² Briggs also allowed a series on higher criticism to be published in the *Presbyterian Review*, a periodical he co-edited. After Briggs outlined his views during his Inaugural Address to the Union Theological Seminary in 1891, conservatives no longer remained quiet. At the General Assembly in Detroit the same year, a vote to remove Briggs from his professorship passed. The New York Presbytery at first refused to bring Briggs to trial, but during the 1892 General Assembly conservatives forced the Presbytery to do so.

¹¹¹ These included arguing that the messianic predictions of the Old Testament were not fulfilled in the Gospels and that Moses did not write the Pentateuch - both denying the Divinity of Christ.

¹¹² New Theology redefined God's nature, morality, and credibility and argued that God manifested his presence through human history and culture.

When Briggs was suspended from the ministry during the 1893 General Assembly, Union Theological Seminary officially separated itself from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.¹¹³

Presbyterian conservatives condemned several other professors during the 1890s: Harry Preserved Smith, a professor of Old Testament at Lane Seminary, and Arthur Cushman McGiffert, the Professor of Church History at Union Theological, were tried for heresy, while James Woodrow, the uncle of future president Woodrow Wilson and teacher at Columbia Seminary in South Carolina, came under attack for teaching evolution and the compatibility of the Bible and science. All three were supported by their schools, although only Smith managed to retain his position. These cases illustrated the division between Presbyterian academics and conservative ministers within the Presbyterian Church. Because modernist professors had support within liberal presbyteries - such as the Presbyteries of New York and Augusta, Georgia - conservatives were compelled during the 1890s to make a stand against the public displays of modernism. Conservatives issued the 'Portland Deliverance' – their statement against higher criticism - and many Presbyterians who denied the literal truth of the Bible and the Confession were asked to leave the Church. Liberals and modernists were not silenced, however, and worked quietly within seminaries and church bodies to press their theological views.¹¹⁴

Liberal influence slowly gained in strength in mainstream Presbyterianism. In order to maintain denominational unity, the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. revised the Westminster Confession in 1903 to state that all infants and adults, except those who knowingly continued to

¹¹³ Hutchinson, 76-87; and North, 197-306. See: Charles, A. Briggs, *Biblical Study: Its Principles, Methods and History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883), *American Presbyterianism: Its Origin and Early History* (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885), and *Whither? A Theological Question for the Times* (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1889). The General Assembly still accepted Union Theological graduates for the ministry.

¹¹⁴ Margaret G. Harden, *A Brief History of the Bible Presbyterian Church and its Agencies* (no publication information), 12-13; Livingstone and Wells, 40-49; and North, 197-306.

commit sin, could obtain salvation. But the Presbyterian General Assembly also adopted The Five Essential Points in 1910, which confirmed the basic tenets of Fundamentalist theology¹¹⁵ and stated that officially the church retained its basic conservatism. The affirmation of the Five Essential Points contained a demand pointed at Harry Emerson Fosdick: the First Presbyterian Church in New York City was ordered to preach conservative Presbyterian theology. The Five Points, however, accommodated liberals, because it did not demand strict subscription, which inspired further liberal defiance. Modernists mounted a new attack against conservative Presbyterianism: eighty-five commissioners at the General Assembly protested the action against Fosdick, and the New York Presbytery refused to condemn him. Then in June 1923, the New York Presbytery defied the General Assembly and licensed two ministers who openly denied the doctrine of the virgin birth. Because the Assembly would not affirm denominational authority, hope for any rapprochement between liberals and conservatives was dashed. While the Five Points were reaffirmed, the election for moderator put William Jennings Bryan up against Charles F. Wishart, the President of the College of Wooster who embraced evolutionary science. Wishart narrowly won, but in a conciliatory move that aimed to maintain denominational peace, the General Assembly appointed Bryan to chair the Committee of Home Missions.¹¹⁶

To promote denominational unity and to defend liberal and modernist ministers, 149 liberal Presbyterian ministers met in upstate New York at the Auburn Seminary in December 1923, to draft a resolution denouncing the Five Essential Points as unconstitutional. *An Affirmation Designed to Safeguard the Unity and Liberty of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America* argued that while most signers held the traditional doctrine of the Church, Presbyterians

¹¹⁵ Sandeen, xviii. The Five Points constituted: Christ's virgin birth, atonement and Resurrection, the inerrancy of scripture, and Christ's ability to perform miracles.

¹¹⁶ Longfield, 54-76.

were entitled to interpret scripture in their own way. Referred to as the ‘Auburn Affirmation,’ the non-binding statement effectively voided the Five Points, allowing liberally-minded Presbyterians to consider them guidelines. The Presbyterian Church had clearly split into two factions.¹¹⁷

PRINCETON, FOREIGN MISSIONS, AND J. GRESHAM MACHEN

Conservatives and fundamentalists held mass meetings in New York and Pittsburgh to defend the fundamentalist viewpoint and attack modernism, and at first appeared successful. The 1924 General Assembly elected the conservative Clarence Macartney as moderator and Bryan as vice-moderator, and appointed conservatives to head each Assembly committee. An internal split between conservatives and fundamentalists, however, made it impossible for fundamentalists to influence the General Assembly. While conservatives wanted to maintain a mandatory belief in predestination, subscription to the Westminster Confession, and supported a literal interpretation of the Bible, they did not want a schism and would not acquiesce to the outright condemnation of Presbyterian modernists. Hence, no action was taken against either the Auburn Affirmation or the New York Presbytery. Although a conservative was again elected moderator in 1925, moderate conservatives backed down from a threat to separate from the General Assembly when liberals and modernists threatened to leave the denomination. According to Joel Carpenter, it was hard for fundamentalists to oppose modernism within Presbyterianism, because of the church’s tradition of loose discipline, the denomination’s history of tolerating opposing ideas, and the wavering support from many conservatives. Consequently, conservatives and fundamentalists lost control of the Assembly. At the 1927 General Assembly,

¹¹⁷ Longfield, 77-103.

the Five Essential Points were declared non-binding, and the Assembly revoked its right to hear heresy trials, eliminating the use of sanctions to enforce orthodoxy.¹¹⁸

Two years later, liberal theologians took over the direction of the Princeton Theological Seminary. Princeton had been administered through two boards, one answerable to the Assembly and one made up of independent trustees who controlled the seminary's property. But in 1929, the school's administration was reorganized, so that the seminary would have a single Assembly-appointed board. Not all Princetonian academics accepted the change. J. Gresham Machen, a professor of the New Testament at the Seminary, took up the conservative counter-attack, uniting with Presbyterian fundamentalists. Over the previous half century, Princeton's faculty had been slowly splitting between Old School conservatives, such as Machen, who wanted to teach only orthodox theology, and those who were more tolerant in their Christianity. Machen was not a strict fundamentalist, but a theological conservative who believed that traditional Calvinism could redeem modern culture. He also believed that the battle against modernism was an academic struggle within seminaries and universities. Machen initially asserted that fundamentalist piety was an Arminian threat to the Westminster Confession, but in *Christianity and Liberalism*, Machen allied with fundamentalism against liberals and modernists. Machen argued that modernism was not Christianity, but a new religion. In June 1929, upset that two members of the new Princeton board had signed the Auburn Affirmation and were not disciplined, Machen and three other faculty members resigned from the Princeton Seminary. The following fall, Machen formed the Westminster Theological Seminary, with the help of twenty-nine current and former students. The new institution, however, placed itself under the

¹¹⁸ Carpenter, 1997, 33-56; and Longfield, 77-124.

Presbytery of Philadelphia, one of Presbyterianism's most conservative, and Westminster remained within the Presbyterian Church.¹¹⁹

Machen also began an attack against modernist foreign missionaries, particularly singling out those working in China. In 1927, eight presbyteries of the Presbyterian Church in China had united with Congregationalists, Methodists and Baptists to form the Church of Christ in China. The new church allowed its missionaries to promote Buddhist and Confucian principles as a means to better explain Christian tenets to the Chinese, a measure that Dr. Robert E. Speer, the senior secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions and the Moderator of the General Assembly, supported. In 1933, Machen sponsored an overture to the Assembly attacking the 'Layman's Inquiry,' an inter-denominational report arguing for new missionary churches based on this syncretic approach. Speer refused to condemn the report. When the overture was defeated, in June 1933 Machen helped found and was elected president of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions (IBPFM).¹²⁰ Independent of the Presbyterian Church, the new mission board supported conservative and fundamentalist missionaries and solicited funds within Presbyterian churches. The 1934 General Assembly declared that the Independent Board was contrary to Presbyterian principles and charged that those who remained on its board violated their ordination and membership vows. After he refused to repudiate the IBFM, Machen was brought to trial by the judicial commission of the New Brunswick Presbytery. Convicted of insubordination and violating church peace, the General Assembly suspended him from the

¹¹⁹ Harden, 19-22; and North, 620-642.

¹²⁰ *Independent Bulletin Board*, "Sham Orthodoxy Versus Real Orthodoxy," February 1935 and "Why I Applied to the Independent Board," June 1935.

ministry. After Machen helped to establish the Presbyterian Church of America in June 1936, the Assembly denied his appeal.¹²¹

Throughout the controversy, Presbyterian fundamentalists backed the conservative leader. Of all his supporters, the most important was Carl McIntire, one of the students who followed Machen into the Westminster Seminary. The young cleric adamantly supported Machen on his stance against modernism amongst missionaries. For instance, McIntire presented an Overture to the Presbytery of West Jersey against modernist foreign missionaries, and issued an extensive pamphlet that attacked Dr. Robert Speer and detailed the extent of modernism amongst Asian missionaries. Ordained by the General Assembly, McIntire became the pastor of the Collingswood (New Jersey) Presbyterian Church after a brief stint in Atlantic City. Elected to the Independent Board for Presbyterian Missions in April 1934, McIntire became the board's most vocal advocate, despite remaining a minister and commissioner to the Assembly's own mission board.¹²² McIntire induced the Woman's Missionary Society of his Collingswood congregation to question the modernism within the Assembly's Board of Foreign Missions. According to McIntire, the Board's Women's Committee recommended Arian pamphlets that questioned the Divinity of Christ and argued that since Jesus loved human life, he had been reluctant to ascend to heaven. The Board of Foreign Missions denied it had approved the

¹²¹ Gary K. Clabaugh, *Thunder on the Right: The Protestant Fundamentalists* (Chicago: Nelson-Hall Company, no publication date), 69-85; *Digest of Acts and Deliverances of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*; and John Albert Stroman, *The American Council of Christian Churches: A Study of Its Origin, Leaders, and Characteristic Positions* (Ph.D. diss., Boston University School of Theology, 1966), 70-92. Machen's trial and the founding of the Presbyterian Church of America were well covered by the media. Several *New York Times* articles are: "Dr. Machen Agrees to Attend His Trial," 9 February 1935, "New Jersey Synod Gets Machen Case," 22 October 1935, "Dr. Machen Ousted By Presbyterians," 2 June 1936, "Presbytery Bans 2 Jersey Pastors," and 17 June 1936.

¹²² Carl McIntire, *Dr. Robert Speer, the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and Modernism* (Collingswood, NJ: no publication information, 1935).

pamphlets, but McIntire argued that the Board was responsible for the work and for the theological position of its subcommittees.¹²³

The Presbytery of West Jersey suspended McIntire in June 1936 for making abusive speeches against opponents and charged him with failure to maintain denominational peace, violation of ordination vows, and for insubordination. Two years later, a Presbyterian court of appeals withdrew McIntire's credentials as a minister, the only Presbyterian minister during this period to suffer this fate. In response, the congregation of the Collingswood Presbyterian Church voted overwhelmingly to withdraw from the General Assembly.¹²⁴

SCHISM WITHIN SCHISM

Within a week, the Collingswood Church, along with Machen, J. Oliver Buswell, the president of Wheaton College in Illinois,¹²⁵ and a group of fundamentalist Presbyterian ministers formed the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA) at Syracuse, New York. Machen and his conservatives and fundamentalist allies officially separated from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. A week later, the new Knox Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia became the first of many fundamentalist congregations to join the new church, and within another two months, nine presbyteries were established across the United States.¹²⁶

¹²³ Clabaugh, 69-85; North, 727-746; and Stroman, 70-92.

¹²⁴ Harden, 34-37.

¹²⁵ The Presbyterian Synod of Chicago put Buswell on trial ordered him to stop working with the Independent Board of Foreign Missions.

¹²⁶ *Christian Beacon*, "Found Guilty," 5 March 1936; Harden, 26-32; and Carl McIntire, *Dr. Robert E. Speer, the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and Modernism, prepared by the Reverend Carl McIntire* (Collingswood, NJ: no publication information, 1935). *New York Times* articles covering this controversy: "Three Fundamentalists Barred From Seats," 28 May 1935, "M'Intyre Jury Quits," 16 June 1935, "Clergyman Admits 'Violent' Speeches," 31 July 1935, "Presbytery Votes M'Intire's Ouster," 11 September 1935, "M'Intire Church Quits Presbytery," 16 June 1936, and "3 Pastors Ousted By Presbyterians, 1 July 1936."

The harmonious relationship between Machen and McIntire did not last long. The two allies disagreed over theology, church independence, and issues of personal morality. Machen was an Old School conservative and not committed to premillennialism. Machen staffed the Westminster Theological Seminary with professors who adhered to the original Westminster Confession of Faith and professed amillennialism, Machen's position on the Second Coming.¹²⁷ Machen also did not believe in dispensationalism or supported the Scofield Reference Bible based on that theology. McIntire, in contrast, accepted the more Arminian Confession as amended by the General Assembly in 1903 and ardently embraced the Scofield Bible and premillennialism. He also took exception to Machen's leniency on moral issues: Machen would not dismiss Westminster students and faculty who smoked, danced or drank, nor would the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America condemn the same behavior. It was Machen's view on separation, however, that drove the wedge between him and McIntire. Although Machen did not have communion with modernists who denied the Trinity or the authority of scripture, he did not believe in a complete separation from Christians who were not strict fundamentalists.¹²⁸

The division of the Presbyterian Church in America between Machen's Old School Presbyterianism and McIntire's militant fundamentalism played out in the struggle for control of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and for appointments to the

¹²⁷ Amillennialism argues that the Millennial Kingdom has existed since the birth of Christ and will continue until the Second Coming. During this final age, earth and Heaven would unite in God's one Kingdom. Amillennials believe – as do premillennialists – that apostasy on Earth is increasing. Amillennialists cite 2 Peter 3:10-14, as one example to argue their interpretation of the End Times.

¹²⁸ D.G. Hart and John Muether, *Fighting the Good Fight: A Brief History of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church* (Philadelphia: Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1995), 41-51; and *50 Years...Carl McIntire and the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood 1933-1983* (Collingswood, NJ: The Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood, New Jersey, 1983).

Westminster Theological Seminary. Machen insisted that the new seminary officially support the IBPFM, a move that violated the independence of the missionary agency. But McIntire, who wanted the Board to retain its independent authority, won the battle. In the fall of 1936, fundamentalists took control of the Mission Board and ousted Machen from its presidency.¹²⁹

Machen died on January 1, 1937, but his death did not heal the fundamentalist – conservative division. After the PCA declined to elect the militant fundamentalist candidate, the Reverend Milo Fisher Jamison, as moderator in June 1937, McIntire and his congregation withdrew from the new denomination. Fourteen Presbyterian Church in America ministers followed, while the remaining members regrouped as the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. McIntire’s group met in Philadelphia to found the Bible Presbyterian Synod and set up its own seminary, Faith Theological.¹³⁰ McIntire’s confrontation with Machen showed that he was willing to confront not only the modernism within mainstream Presbyterianism, but also conservatives and fundamentalists who did not follow his moral viewpoints or separatism. Because of his actions, McIntire’s reputation as a militant maverick grew and militant fundamentalism had a self-professed martyr.¹³¹

SEPARATION: THE BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

On January 1, 1938 - when Paisley was barely ten years old - McIntire was ready to spread his separatist gospel to the Christian masses in America. With the formation of the Bible Presbyterian Church, McIntire obtained a safe pulpit to preach his brand of theology, and with the organization of Faith Theological Seminary he created a base to train like-minded ministers

¹²⁹ North, 727-746.

¹³⁰ Hart and Muether, 41-51.

¹³¹ Carpenter, 33-56; Clabaugh, 69-85; Harden, 61; and Sandeen, 250-260. McIntire argued that he was a “martyr” because of his legal and theological battles with the Presbyterian Church in America.

and missionaries. In addition, McIntire put into place the tools necessary to take advantage of mass media. In 1936, he started the *Christian Beacon*, an eight-page weekly containing articles outlining the theological, political and cultural viewpoints of the Bible Presbyterians. The small newspaper also included articles from the American and international press critical of McIntire's ministry and his church, but these were included to support his martyrdom. Shortly thereafter, McIntire founded the Christian Beacon Press to publish his writings and took to the airwaves on WPEN, a Philadelphia radio station.¹³²

Although the use of the news media and radio marked the beginning of McIntire's nationwide crusade against modernism, McIntire needed to gain control over his own church property. He served a church to which the mainstream denomination had legal title. After his suspension from the Presbyterian Church in July 1936, McIntire still remained in his ministerial position. Under Presbyterian rules a congregation selects and dismisses the minister that they want to serve their church.¹³³ Having been so elected and never removed by his flock and viewing McIntire's suspension as illegal, McIntire remained as the pastor of the Collingswood church – despite having joined the Presbyterian Church in America and the Bible Presbyterian Synod. Preaching out of the Collingswood Presbyterian Church gave McIntire a pulpit and a congregation, but the Presbyterian Church in the United States still owned the actual church building and the land on which it stood.¹³⁴

¹³² *New York Times*: “Foreign Missions Cause New Revolt;” 3 June 1937, “Rev Carl McIntire Is Ousted by Court;” 19 March 1938; Abrams, 11-39; Clabaugh, 74-75; and Stroman, 110. Within the *Christian Beacon*, articles that were critical of McIntire were always refuted by pro-McIntire pieces, editorials and letters, and were included to illustrate the threat to militant fundamentalism.

¹³³ *Book of Order: The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A)* (Louisville, KY: General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (USA), 1936). The selection and dismissal process, however, is conducted under the guidance of the local presbytery and regional synod.

¹³⁴ *New York Times*, “Quit New Church to Form Another,” 5 June 1937.

To remove McIntire, the Presbyterian Assembly chose to work from within his church. Immediately after his suspension, five dissident members filed a court action asking for McIntire's removal and for the church's property to revert back to the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The Bible Presbyterians answered the suit and countered that the real issue was an attack on their militant fundamentalist theology and McIntire's leadership, not property rights. They also argued that the congregation itself owned the church property. The court disagreed and ordered McIntire to vacate the church. McIntire appealed and remained as Collingswood's minister for two more years while the case dragged through the appeals process. When the court issued a final decision in March 1938, one thousand supporters of McIntire witnessed as the presiding judge gave McIntire two weeks to leave his pulpit. Supported by the overwhelming majority of his congregation, McIntire began preaching several blocks away in a tent until a newer, bigger structure was built.¹³⁵

In a style that other militant fundamentalists and Ian Paisley would emulate, McIntire used the legal trouble to further his ministry. McIntire made sure his eviction made national news. The Sunday after he left Collingswood Presbyterian for the final time, McIntire publicized his tent preaching to a small contingent of newspapermen. The service, which also served as a groundbreaking ceremony for a new church, drew 1,200 worshippers, in contrast to the attendance in his former church, where 200 heard Dr. Frederick W. Loetcher of Princeton Theological Seminary lead a subdued meeting. A short time later, and to great personal fanfare

¹³⁵ *New York Times*, "Bars Writ to Oust 'Deposed' Pastor," 7 July 1936, and "Rev. Carl M'Intire is Ousted by Court," 19 March 1938; and Morris McDonald, *A Brief History of the Bible Presbyterian Church* (Charlotte, NC: Fundamental Presbyterian Publications, 2003), 18-20.

and substantial press coverage, McIntire and his congregation moved into the new Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood, New Jersey.¹³⁶

THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES

From this humble beginning McIntire was now a substantial figure within the American militant fundamentalist community and the head of his own denomination. With a secure operating base, McIntire focused on the core issue of his crusade: modernism within the Presbyterian Church and the ecumenical organizations that supported the despised theology. McIntire chose as his first targets the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America (FCC) and an associated group, the World Council of Churches, an organization whose existence was still in the discussion stage.¹³⁷ The FCC wanted to spread its message throughout the world, although the impending crisis against fascism in Europe and Asia and the expectation of war made it difficult to advance plans for an alternate organ. Militant fundamentalists intensely disliked the Federal Council, which was founded to propagate the social gospel and to promote ecumenism. Equally galling was the Federal Council's control over the religious broadcasting that major networks provided free of charge to Protestant, Catholic and Jewish groups; the FCC had demanded and won the right to represent all protestant denominations on the airwaves. Conservative and militant fundamentalists argued that this was unfair and that the Federal Council only represented the liberal and modernist viewpoints, not the entire spectrum of

¹³⁶ *New York Times*, "Ousted From Church, 1,200 Meet in a Tent," 4 April 1938.

¹³⁷ Following on the ecumenical principles of the World Conferences on Faith and Order were two monumental events in the ecumenical movement: the establishment of the World Council of Churches in Geneva in 1938 and the Church of South India in September 1947. For ten years the World Council of Churches (WCC) was just a forum to exchange ideas, but this changed after its first assembly met in Geneva in 1948. The Church of South India united the Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, Congregationalist and Dutch Reformed Churches in India, Burma, and Ceylon in order to consolidate missionary activities and combine congregations. To militant fundamentalists, the new ecumenical, inter-denominational church preached a liberal and modernist theology.

Protestantism. To militants, the Federal Council of Churches' broadcast monopoly demonstrated rising liberal and modernist influence within Protestant churches and within the American government.¹³⁸

McIntire and his militant fundamentalist allies within the Bible Presbyterian Church, Westminster Theological Seminary, and the Independent Board for Foreign Missions decided to form their own organization to counter the plans of Federal Council. During a September 1941, meeting at the National Bible Institute in New York, a small group of independent fundamentalists joined McIntire and the Bible Protestants to form the American Council of Christian Churches (ACCC), and elected McIntire as the first president. The organization sought to advance a four-point agenda: to proclaim what they considered to be proper Christian theology and Biblical separatism; to attack modernism; to expose communist influence within protestant churches; and to form a fellowship for Christian churches "true" to Biblical Protestantism.¹³⁹ The new separatist council did not expand quickly; initially only the Bible Protestant Church of nearby Camden, New Jersey joined the new organization. The Bible Protestant Church - originally a small Methodist Protestant denomination - was separatist, having split from the Eastern Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church in 1939 when the Conference proposed to unite with the Methodist Episcopal Church, the forerunner of today's United Methodist Church. To McIntire, however, the addition of Methodist fundamentalists was important. Methodism was America's largest Protestant denomination - and therefore, next to American Presbyterianism, the nation's most apostate group.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁸ Erling Jorstad, *The Politics of Doomsday: Fundamentalists of the Far Right* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970), 34-59; and McIntire, *The Testimony of Separation*, 1-6.

¹³⁹ Clabaugh, 79-82; and McIntire, *The Testimony of Separation*, 7-20.

¹⁴⁰ Stroman, 110-133.

The combination of Wesleyan and Calvinist churches made the Council an organization that was theologically more diverse than Bible Presbyterianism and the Faith Theological Seminary. While the ACCC sought new members, its membership criteria restricted its expansion. It did not allow denominations to join that belonged to the Federal Council of Churches, although independent congregations and individuals within these churches could join if they publicly repudiated the Federal Council.¹⁴¹ The small independent churches and the heads of several Bible colleges that joined the new group included five important fundamentalists - the presidents of Shelton College, the Moody Bible Institute, and the Philadelphia School of the Bible, J. Oliver Buswell, Dr. William Houghton, and Reverend J. Davis Adams respectively – as well as the pastor of St. Paul’s Lutheran Church in Camden, New Jersey, and a member of the New York State Gideons.¹⁴² The sponsoring committee for the new organization included Bob Jones, Sr., the founder of Bob Jones College. The council provided important publicity for McIntire, enabling him to attract new converts to his separatist network.¹⁴³ In the early 1950s, the

¹⁴¹ A corresponding group, the National Association of Evangelicals (made up of evangelicals, conservatives, and fundamentalists) formed in St. Louis, Missouri in April 1942. McIntire refused to join the new organization. A philosophical approach to fundamentalism split the NAE and the American Council of Christian Churches: the denominations and independent churches belonging to the National Association of Evangelicals could retain membership in “apostate” organizations such as the federal Council of Churches, while ACCC members could not. The difference created an irreversible split in the fundamentalist movement (Carpenter, 1980, 257-288).

¹⁴² J. Oliver Buswell left Wheaton College in 1940 and became President of Shelton College until expelled in 1956 for opposing McIntire’s leadership. Buswell joined the dissident Columbus (Ohio) Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church.

¹⁴³ Bob Jones, Sr. and supporters within his school – reopened October 1, 1947 in Greenville, South Carolina as a university – were relatively late converts to militant fundamentalists. Although Jones broke with the Methodist church in the mid-1930s and joined the ACCC in the 1940s, he also was an early member of the National Association of Evangelicals, believing that the evangelical group could bring revival to the United States. But in 1951, several factors caused Jones to split with the NAE: the evangelical group’s expansion into the social gospel and the NAE’s refusal to hold a convention in Greenville. Denouncing social activism and new evangelicalism, Bob Jones University became a militant fundamentalist

American Council remained small, but accepted the membership of thirteen denominations and organizations, the two most notable being fundamentalist Baptists: Thomas Todhunter (T.T.) Shields¹⁴⁴ and the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec, and the Independent Bible Baptist Missions, organized by Harvey H. Springer of Colorado Baptist. The strict separation espoused by the new council limited its size: To separatists, it was more important to maintain a small and separate, but correct, fundamentalist fellowship of those they considered God's Elect.¹⁴⁵

THE COLD WAR

To McIntire, his separatist movement needed a recognizable moniker, and accordingly the Bible Presbyterians promoted their crusade as the "Twentieth Century Reformation Movement." To articulate his ideas, the Beacon Press published McIntire's *Twentieth Century Reformation* in 1944, which argued that militant fundamentalism was the best defense for the American version of free government and capitalism. Two years later, in *Author of Liberty*, McIntire blamed the

institution by the late 1950s (Mark Taylor Dalhouse, "Bob Jones University and the Shaping of Twentieth-Century Separatism 1926-1990" (Ph.D. diss., Miami University, Oxford, OH, 1991); R.K. Johnson, *Builder of Bridges: The Biography of Dr. Bob Jones, Jr.* (Murfreesboro, TN: Sword of the Lord, 1969); and Daniel L. Turner, *Standing Without Apology: The History of Bob Jones University* (Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1992).

¹⁴⁴ T.T. Shields' relationship with McIntire is briefly examined within this chapter. Shields, born in England, became a Baptist minister in 1894 and the pastor of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church in Toronto, Canada, in 1910. In 1915, Shields visited England to preach in Spurgeon's Tabernacle. In England, Shields made a name for himself after he charged that Roman Catholics in Quebec were hindering Canada's efforts in World War One. Shields turned the Jarvis Street church into a bastion for militant fundamentalism, inviting such notables as J. Frank Norris to preach, and opening the Toronto Baptist Seminary for fundamentalist Baptists. From this pulpit, Shields opposed modernism and the ecumenical movement, but also premillennial dispensationalism. Shields' notoriety made him a popular speaker in North America, the British Isles, and in Australia. It is through this fame and through Shields' news paper, *The Gospel Witness* that Irishmen such as Kyle Paisley came in contact with the Canadian fundamentalist – a subject explored on pp. 120-122 (Leslie K. Tarr, *Shields of Canada: T.T. Shields (1873-1955)* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1967).

¹⁴⁵ Stroman, 111-154. Stroman provides a good, detailed look at the early members of the American Council of Christina Churches.

onset of the Cold War and the threat of communism on both America's failure to maintain true Christianity and the "totalitarianism" of the Roman Catholic Church. McIntire attacked what he saw as the socialist trend within the federal government, and the leftist and liberal attack on America's Protestant heritage. He viewed the progressive income tax, the Fair Employment Practices Code, and closed trade shops not only as threats to Christian liberty and devotion – because they deprived the individual of responsibility and self-esteem - but also as incitements to class and racial hatred, because they created envy.¹⁴⁶

During the second half of the 1940s, as the Cold War polarized the world, a corresponding theological divide developed within American and European churches, with modernists and militant fundamentalists on opposing poles and conservative Christians attempting to mediate the differences. The multiple threats of ecumenism, modernism and communism on the one hand, and acquiescence from conservatives on the other hand, appeared to militant fundamentalists as elements within a single conspiracy. To militants, the same battle played itself out within American foreign and domestic policies, as well as American Protestantism. McIntire perceived communism to be infiltrating both the American government and America's churches. For instance, in October 1946, McIntire attacked the Federal Council of Churches for its criticism of America's contentious foreign policy towards the Soviet Union. The FCC had declared American policy intolerant and "contrary to the basic principles of the Christian faith." To McIntire, the FCC's actions amounted to political and theological treason. Thus, the divide

¹⁴⁶ Clabaugh, 69-85; Arnold Foster and Benjamin R. Epstein, *Danger on the Right* (New York: Random House, 1964), 100-115; and Carl McIntire, *The Twentieth Century Reformation* (Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1944) and *Author of Liberty* (Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1946).

separating McIntire's militant fundamentalism from both conservative and liberal Christians had political and economic implications as well as theological connotations.¹⁴⁷

The dual threats of the Cold War and Christian modernism enabled McIntire to rally a network of militant fundamentalists and secular Christian "patriots" to his Twentieth Century Reformation. To press McIntire's position, the American Council passed a resolution at its seventh annual convention in October 1948, calling for a showdown with the Soviets. The ACCC asserted that because the United States alone had the nuclear bomb, America must launch a first strike before the Soviet Union developed its own. McIntire declared: "It is a betrayal of Christian principles and common decency for us to sit up and permit such a revolutionary force to gain advantage for the enslavement of the world."¹⁴⁸ McIntire called for war with the Soviets: "We call upon the representatives of the freedom-loving nations for a complete and frank showdown with Russia."¹⁴⁹ McIntire's statement, couched in premillennial rhetoric, constituted an appeal to the U.S. government to hasten the Battle of Armageddon. To McIntire, his message foreshadowed the events outlined in the Book of Revelation.¹⁵⁰

McIntire and the American Council of Christian Churches also attacked the appointment in 1948 of John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State. The American Council argued that Dulles was a Soviet appeaser and an adherent to the social gospel - in other words a communist sympathizer and a socialist - and a supporter of both the Federal and World Council of Churches. Militants

¹⁴⁷ Jorstad, 34-37; Marsden, 1987, 69-82; and McIntire, *The Testimony of Separation*, 1-6.

¹⁴⁸ *New York Times*, "Churches Demand Test With Russia," 29 October 1948.

¹⁴⁹ *New York Times*, "Churches Demand Test With Russia," 29 October 1948. McIntire and the ACCC further asserted: "For us to have the atomic bomb, and in the name of false morality born of a perverted sense of self-respect and pacifist propaganda, to await the hour when Russia has her bombs to precipitate an atomic war, is the height of insanity and will, when the fateful hour comes, be a just punishment upon us." The American Council of Christian Churches connected the betrayal of Christian principles such as appeasement permitted, with Satan's strategy to penetrate Christian churches with modernism.

¹⁵⁰ *New York Times*, "Church Group Backs Use of Atomic Bomb," 6 December 1950.

were outraged that Dulles, a Presbyterian elder, had been defense council for Harry Emerson Fosdick in 1924, and vice president of the International Affairs Commission of the newly formed World Council of Churches.¹⁵¹

Two years later, McIntire and the ACCC also attacked the appointment of an American ambassador to the Vatican. When President Harry S. Truman nominated General Mark W. Clark for the post, McIntire charged that it was a betrayal of America's protestant heritage. It did not matter that Franklin Delano Roosevelt had already broken tradition and appointed a special representative to the Vatican in the 1940s. Truman withdrew Clark's nomination, but only partly due to the militant fundamentalist opposition. A wide spectrum of moderate and liberal protestant opinion, including the Federal Council of Churches, the National Association of Evangelicals, and smaller organizations such as Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State and the National Sunday School Association also argued against the move. To all concerned, Truman's decision violated the American tradition of separation of church and state; the U. S. government should not have diplomatic ties with any church, especially the Roman Catholic Church.¹⁵²

The campaign against the ambassador to the Vatican involved both moderate and militant fundamentalists. However, they campaigned in two different ways: the moderate National Association of Evangelicals called for associated churches to hold a vigil against the appointment, while the militant American Council sent McIntire and the Reverend Harvey Springer and approximately five hundred clergymen to Washington, D.C., with a 50,000

¹⁵¹ *New York Times*, "Dulles Attacked by Church Council," 30 October 1948, "Bible Body Lashes at World Council," 21 August 1948; and *The (Philadelphia) Evening Bulletin*, "Churchmen Differ on Russian Policy," 25 October 1946.

¹⁵² *New York Times*, "Protestants Join in Assailing Step," 21 October 1951, and "Clark Says Post is Up to Congress," 25 October 1951.

signature petition. During the accompanying protest, which blocked the entrance to a Senate foreign Relations Committee hearing, McIntire restated the perceived connection between communism and Catholicism when he declared: “Communism is an enemy, we are all against, but we have another enemy too, older, shrewder. It is Roman Catholicism and its bid for world power. In the United States it is Spellmanism [referring to the New York Cardinal].”¹⁵³

THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES

When the World Council of Churches (WCC) finally formed in Amsterdam in September 1948, McIntire and his militant fundamentalist allies preempted the move. Once again, McIntire was one step ahead of the modernists. The week before, McIntire formed his own global organization, the International Council of Christian Churches (ICCC). Its purpose was to promote a world-wide fellowship of militant fundamentalist churches to attack the Roman Catholic Church and to denounce the WCC as a front for socialism and church unification. According to McIntire, the World Council aimed to unite all Protestant churches under the auspices of Rome and to promote socialist policies internationally. The founding members of the ICCC illustrated its international appeal: they included McIntire (as president), the Canadian T.T. Shields, J.J. van der Schuit, a theological professor from the Netherlands, and the Reverend Chia Yu Ming, the moderator of the Presbyterian Church of Christ in China (Nanking).¹⁵⁴

McIntire and the ICCC found much to attack in the World Council. The WCC published one report condemning the excesses of both communism and capitalism as incompatible with Christianity, and another promoting the United Nations as an avenue for world peace. The International Council viewed the WCC reports as endorsements for socialism, for a one-world

¹⁵³ *New York Times*, “500 Clergymen Rally in Capital to Protest Any Envoy to Vatican,” 25 January 1952; and Gaspar, 55-75.

¹⁵⁴ *New York Times*, “Church Council Accused: Head of Second Group Says Other Body is Front For Socialism,” 7 September 1948; and Stroman, 215.

government and for a united church under Roman Catholic leadership. To the ICCC, all three were omens of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. It might seem contradictory that the ICCC would fight against organizations that they believe were hastening the Second Coming. But a vital component of premillennial eschatology requires “true” Christians to expose apostasy and the work of the Devil on Earth, all the while eagerly awaiting the return of Christ.¹⁵⁵

The next target for McIntire and the American Council was the National Council of Churches of Christ in America (NCC), which was formed in Cleveland, Ohio, on December 1, 1950 by the Federal Council of Churches, twenty-five protestant churches, and four Eastern Orthodox denominations. Like the Federal Council, the stated goal of the NCC was to further the social gospel and to promote ecumenism. McIntire and his allies not only picketed the founding convention, McIntire attended with a press pass. The militant was proud when Charles P. Taft of the National Lay Committee denounced him from the stage; far from being offended, McIntire saw the resulting notoriety as vindication for his anti-ecumenical and anti-communist campaigns and further proof of his “martyrdom.” Within *Christian Beacon* articles, McIntire boasted of the dislike modernists showed him, while also attacking the National Council’s modernism, pacifism, and socialist leanings.¹⁵⁶

What galled McIntire and the militant fundamentalists the most, however, was the new Bible that the National Council sponsored and published in 1952. The Revised Standard Version was the result of fifteen years of work by thirty-two liberal, modernist, and orthodox Biblical scholars and was intended to modernize the language of the King James Version and clarify the theological message. Fundamentalists attacked the Revised Version with numerous ‘Back to the

¹⁵⁵ *Constitution of the International Council of Christian Churches* (Amsterdam: International Council of Christian Churches, 1948).

¹⁵⁶ Jorstad, 49-79; and C. Gregg Singer, *The Unholy Alliance* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House Publishers, 1975), 177-190.

Bible' rallies and even RSV-Bible-burnings in large cities.¹⁵⁷ They denounced the new Bible translation for what they perceived as Unitarian, modernist, ecumenical, and communist leanings. McIntire argued that the new translation minimized the prophetic references to Jesus Christ in important passages from the Old Testament.¹⁵⁸ For instance, in Isaiah 7:14, no longer was it a virgin who was to conceive the Christ, but simply a young woman.¹⁵⁹ Passages from the New Testament were revised as well: Romans 9:5 was changed from "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is overall, God blessed forever. Amen." to "To them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ. God who is over all be blessed forever. Amen." With the change, militant fundamentalists believed that the New Revised Edition compromised Christ's divinity. These differences might seem subtle, but to militants, the nuances were designed to question basic Christian tenets, to undermine the fundamentalist faith in Biblical inerrancy, and to promote a liberal and modernist interpretation from its readers. More galling was the success of the new Bible; within eight weeks it sold over one-and-a-half million copies.¹⁶⁰

The attacks on the Revised Standard Bible took on an anti-Semitic and vicious tone. On December 5, 1948, William Denton, an English-born evangelist broadcasting from Akron, Ohio

¹⁵⁷ Gaspar, 55-75. The new Bible was burned in North Carolina and in Akron, Ohio.

¹⁵⁸ Singer, 226. Supporters of the New Revised Edition insisted that Old Testament passages were re-translated to accurately reflect the textual evidence.

¹⁵⁹ Carl McIntire, *The New Bible: Revised Standard Version, Why Christians Should Not Accept It* (Collingswood, NJ: Christian Bacon Press, 1952). "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign, Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel" (King James Version) as compared to "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign, Look the young woman is with child and shall bear a son, and shall name him Immanuel" (Revised Standard Version).

¹⁶⁰ *New York Times*, "Million-Copy Sale Starts New Bible," 28 September 1952; and McIntire, *The New Bible*.

criticized the new translation as a conspiracy of Jewish Marxists to defile the white race.¹⁶¹ In the face of the outrage his comments generated, the American Council of Christian Churches defended Denton, charging that the denunciation of the evangelist was communist-inspired. In his *Defender* magazine, Gerald B. Winrod, a Nazi sympathizer and anti-Semitic,¹⁶² charged that Jewish scholars were behind the new translations, and that Jews controlled the National Council of Churches. Despite his open anti-Semitism, Winrod received militant fundamentalist support when he opened the Defender Seminary in Puerto Rico in 1954; several years later he granted an honorary doctorate to Billy James Hargis, a new ally of Carl McIntire. There is no evidence that McIntire and Hargis were anti-Semites, but the fact that the ACCC openly worked with such men raised questions within mainstream Protestantism regarding the organization's motivation and moral values.¹⁶³

During this period, McIntire organized a global network in an attempt to rival that of the World Council. In the late 1940s, for example, McIntire and the International Council of Christian Churches made an effort to reach out to East Asian fundamentalists. In December 1949, McIntire led sixteen militant fundamentalists, including T.T. Shields, to Bangkok to protest the East Asian Christian Conference that the WCC and the International Missionary Council set up. McIntire asserted that his group was in Thailand to “inform the national churches of Southeast Asia of the departure from the Bible by the World Council, to expose the leadership in Asia for its support of communism and to keep the World Council from the

¹⁶¹ Clabaugh 83-88; and Ralph Lord Roy, *Apostles of Discord: A Study of Organized Bigotry and Disruption on the Fringes of Protestantism* (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1953), 219-220. The anti-Semitic charges followed a perverse chain of logic: Jews invented communism, communists conspired with modernists to corrupt true Bible Protestantism, while an “apostate” Christianity would leave Caucasians open to racial integration.

¹⁶² In 1934, Winrod had traveled to Germany to meet pro-Nazi Christian Germans and to praise Adolf Hitler; during the Second World War he was arrested three times for sedition.

¹⁶³ Forster and Epstein, 68-86; and Roy, 26-58.

consolidation of this part of the world.”¹⁶⁴ McIntire blasted the conference and its leader, Dr. T. C. Chao of China and Asian president of the World Council of Churches, as an advocate for communism, charging: “(Chao) welcomed Communists in China as liberators and accepted a post on the People’s Consultative Council to advise the Reds.”¹⁶⁵ The seven-point resolution that the conference adopted denounced Chao’s communist appeasement. The resolution called for Asian Christians to:

... distinguish between social revolution, which seeks justice, and the totalitarian ideology which interprets and perverts it. Churches (in East Asia) should take the initiative in bridging the gap between church and organized labor in town and village. ... The revolution in China, though led by Communists, may not yet have manifested fully the evil consequences of the moral relativism integral to communism, and the churches’ task in China may be specifically to seek to provide a moral and religious foundation for the new sense of social freedom and economic justice among the people.¹⁶⁶

Militant fundamentalists regarded the resolution as an outright call for a communist China and vindicated the past efforts of militants to expose modernism amongst Chinese missionaries. In response, McIntire vowed to organize his own Conference of Christian Churches in Asia.¹⁶⁷

A Second Plenary Congress of the ICCC was held in Geneva, Switzerland in 1950, the Third Congress four years later in Philadelphia, and the Fourth Plenary Congress in Petropolis, Brazil in 1958. Philadelphia had been chosen when the International Council could not find an adequate facility in Evanston, Illinois, to confront the World Council of Churches meeting in that city. Even the Orthodox Presbyterian Church – the denomination J. Gresham Machen helped to

¹⁶⁴ *New York Times*, “Mission Parley Split on East Asian Reds,” 4 December 1949 and “Church Group is Barred,” 5 December 1949.

¹⁶⁵ *Christian Beacon*, “A World Council President Rejoices in Communist Victor,” 10 March 1949; *Who Is Carl McIntire? Testimony to Christ and a Witness for Freedom* (Collingswood, NJ: Twentieth Century Reformation Hour, no publication date), 10-11; and Carl McIntire, *The Battle of Bangkok: Second Missionary Journey* (Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1950).

¹⁶⁶ *New York Times*, “Asia Churches See Red Fight as Basic,” 12 December 1949.

¹⁶⁷ Roy, 180-202.

found - joined the International Council, although it withdrew after a few years because the ICCC accepted denominations that professed dispensationalism and did not adhere to strict versions of the reformed faith (for instance, fundamentalist Methodists). While McIntire was president of the American Council of Churches for only one year, he remained in control of the International Council for several decades and maintained the organization's headquarters at his Collingswood, New Jersey church. In this manner, McIntire retained more power over his international fellowship than he did the American organization.¹⁶⁸

MILITANT FUNDAMENTALISM AND JOSEPH McCARTHY

During the 1950s, McIntire cooperated not only with militant fundamentalists, but also with secular forces, such as Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin.¹⁶⁹ The relationship that developed between militant fundamentalists and McCarthy created a strong link between the secular American right-wing and their religious counterparts; militant fundamentalists avidly collaborated with both McCarthy and the House Committee, despite McCarthy's Catholicism.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁸ Clabaugh, 82-83; and Hart and Muether.

¹⁶⁹ The connection between McIntire and McCarthy indirectly involved Paisley - it elevated the stature that McIntire obtained with militant fundamentalists in the United States and subsequently the international community. The McIntire - McCarthy relationship also helped McIntire's ability to publicly protest Protestant apostasy and the communist threat to the U.S. and to present an argument that the entire world, including Northern Ireland, was threatened by a communist-ecumenical conspiracy. Many of McIntire's associates - Bob Jones, Sr. and Jr, Harvey Springer and T.T. Shields for instance - also argued the same position as McIntire and all became important influences on Paisley. Although the Bob Jones family would become one of the most important friendships that Paisley made, they do not enter this story until 1962.

¹⁷⁰ See Fred J. Cook, *The Nightmare Decade: The Life and Times of Senator Joe McCarthy* (New York: Random House, 1971); Walter Goodman, *The Committee: The Extraordinary Career of the House Committee on Un-American Activities* (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1964), 3-152; Robert Griffith, *Politics of Fear: Joseph R. McCarthy and the Senate* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1987), 30-51; and Richard H. Rovere, *Senator Joe McCarthy* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1959), 3-44. McCarthy headed the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC). McIntire's willingness to overlook McCarthy's Catholicism - compromising militant

Militant fundamentalists and right-wing politicians, however, had overlapping, but different priorities. McCarthy and the House Un-American Activities Committee were primarily concerned with communist subversion of the American government, while other groups, such as churches were secondary; McIntire and fellow militant fundamentalists were preoccupied with communist infiltration of Protestant churches and placed politics in a subsidiary role.¹⁷¹ But when McCarthy and other right-wing politicians charged that communists were infiltrating Christian churches, their assertions vindicated McIntire and his fellow militant fundamentalists in the eyes of a substantial segment of the American public. While the majority of Americans still considered McIntire and other militant fundamentalists to be extremists, cooperation with Congressmen and Congressional committees gave militants a degree of respectability. In late November 1948, Chairman J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey and the House Committee on Un-American Activities published five pamphlets, with titles such as *100 Things You Should Know About Communism and Religion*, all claiming that communists had penetrated deeply into American churches and religious groups. The YMCA, the Methodist Federation for Social Action (MFSA), *The Protestant Digest* magazine and the Epworth League - a defunct Methodist group - were named as communist-front groups. The Thomas committee charged that: “The Communist party of the United States assigns members to join organizations, in order to take control where possible, and in any case to influence thought and action toward Communist

fundamentalist theology and separatism – shows McIntire was willing to be pragmatic in politics. Two decades later, Paisley copied this political amillennialism.

¹⁷¹ Warren L. Vinz, “Protestant Fundamentalism and McCarthy,” *Continuum* 6 (August 1968), 314-325. Vinz notes that there were numerous Christian and secular groups and leaders that McCarthy and militant fundamentalists mutually attacked: for example, the United Nations, the National Council of Churches, the World Council of Churches, Secretary of State George C. Marshall, and the Voice of America.

ends.” Unsurprisingly, McIntire, the ACCC, and the International Council praised the governmental report.¹⁷²

In July 1952, HUAC conducted another series of hearings in New York City on the penetration of communism into American protestant churches. The Committee heard former communists testify to the collaboration between modernist protestant leaders - especially Methodist - and communist front-groups that was directed from Moscow. Because the Committee’s report did not receive extensive coverage in the secular press, militant fundamentalists claimed that the media and churches conspired to cover-up the situation.¹⁷³

McCarthy relied to a great extent on information militant fundamentalists provided. McCarthy used “evidence” that militant fundamentalists supplied, but the relationship was mutually beneficial. McIntire and his allies joined with Christian laymen to provide source material for McCarthy, while militant fundamentalists used the reports and hearings of the committee to support their attacks on Christian leaders.¹⁷⁴ It was important for militant Christians that McCarthy’s style of attack involved innuendo and guilt by association, while not offering hard facts. By publicly making charges and then withdrawing them when asked to provide proof, McCarthy could condemn a victim and refuse to provide a forum to respond,

¹⁷² Roy, 308-336. Two churchmen, the Reverends Claude C. Williams and Eliot White, were denounced as outright communists. Williams, a Cumberland Presbyterian, made a career supporting black automobile workers in Detroit and civil rights in the South, and was defrocked for unorthodox theology. From his pulpit at Grace Episcopal Church in New York, Eliot White argued for a socialist America. In 1952, the Methodist General Conference passed a resolution denouncing the MFSA, demanding that they drop the moniker “Methodist.” Ralph Lord Roy, who wrote an expose of the American right wing, agrees that the Methodist Federation for Social Action did include pro-Soviet communists within its ranks, but argued that they were primarily within the group’s leadership.

¹⁷³ Goodman, 332-345.

¹⁷⁴ *New York Times*, “Red Infiltration Found in Religion,” 23 November 1948, and “House Group Praised,” 26 November 1948, and “Cleric Repudiates Matthews Charge,” 12 July 1953; Jorstad, 65-69; and Roy, 308-336

citing Senatorial privilege. When the charges were directed at Protestant targets and the press routinely printed the charges, militant fundamentalism benefited.¹⁷⁵

At times McCarthy used religious imagery to support his political accusations. Warren L. Vinz argues that not only did McCarthy reiterate what McIntire and his allies had already charged and that the Senator often made religious references in his speeches, but that McCarthy's secular charges paralleled the premillennial view of the Second Coming. To McCarthy, a struggle with the Soviet Union was inevitable, and liberal humanist efforts, such as the United Nations, which favored the eastern bloc, supported the communist advance.¹⁷⁶

MILITANT LAYMEN

The link between McCarthy, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and militant fundamentalists was manifest in a group of ultra-conservative writers and Christian laymen, most notably J.B. Matthews, Captain Edgar C. Bundy, John T. Flynn, and Verne F. Kaub. The diverse group specialized in exposing the communist infiltration of churches and the government. Matthews, the son of a Methodist fundamentalist minister from Kentucky, became a Methodist missionary in Malaya as a young man and originally advocated the social gospel, racial equality, and pacifism. In the 1930s he chaired the American League against War and Fascism – a group that included the American Communist Party – until he turned to the right and joined the Dies Committee - the forerunner of the HUAC – in August 1938. Matthews became disillusioned after he supported the Consumer Union during a contentious strike by its employees and the Left

¹⁷⁵ Griffith, 52-57.

¹⁷⁶ Donald F. Crosby, Jr., *God, Church, and Flag: Senator Joseph R. McCarthy and the Catholic Church 1950-1957* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978), 40-41; and Vinz, 314-325. According to Vinz, McCarthy made frequent allusions to God and politico-religious references: the Soviet Union was the evil in Revelation; Armageddon was coming; the United Nations represented futile and humanly efforts; he alluded to atheistic communism; and charged that John Foster Dulles equated the Sermon on the Mount to an endorsement for communism.

denounced him. Matthews became the star witness for the Dies Committee as well as its research director. After the Second World War, Matthews worked for the American Council of Christian Churches, and wrote anti-communist articles for various newspapers and periodicals, most notably the *American Mercury*.¹⁷⁷

Hired by William Randolph Hearst as a specialist on communism, Matthews convinced Hearst to support McCarthy and subsequently was hired as a researcher for the Senator's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Matthews became the most direct link between the House Committee and militant fundamentalists. An outcry of opposition was heard from moderates, however, after McCarthy appointed Matthews to be executive staff director of the Subcommittee on Investigations. A larger uproar broke out when his article "Reds and Our Churches" appeared in the July 1953 edition of *American Mercury*, forcing Matthew's resignation. The article was written to support Representative Harold H. Velde of Illinois who had announced his own investigation into communist clergymen. Matthews asserted that seven thousand American clergymen were Communist party members or sympathizers, that HUAC had the names of 471 protestant pacifists, and that "the largest single group supporting the communist apparatus in the United States today is composed of Protestant clergymen."¹⁷⁸ The American Council of Christian Churches petitioned President Eisenhower to reinstate Matthews, but under pressure from the National Council of Churches and a cross-section of Christian groups – including the Southern Baptist Conference and the National and Federal Council of

¹⁷⁷ *The Reformation Review*, "Moscow-Directed Subversion in the Churches: Address delivered at the Fifth Plenary Congress of the ICCS by Major Edgar C. Bundy, U.S.A., August 12, 1962," October 1961 (The International Council of Christian Churches published *The Reformation Review*); and Goodman, 24-58.

¹⁷⁸ J.B. Matthews, "Reds and Our Churches," *The American Mercury* (July 1953), 3-13.

Churches - the President refused to intervene. Militant fundamentalist support continued however, and McIntire maintained a relationship with Matthews through the 1950s.¹⁷⁹

Major Edgar C. Bundy, a retired air force intelligence officer and ordained Southern Baptist minister, also became a close associate of McIntire's. Bundy joined the National Laymen's Council of the Church League of America, a group founded in March 1937 as a private intelligence office to sell information about any person or organization suspected of communism, socialism, or civil libertarianism. Anyone could purchase the information and it was provided free-of-charge to interested parties within the United States government.¹⁸⁰ In the 1950s, militant information was disseminated through *News and Views* monthly, through special reports that could be purchased from the League, and through the lecture circuit. Each issue of *News and Views* covered one subject, such as "Socialism in the Churches," "The National Council's Program for Revolution," and "High Tide of Black Resistance, 1967." The Church League claimed that *News and Views* had a paid subscription of 6,000 clergyman and 50,000 laymen; unlike McIntire and Hargis, Bundy's impact on the public at large was indirect. But what made the organization effective was that the information the Church League of America collected and distributed was difficult to dispute – which mimicked the McCarthy method. In addition, their massive files made Bundy and the Church League of America an important bridge between the secular right wing and militant fundamentalists.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹ Cook, 424-433; Goodman, 24-58 and 332-345; Griffith, 221-235; and Vinz, 314-325. Congressman Kit Clardy of Michigan inserted "Reds and Our Churches" into the *Congressional Record*. In 1958, the Christian Beacon Press published J.B. Matthews' *Communism in our Churches*.

¹⁸⁰ Clabaugh, 86-87; and Forster and Epstein, 144-150.

¹⁸¹ *News and Views*, "Socialism and the Churches," May 1966, "The National Council's Program for Revolution," August 1966, and "High Tide of Black Resistance, 1967," October 1969.

A close relationship between Bundy and McIntire developed in 1949. Bundy became a popular speaker to Christian and secular groups after he testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the Far East in 1949. Bundy predicted the communist attack on South Korea, and after the Korean War started, he became an “expert” on communist aggression in Asia. Bundy also preached to revival meetings, including an eight-week campaign in spring 1949 that ended with a speech to the International Council of Churches meeting in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. The 1,200 attendees to the ICCC meeting heard Bundy relate stories such as his confrontation with Dr. John Stamm, the Bishop of the United Brethren Church and the president of the Federal Council of Churches. Because Bundy’s maternal grandfather had been an Evangelical United Brethren Church minister, the seeming apostasy within that denomination greatly concerned the militant fundamentalist. Bundy joined the American Council of Christian Churches in the late 1940s, became a part-time public relations officer and intelligence officer on McIntire’s personal staff, and wrote articles for the *Christian Beacon*. Partly because of his relationship with McIntire, the revenues of the League expanded 600 percent over the next four years, becoming a major source of information for militant fundamentalists.¹⁸²

In the mid-1950s, Bundy furthered his fame when he wrote *Collectivism in the Churches*, in which he argued that the ecumenical movement aimed to standardize Christian doctrine - creating a Christian collective - and that the social gospel of the Federal, National and World Councils of Churches was a front for a communist attack on American freedom. For instance, Bundy charged that the FCC’s Commission on the Church and Social Service consistently made pronouncements sympathetic to socialism and communism, such as in February 1951 when the

¹⁸² Stroman, 239-241.

Executive Committee of the WCC issued a resolution arguing that communism traced a direct lineage to the Gospel of Jesus Christ.¹⁸³

The third conservative who linked McCarthy and militant fundamentalism was John T. Flynn. Flynn began as a liberal newspaperman who exposed the corrupt practices of big business and who advocated isolationism. He opposed America's entry into the Second World War as an attempt by Roosevelt liberals to defend European imperialism and to spread secular liberalism. After the United States and Great Britain formed the alliance with the Soviet Union, Flynn turned anti-communist and joined the Republican Party. In 1945, Flynn joined the House Un-American Activities Committee to expose communism within the Truman Administration and six years later joined with McCarthy in his anti-communist crusade. Flynn wrote two books, *The Road Ahead, America's Creeping Revolution* and *The Roosevelt Myth*, both of which became bestsellers and which asserted that socialists were influential within the American government, unions, and churches.¹⁸⁴

Published in 1949, *The Road Ahead* charged that the Federal Council of Churches was a communist-front organization that a number of American church leaders were active communists, and that Fabian Socialists, supported by liberal Protestant ministers, were pushing National Planning as a precursor to fascism. The most important of these liberal Protestants, according to Flynn, were two Methodists: Dr. E Stanley Jones, a missionary to India, and

¹⁸³ "Christian Beacon, "Captain Bundy, former News Reporter, Tangles with FC's President Stamm: Harrisburg Hears ICC - WCC Issue," 19 March 1949, and "The Battle For Truth by Edgar C. Bundy," 26 July 1962; and Edgar C. Bundy, *Collectivism in the Churches* (New York: Devin-Adair Company, 1954).

¹⁸⁴ John T. Flynn, *The Road Ahead, America's Creeping Revolution* (New York: Devin-Adair Company, 1949) and *The Roosevelt Myth* (New York: Devin-Adair Company, 1948); and Ronald Radosh, *Prophets on the Right: Profiles of Conservative Critics of American Globalism* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975), 197-231.

Garfield Bromley Oxnam, the Bishop of the Washington, D.C. area.¹⁸⁵ Flynn despised Jones for advocating a federal union of all Christian churches, for calling Gandhi and his pacifism “Christian,” and for condemning capitalism as decadent and selfish. Flynn claimed that Jones called the Kingdom of God a social order, not a theological system, and that Bishop Oxnam allowed the writings of pro-communist Christians, such as Dr. Jerome Davis, to be sold in Methodist churches. Within several pamphlets, Davis argued that Stalinist economic and social policies reflected the ideals of the Russian masses.¹⁸⁶

In 1950, Verne F. Kaub, from Madison Wisconsin, formed the American Council of Christian Laymen to distribute copies of *The Road Ahead*. Kaub, like Matthews, Bundy and Flynn, was a conservative writer who drew together the secular and religious strands of anti-communism. Kaub wrote his own pamphlet, “How Red is the Federal Council of Churches,” which not only charged that Oxnam and Jones were communists, but that they followed in the tradition of important liberal Christians like Harry Emerson Fosdick.¹⁸⁷

McIntire and the ACCC led the militant fundamentalist attack on Jones and Oxnam, employing the press, the pulpit and public protests. For example, members of the southern California branch of the ACCC picketed Dr. Jones’ appearance at the Pasadena Council of Churches in 1950. The leader of the demonstration, Marion H. Reynolds of the Militant Fundamental Bible Churches and founder of the Fundamental Bible Institute of Los Angeles in

¹⁸⁵ *Whither Methodism?* “Highlights of Modern Methodism” October 1965. Oxnam was president of the WCC’s Council for North America from 1948 until 1954, the past president of both the Federal Council of Churches and DePauw University, and a member of the American Civil Liberties Union.

¹⁸⁶ Carl McIntire, *Russia’s Most Effective Fifth Column in America, A Series of Radio Messages by Carl McIntire* (Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1948); Radosh, 231-273; and Roy, 228-250. E. Stanley Jones put his arguments into print in a series of books, most notably *Christ’s Alternative to Communism*.

¹⁸⁷ Jorstad, 76-80.

1936, approached Pasadena's two daily newspapers with information outlining the militant position. Although the *Star-News* refused to use the information, the *Independent* printed most of Reynolds' charges verbatim.¹⁸⁸

The American Council of Christian Churches organized special meetings across the United States to publicize their charges against Bishop Oxnam. McIntire's tactics were effective: in early March 1953 the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Representative Harold H. Velde of Illinois went on the television show *Reporters' Roundup* and announced that an investigation into liberal and modernist churchmen, such as Oxnam, would shortly begin. Despite a public outcry that forced Velde to quickly back down, another HUAC committee member, Representative Donald Jackson of California proposed the same idea on the House floor. Jackson charged that Oxnam "served God on Sunday and the communist front for the balance of the week." The following May, 200 members of the American Council travelled to Washington, D.C. to hand Jackson a 25,000 signature petition that demanded Oxnam be brought before the House committee.¹⁸⁹

The tactics of the militant fundamentalists worked and Bishop Oxnam insisted on a hearing. On July 21, 1953, the cleric voluntarily testified for ten hours. Captain Bundy and several members of the ACCC attended the spectacle and were given front row seats. Although the committee agreed that there was no concrete evidence against Oxnam – he admitted only that in the 1920s he had belonged to groups that would later develop ties with the Communist Party, and that he supported the aims of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, but not its communist

¹⁸⁸ *The Reformation Review*, "In Memoriam, Dr. Marion Reynolds, Sr.," October 1970. In 1961, Paisley and Northern Irish militants picketed Jones' visit to Belfast, while Reynolds was one of many American clergymen to visit Paisley's Ravenhill Church after the Ulsterman's imprisonment in 1966. See pages 199-201.

¹⁸⁹ Gasper, 55-75; and Stroman, 174-182.

leadership – the charges against the churchman gained credence within the world of militant fundamentalism. But because of the inability of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to indict Oxnam as a communist or to prove the same charge against Jack R. McMichael, the director of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, no other Protestant clergyman was brought before Congress.¹⁹⁰

DEFENDING AMERICA FROM COMMUNIST-BLOC CLERICS

During the early 1950s, the American fear of communism and the Korean War enhanced the McIntire crusade and strengthened his relationship with Senator McCarthy and the House Un-American Activities Committee. But after the Matthews fiasco and McCarthy's Senate censure in 1954, McIntire's influence in national politics seemed to wane, and criticism of his tactics increased. This reversal, however, was temporary and new campaigns quickly revitalized McIntire and the American Council of Christian Churches: the fast rebound illustrated McIntire's vitality.¹⁹¹

One important battle was waged against the visit to the United States of Protestant and Orthodox clergymen from Eastern Europe. Militant fundamentalists argued that the communist-bloc clerics were not Christians, that their national governments controlled their theology and the activities of their churches, and that these clerics were nothing but spokesmen for communism. The first attacks on the "red" clergymen began in early 1954 when the World Council of Churches applied for visas to allow Professor Joseph L. Hromadka of Czechoslovakia and Bishop Albert Bereczky of the Reformed Church in Hungary to attend its Second Plenary session in Evanston, Illinois. After the U.S. State Department granted the visas, McIntire petitioned

¹⁹⁰ *New York Times*, "Red Inquiry Group Assails Chairman," 11 March 1953; and Goodman, 332-345.

¹⁹¹ *New York Times*, "Women Criticize Inquiry Methods," 20 January 1954.

Secretary of State Dulles and Attorney General Herbert Brownell to reverse the decision, citing the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. The legislation barred entrance into the United States to citizens of communist countries who did not openly disapprove of their totalitarian governments. McIntire further argued that the two clerics and their sponsor, the WCC, expressed sympathy towards socialism and communism.¹⁹²

Although McIntire and twelve clerical supporters personally delivered a petition to Washington, the Hungarian and Czech Christians received their visas and appeared twice in Evanston, once at the plenary session and again at the World Council meeting the following August. But the militant fundamentalist opposition was loud, beginning with a Faith and Freedom Rally at the Collingswood Bible Presbyterian Church. McIntire and the ICCC imported their own foreign voices for the event: Norman Porter of Northern Ireland called communism and modernism the two biggest threats facing the Christian and secular worlds, while the Reverend Roman K. Mazierski, superintendent of the Polish Reformed Church in Great Britain, alleged that church leaders in communist countries “proved to be perfect mouthpiece(s)” for communist governments that “removed church officials and had them replaced by active Communists.” The Reverend Samuel A. Jeanes of Merchantville, New Jersey, honored the numerous Baptist leaders imprisoned in Czechoslovakia for their faith, while McIntire charged that “Communist Governments in Iron Curtain countries have placed their own Communist agents in high ecclesiastical positions and are now using these agents in the church to deceive and mislead Christian people both behind the Iron Curtain and in the western world...” Further protest in Evanston proved difficult as the International Council of Christian Churches failed to

¹⁹² Gasper, 55-75.

find a location to hold their own meeting and was forced to call their counter-council at the Faith Theological Seminary in Elkins Park, Pennsylvania.¹⁹³

The ACCC joined in the attacks against the visiting clerics after nine American clergymen associated with the National Council toured the Soviet Union. Although the NCC delegation reported that the Christian churches within the Iron Curtain could not operate as freely as western churches and that religious toleration was traded for political suppression, McIntire nevertheless ridiculed the visit as “beneficial to communism and in keeping with the Communists’ new line to deceive the West.”¹⁹⁴ Subsequently, two years later, when the National Council of Churches arranged for eight Soviet Orthodox, Baptist and Lutheran clerics to come to the United States in an exchange visit, they met public demonstrations. Supported by militant fundamentalists and Soviet émigré groups, the protests were held on the arrival of the Soviets at New York International Airport, outside St. Nicholas Orthodox Cathedral in Manhattan, and at Wooster College in Ohio. Protestors appeared everywhere Metropolitan Nikolai of the Russian Orthodox Church preached. Militant fundamentalists charged that Nikolai was a Soviet secret agent who controlled the Soviet Union’s Orthodox churches for the nation’s communist leadership, an accusation that the U.S. Senate’s Internal Security Committee took into serious

¹⁹³ International Council of Christian Churches, Sixth Plenary Congress, Geneva Switzerland August 5-11, 1965, “The Battle” (Collingswood, NJ: International Council of Christian Churches, 1965); and Carl McIntire, *The Russian Baptists: Twenty Years of Soviet Propaganda: The Hammer and Sickle on the Platform of the Baptist World Alliance* (Collingswood, NJ: Twentieth Century Reformation Hour, no publication date). The ICCC report detailed the campaign against the visiting clerics from the Soviet bloc. The quotes are from McIntire, *The Russian Baptists*.

¹⁹⁴ *New York Times*, “Church in Russia is Found Isolated,” 24 March 1956.

consideration. The largest group of protesters assembled as the visiting clerics visited Independence Hall in Philadelphia, less than ten miles from McIntire's Collingswood church.¹⁹⁵

Further ICCC activities included sponsoring a 'truth squad' to protest Professor Hromadka's appearance at the 18th General Assembly of the World Presbyterian Alliance in Sao Paulo in 1959 and a protest by ten ICCC leaders, including McIntire, at the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches in New Delhi in November 1961. In India, the International Council members protested the presence of five official Roman Catholic observers and the admittance of two Pentecostal churches and the Russian Orthodox Church of Moscow as full members. When McIntire and his group travelled to Brazil, it was not the first time the International Council had ventured to South America to contest international gatherings of evangelical apostates. In July 1949, McIntire, Margaret Harden of the International Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, and Carl Matthews of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches protested the Inter-American Evangelical Conference in Buenos Aires and held a Reformation Rally in Sao Paulo. The militant fundamentalists were refused entrance but held a protest meeting in a nearby church.¹⁹⁶

It is important to note that the International Council of Christian Churches, not the American Council organized these demonstrations. Although McIntire divided his crusade into international and American spheres, the ACCC was still an important part of McIntire's efforts. For example, when the Central Committee of the WCC met at Yale Divinity School in 1955, to

¹⁹⁵ *Christian Beacon*, "Metropolitan Nikolai is 'Agent in Secret Police,'" 26 March 1959 and "Senate Committee Hears Agents Control Churches Behind Iron Curtain," 21 May 1959; *New York Times*, "8 Russian Clerics Arrive For Tour," 3 June 1956, "Russian Booed at Liberty Bell," 9 June 1956, "Churchmen Meet in World Session," 31 July 1957, and "Oriental Protestants in City to Oppose Red China," 18 March 1959; and McIntire, *The Russian Baptists*.

¹⁹⁶ Carl McIntire, *The Struggle for South America: First Missionary Journey* (Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1949).

discuss the role of religion in the nuclear age, a meeting that included two Hungarians and an East German church leader, the American Council protested the conference. Four years later, McIntire organized ACCC rallies to protest the visit to the United States by Soviet Premier, Nikita Khrushchev; the first held at Connie Mack Stadium in Philadelphia drew a sparse crowd and included many Soviet bloc-immigrants. Other rallies included large protests at the Washington Monument in Washington, D.C. and the Rose Bowl in Pasadena, California, and smaller ones in places such as Des Moines, Iowa and Evansville, Indiana. Another rally was held in New York to oppose the United Nations' recognition of the People's Republic of China. The ACCC imported five clerics from Taiwan and South Korea to protest at the U.N. and to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee.¹⁹⁷

THE FELLOWSHIP OF MILITANT FUNDAMENTALISM

Although McIntire was one of the most famous and vocal leaders of American militant fundamentalism, the men he associated with in the 1950s widened the outreach and support that his crusade commanded; together they created the religious core of America's radical right. Despite the numerous friends and allies that McIntire made through his ministry and through the American and International Councils, three of his most important associates came from outside the two councils. These were Billy James Hargis, Fred Schwarz, and Harvey Springer.

¹⁹⁷ *Camden-Courier Post*, "Reds Appoint Clergy, Polish Exile Asserts at Westmont Rally," 26 July 1954; *Christian Beacon*, "Khrushchev Protest Rallies Planned by ACCC," 13 August 1959, "Washington DC Rally Set for September 14: Groups Co-Operating in Protest to Khrushchev's Visit," 27 August 1959, "Hromadka Urges WCC's Central Committee to Use its Power to get Red China into UN," 1 September 1960, "Anti-Khrushchev Rallies Planned for Des Moines, Iowa and Evansville, Ind. Philadelphia Rally Program Announced," 10 September 1959 and "Sylvan Amphitheater at Base of Washington Monument, Washington D.C. Secured for Khrushchev Protest and Memorial Meeting, September 14 at 7:30 PM/Rose Bowl Secured by ACCC Leaders for Los Angeles Area Rally, September 18 7:30 PM," 30 September 1959; *The (Philadelphia) Evening Bulletin*, "1,000 Attend Protest Rally," 12 September 1959; International Council of Christian Churches, Sixth Plenary Congress; and Stroman, 217-219.

While all three men made a unique and substantial contribution to the radical right, Hargis was McIntire's most important ally. The Oklahoma-based preacher boasted the largest and most widespread following because of his radio ministry and because of Hargis' willingness to work with the secular right. Born in Texarkana, Texas on August 3, 1925, as a teenager Hargis became an ordained minister of the Disciples of Christ and began a preaching career at churches throughout Oklahoma and Missouri. Hargis' ministry was unremarkable until 1948 when he resigned his pulpit at the First Christian Church in Sallisaw, Oklahoma, and relocated to Tulsa to found the Christian Echo Ministries, Inc. Better known as the Christian Crusade, Hargis used the organization to embark on a crusade against modernism, communism, and racial integration.¹⁹⁸ Hargis published a small eight-page monthly and began to make radio broadcasts, but remained only a regional success. Hargis' rise to international fame began in the early 1950s when he managed to attract the attention of Senator McCarthy and the House Un-American Activities Committee. In his autobiography, Hargis argues that McCarthy used Christian Crusade materials to prepare for the Oxnam hearings, and claims to have written a Senate speech McCarthy gave against Bishop Oxnam. There is, however, no record of the speech in the *Congressional Record*. But what is important is that the militant fundamentalist community accepted the assertion and Hargis' stature rose. In 1960, Homer H. Hyde also cited Hargis as an important source when Hyde authored an U.S. Air Force training manual that contained accusations of communist infiltration into American churches and schools.¹⁹⁹ Citing Hargis, the ACCC, and other radical right sources, Hyde blamed the infiltration on numerous organizations and modernist theological

¹⁹⁸ John Harold Redekop, *The American Far Right: A Case Study of Billy James Hargis and Christian Crusade* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968), 1-22; and Stroman, 256-264

¹⁹⁹ Donald Janson and Bernard Eisman, *The Far Right* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963), 69-91. The manual's purpose was to instruct non-commissioned reserve officers on civil defense.

innovations, including the National Council of Churches and the new Revised Standard Version of the Bible.²⁰⁰

Hargis' international stature continued its dramatic rise when he, McIntire and the International Council of Christian Churches embarked on the 'Bible Balloon Project' in 1953, to protest the publication of the Revised Standard Version Bible. Mimicking the use of helium balloons that the newspaper columnist Drew Pearson pioneered during his 'Crusade for Freedom' project, Hargis and the ICCC proposed to airlift Bibles printed in German, Russian, and various eastern European languages into the Soviet bloc. To publicize the project, Hargis undertook a tour of Europe, preaching in Scotland, London, Amsterdam, Paris and Geneva. The U.S. State Department and the World Council of Churches initially opposed the balloon project as provocative, but after an appeal to President Dwight David Eisenhower, the first 3,300 Bible tracts and 53,000 religious pamphlets left Nuremberg. The project continued for four years, despite opposition from the West German government.²⁰¹

During the two years following the balloon project, Hargis used his new international notoriety, his connection with McCarthy and the shrewd hiring of a local promoter to expand his radio revenues by over 300 percent.²⁰² By the early 1960s, Hargis' radio revenue surpassed McIntire's and all militant fundamentalists and the Christian Crusade was broadcasting nine

²⁰⁰ Billy James Hargis, *My Great Mistake* (Green Forest, AR: New Leaf Press, 1985), 61-67.

²⁰¹ *Christian Crusade*, "Remembering the 1950s Bible Balloon Launches," by Billy James Hargis, September 1998; *New York Times*, "Churches to Send Bibles Over 'Curtain by Balloon,'" 26 July 1952, "U.S. Ban on Sending Bibles to Reds by Air Reported," 31 August 1953, "Bible Airlift Lauded," 5 September 1953, and "Bonn Reported to Halt Bible Balloons to the East," 23 September 1955; and Dr. Fernando Penabaz, "*Crusading Preacher From the West: The Story of Billy James Hargis*" (Tulsa: Christian Crusade, 1965), 84-149.

²⁰² The promoter, L.J. White, Jr had previously helped to build the radio empire of Oral Roberts, the Tulsa televangelist and faith healer.

times per week, attacking targets such as the United Nations, the National Council of Churches, and the U. S. Supreme Court.²⁰³

Although Hargis cultivated friendships amongst the elite of the Christian right - for instance, Bob Jones, Sr., spoke at Christian Crusade meetings.²⁰⁴ Hargis differed from McIntire in his willingness to work with secular groups and right-wing politicians: the most notable was the John Birch Society, an organization founded in 1957 and whose founder Robert H. Welch described democracy as “mob rule.” To Welch, America was a republic; democratic rule was a prelude to a communist dictatorship. A strong relationship developed between Hargis and the John Birchers; Robert Welch regularly spoke to the Christian Crusade, while Hargis publicly supported the work of Welch’s organization. Welch and the John Birch Society echoed militant fundamentalists and charged that communists held high positions in the U. S. government and had dictated American foreign policy since 1941, and that many “reds” were amongst the clergy of America’s mainstream denominations. The Society, many of whose members were fundamentalists, used militant tactics; they organized protests to heckle disliked speakers and formed public pressure groups to harass stores that carried merchandise made in communist countries. The John Birch Society opposed the civil rights movement and racial integration, and believed that American foreign aid not only hurt Christian missionary work, but aided the crusade of atheist communism.²⁰⁵

There was, however, a limit to the cooperation that Hargis would undertake with other militant fundamentalists. While Hargis still cooperated with American and International Council

²⁰³ Janson and Eisman, 69-91.

²⁰⁴ In 1961, Hargis was granted an honorary Doctorate of Divinity from Bob Jones University.

²⁰⁵ *New York Times*, “Right-Wing Leaders Shape Secret Fraternity,” 16 September 1961, “Birch Group Labels Some Stores Red,” 25 October 1962; and “Right-Wing Units Pan Federation,” 15 January 1962;” and Morris, 259-314.

of Churches activities, by the mid-1950s, the Christian Crusade leader had little personal contact with Carl McIntire. Although Hargis and McIntire's relationship became distant – due to intense rivalry – they maintained the appearance of being close associates. This perception led the public-at-large and their clerical adversaries to regard both ministers as the leaders of militant fundamentalism.²⁰⁶

In 1948, McIntire began a relationship with Harvey Springer, an anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic who pastored the First Baptist Church and Tabernacle in Englewood, Colorado, and ran the Independent Bible Baptist Missions to support separatist missionaries. Springer published a widely-read separatist publication, the *Western Voice*, started in opposition to what he considered to be Jewish-inspired modernism, but which in the early 1950s turned to anti-Catholicism. In spite of the rise of Senator Joseph McCarthy and his alliance with militant fundamentalism, Springer viewed the Roman Catholic Church as a stronger threat to America's protestant constitution than Jewish-led communism. To Springer, Catholics far outnumbered communists in the United States, and in addition, Catholics were loyal to a dictatorial foreign government. Catholics represented a fifth-column, a threat to which many Americans were ignorant. The fellowship between Springer and McIntire was based on a shared separatist theology, and both frequently spoke at each other's meetings and churches. Beginning in 1948, the Coloradan held a popular, annual revival that the Collingswood Bible Presbyterian Church sponsored. For instance, in February 1949, Springer spoke to 3,000 at the nearby Camden, New Jersey armory. The close relationship became apparent to the militant community when Springer was appointed

²⁰⁶ Billy James Hargis to Bob Jones University, 9 June 1961, Fundamentalism Files; Clabaugh, 86-101; and Billy James Hargis, *Communist America Must it Be?* (Tulsa: Christian Crusade, 1962), and *Facts About...Christian Crusade* (Tulsa: Christian Crusade, no publication date).

head of the ICCC's Commission on Information and Publicity during the 1948 Conference in Amsterdam.²⁰⁷

The relationship between militant fundamentalism and Dr. Frederick C. Schwarz, an Australian, began in 1950 when McIntire and T.T. Shields of Canada heard the doctor speak during a two-month tour of Asia. Son of an immigrant Viennese Jew, Schwarz converted to Christianity and became a Baptist lay preacher. In the 1940s he began a crusade in Australia against communism. McIntire and Shields were impressed enough to sponsor a speaking tour in the United States, during which the doctor was well received. Within two years Schwarz returned to America, gained residency status, and began a radio program out of Waterloo, Iowa. Schwarz started the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, which he moved to southern California, a hotbed for McCarthyism. After an extensive, but short speaking career in local churches he gained sufficient publicity to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee. Schwarz was considered an expert on communism and the U.S. Information Agency chose to distribute his book, *You Can Trust the Communists (To Do Exactly As They Say)*. Initially Schwarz aligned himself with McIntire, the American Council, and separatism. He appeared on McIntire's radio show and lectured in churches belonging to the organization. Schwarz, however, was not a fundamentalist, separatist or premillennialist, only conservative and anti-communist. As his popularity grew, he began to distance himself from militant fundamentalism and his religious rhetoric became decidedly moderate. However, McIntire's initial link to

²⁰⁷ *Christian Beacon*, "Springer Closes Great Campaign," 17 February 1949; *New York Times*, "Democrats List 5 as Extremists," 17 September 1960; Roy, 180-202; Harvey H. Springer, *Catholicism in America: Our Hope the Bright and Morning Star* (no publication information); and Stroman, 126-128.

Schwarz demonstrates the internationalism of the Bible Presbyterian ministry and his willingness to work with non-militants if it suited his agenda.²⁰⁸

These relationships show that McIntire's ministry took on an international focus after the formation of the International Council of Christian Churches in 1948. Although McIntire and the Bible Presbyterian Church already maintained an international fellowship through their support for missionaries and through the foreign students studying at the Westminster and Faith seminaries, the activities and agenda of the ICCC increased the scope of such activism. The International Council elevated McIntire's stature within militant fundamentalism, from an important American figure into an international crusader. The ICCC also enabled McIntire to travel to Northern Ireland to meet the young Ian Paisley and into a position to influence the development of Paisleyism. In addition, many of McIntire's militant allies – including Hargis and Springer – would develop relationships with Paisley and other fundamentalists in Northern Ireland.

²⁰⁸ Clabaugh, 107-110; Forster and Epstein, 47-67; and Janson and Eisman, 55-68.

CHAPTER 4 THE THEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL BIRTH OF ULSTER PROTESTANTISM

The forces that led to Paisleyism were not limited to American militant fundamentalism or to Irish revivalism and theological issues. The political, cultural, and economic history of the British Isles – from the Reformation through the mid-1950s - augmented the effects of fundamentalism, revivalism, and the transatlantic schisms within Presbyterianism on Irish militant fundamentalism. This is clear from the historical references Paisley made throughout his ministry, images Paisley used to connect his militant religiosity with Protestant martyrdom and traditional Calvinism. The political, cultural, and economic development of Ireland and Great Britain - a process that began with the English Reformation and continued through the spread of Protestantism into Scotland and Ireland and into modern Irish history – coalesced with American fundamentalism to set the stage for the career of the Reverend Ian Paisley.

REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND

The Scottish Reformation was inextricably linked to the career of John Knox. As the *Protestant Telegraph* put it: “Such a man as Knox was used of God to further the Reformation in Scotland.”²⁰⁹ Knox, who saw himself as a prophet, was the principal theologian of the Scottish Reformation. He helped to establish the Church of Scotland and was largely responsible for the success of Calvinism in Scotland. Knox argued that kings were subservient to the Bible and recognized the authority of civil government if such authority did not contradict Scripture. To Knox, Scottish Calvinists could rebel against an ungodly ruler, but church and state must work together. Militant fundamentalists, including McIntire and Paisley supported Knoxian

²⁰⁹ *Protestant Telegraph*, “John Knox,” 12 September 1970. Although no author is attributed to this article, all opinions expressed in the paper follow those of the editor – Paisley.

principles; Knox's theology is evident in the American and Irish militant fundamentalist demand that government act in accord with the Bible. Knox also taught that scripture was the inerrant Word of God, that proper church discipline required a trained and structured ministry, that the church had the duty to punish immorality and uphold the Sabbath, and the Roman Catholic Church was the Whore of Babylon described in the Biblical Book of Revelation. Accordingly, ministers must proclaim the Gospel, while exposing apostasy and denouncing rulers who contradicted Scripture.²¹⁰ In a sermon delivered to Ravenhill Free Presbyterian Church, Paisley argued that John Knox was as important to the Reformed faith as was Martin Luther, Ulrich Zwingli, and John Calvin: "No Knox, No Kirk of Scotland, No Protestant Ulster."²¹¹

In spite of (and to a degree because of) the success of Calvinism in Scotland, the Scottish Kirk was afflicted with theological and political problems after the English, Irish, and Scottish crowns were united in 1603. Following his ascension to the throne, James I inserted bishops into the Presbyterian structure and imposed the Articles of Perth on the Scottish church, which included Anglican sacraments such as private baptism and the celebration of festivals. James, an aspiring absolutist, forced these changes onto the Church of Scotland and on an unwilling Scottish population – in part because he understood that Scottish bishops would strongly support the English monarchy. The religious situation within Scotland became more complex when Charles I pursued the Arminian theology of William Laud, the Archbishop of Canterbury.

²¹⁰ Ahlstrom, 265-267; Ian B. Cowan, *The Scottish Reformation: Church and Society in Sixteenth-Century Scotland* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1982), 89-114; J.D. Douglas, *Light in the North: The Story of the Scottish Covenanters* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), 13-21; Richard L. Greaves, *Theology and Revolution in the Scottish Reformation: Studies in the Thought of John Knox* (Grand Rapids, MI: Christian University Press, 1980), 4-67; and McIver, 1984.

²¹¹ Ian R.K. Paisley, "John Knox, a sermon preached 10th and 17th November 1963 to the Ravenhill Free Presbyterian Church," no publication information. The founding of the Ravenhill church is described on pp. 126-128.

Laudism denied predestination and revered the Eucharist and sacraments as the main channel to salvation, two tenets that were considered pro-Catholic and in diametrical opposition to Calvinism. Scottish Presbyterians detested Laudian theology. Charles supported Laud because the king wanted to make religious devotion uniform throughout his three kingdoms and Laud sought to elevate Charles' authority over the churches of England, Ireland, and Scotland.²¹²

Both Charles and Laud believed that Calvinists were disloyal to the crown. When the king and his archbishop tried to impose the new Anglican Book of Common Prayer on Scotland and began to repossess the church property previously sold to Scottish nobles, Scottish Presbyterians were driven to rebel. Meeting in Glasgow, the rebels made an alliance with sympathetic nobles, and swore an oath to the National Covenant of 1638. While the Covenant conditionally supported the king as the head of state, it did not accept James as the head of the Scottish Church. The Covenant was a virulently anti-Catholic statement that condemned both the Laudian Book of Canons and the Articles of Perth, and reconfirmed the Calvinist principles of John Knox. But Covenanters would not accept James as the head of the Scottish church. Laud's religious policies in Scotland not only drove the Scottish Covenanters into open rebellion, but weakened the king's position with the English parliament. In August 1643, in exchange for their military aid, the Scots forced the English parliament to sign the Solemn League and Covenant. The document called for the Church of England to abandon its episcopal structure and to adhere to Calvinist doctrine. The Covenanters swore to defend Presbyterianism to the death and saw their fight against the Stuarts as a struggle for religious liberty and against despotism. Three

²¹² Jane Dawson, "Calvinism and the Gaidhealtchad in Scotland," 231-253 in *Calvinism in Europe*, Andrew Pettegree, Alistair Duke and Gillian Lewis eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 231-253; Conrad Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637-1642* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 38-40; and Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).

years later, parliament and the Covenanters agreed to the Westminster Confession of Faith, which became a defining tenet of the Scottish Church, but which the Church of England repudiated after the Restoration.²¹³

THE PLANTATION OF SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIANISM INTO ULSTER

The success of Protestantism in England enabled a Calvinist and Anglican Church to be established in Ireland. Not all Irishmen adopted Protestantism, however. The majority of the population stuck adamantly to the Catholic faith, and only a minority of the Anglo-Irish nobles and gentry and a small colony of Englishmen centered in Ireland's major towns accepted the new Church of Ireland. Because Irish Catholics were considered disloyal to the English crown, the subjugation of Irish Catholicism and the augmentation of the Irish Protestant population became important aspects of English security. To accomplish this goal, English, Welsh and Scottish Protestants were transplanted into the four provinces of Ireland, through a program that began during the reign of Elizabeth I and continued throughout the seventeenth century. While in most parts of the island the plantation was only partially successful, in Ulster, the arrival of thousands of lowland Scots - who brought their Presbyterian heritage and Reformed religion - ensured that the population was largely Protestant and non-conformist.²¹⁴

The plantation of Ulster had a special significance; prior to the Scottish immigration, England's jurisdiction in Ulster was weak and the Protestant Reformation less successful than elsewhere in Ireland. In 1595, Hugh O'Neill, the Catholic earl of Tyrone and the strongest power in Ulster, rose in revolt to thwart further English encroachment. With support from chieftains throughout Ireland and with Spanish help, the earl of Tyrone initially appeared

²¹³ Douglas, 22-37; and Raymond Gillespie, "The Religion of the Protestant Laity in Early Modern Ireland," in *Christianity in Ireland: Revisiting the Story*, Brendan Bradshaw and Daire Keogh, eds. (Dublin: The Columba Press, 2002), 109-123; and Westerkamp, 15-42.

²¹⁴ Ford, 1-41.

victorious. But in 1601 when the Spanish expedition had trouble holding the southern port of Kinsale, O'Neill's army became overextended and was defeated attempting to relieve their Spanish allies. Realizing that England's position in Ireland remained insecure, however, Elizabeth ordered her representatives to sign a peace treaty. This allowed a weakened O'Neill to retain his lordship and most of his traditional lands. When Elizabeth died the treaty had yet been finalized and the new king, James I, ordered the administration in Dublin to change policy. The English crown again moved against Ulster, and understanding that his power was in decline, O'Neill and several allies fled to the continent.²¹⁵

The so-called "Flight of the Earls" left a vacuum in the north, enabling James I to confiscate O'Neill's lands and those of his allies. As the king of the Scots and the English, James awarded the new property to new planters from both realms; undertakers from England and Scotland cleared the estates of the native Irish and recruited suitable settlers. The plan aimed to neutralize Ulster, to lessen the threat of foreign invasion, and to strengthen the protestant position in Ireland. But an uneven balance developed: Scotland sent a larger number of poorer emigrants, while the smaller number of English brought more capital. In addition, the undertakers did not always follow the orders of the English crown and hired a substantial number of Gaelic Irish as tenants and laborers.²¹⁶

Although O'Neill's defeat strengthened the Crown's control over Ulster, the strong presence of Scottish presbyterians created a theological division within the protestant population. In response, the Stuarts followed a religious policy in Ireland that established an Episcopal hierarchy and liturgy for the Church of Ireland, but also accepted Presbyterian ministers. The Irish church combined Anglicanism with Reformed theology: the Irish Articles of 1615, which

²¹⁵ Bardon, 1992, 75-147; and Ford, 153-192.

²¹⁶ Bardon, 1992, 115-147; and Westerkamp, 15-42.

established the tenets of the Irish church, installed the five basic points of Calvinism,²¹⁷ an episcopal structure, and the Book of Canons. The system temporarily allowed for a harmonious theological relationship between Anglicans and Presbyterians in Ireland; Irish Presbyterians felt that the state church considered their theological views.²¹⁸

But in Ulster, Scottish presbyterians adopted the Covenanting tradition that gave only a conditional support to the English crown. After a majority of Scots presbyterians swore allegiance to the National Covenant, Thomas Wentworth, the first Earl of Strafford and the new lord deputy, required all Ulster Scots to repudiate the Covenant. The Ulster Presbyterian ministers working within the Church of Ireland had to attest that the English king was the head of the Church, a requirement Calvinists could not accept. Wentworth's policy drove a majority of the Ulster Scots clergy out of the province; some of these ministers returned to Scotland, while others emigrated to the American colonies.²¹⁹

Religious disaffection fused with political discontent. Needing new additional fiscal resources, the king ordered Wentworth to impose arbitrary fines on presbyterian and anglican planters and on the Irish church. The fines alienated the entire spectrum of Irish protestants. Sensing that the weakness of the English crown offered them an ideal opportunity to retake their lands and to strengthen Catholicism in Ireland, Ulster's Gaelic and catholic lords arose in rebellion in 1641. The rebels took their anger out on the entire protestant community,

²¹⁷ The five basic points of Calvinism are: the total depravity of man; unconditional election; limited atonement where Jesus Christ's crucifixion saved only those God elected; irresistible grace; and perseverance of the saints.

²¹⁸ Ford, 193-216; and William Alison Phillips, *History of the Church of Ireland From the Earliest Times to the Present Day, Volume III, The Modern Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), 1-58.

²¹⁹ Bardon, 1992, 115-147; and Westerkamp, 43-73.

massacring the English as well as Ulster presbyterians. The 1641 massacres left a crucial legacy amongst Ulster presbyterians as this description testifies:

Infant children were murdered before their mother's eyes...Protestant parents had their eyes gouged out. Women were ravaged...The priests and the bishops of Rome incited their parishioners to commit devilish acts...It has been calculated that in Ulster alone 154,000 Protestants were massacred or expelled...where retaliation was possible the Protestants stood their ground...the foundations of the militant Protestant faith in Ulster were cemented with the blood of our forefathers...They paid the price that we could enjoy Protestant liberty...²²⁰

The massacres added fear to Ulster Scot anti-Catholicism; the perceived treachery of Roman Catholicism became a vital part to the cultural identity of the Ulster Scots. To subdue the catholic rebels, Charles raised an army in Scotland. This army also enabled Ulster presbyterians to form the nucleus of an Irish church: the army brought along five Presbyterian chaplains and their congregations, who at Carrickfergus organized themselves into an Irish presbytery, the first official Presbyterian structure on the island.²²¹

The situation in Ireland became increasingly complicated after the English Parliament formed an army and entered into civil war with Charles. The "Long" Parliament despised the king's autocratic rule and felt threatened by Charles' control over the Scottish army in Ireland. Ulster Scots, however, were uncomfortable opposing the Stuart monarchy. The English Civil War and the formation of the Confederate Catholics of Ireland (the Confederacy) in Kilkenny in October 1642 placed Ulster presbyterians in a precarious position. Over the following eight years, a majority of Ulster presbyterians opposed the parliamentary army - arguing that the

²²⁰ *Protestant Telegraph*, "The Massacre of Irish Protestants 1641," 16 September 1977. In another article published in 1964, Paisley compared the 1641 massacre with the St. Bartholomew's Massacre. Paisley argued that the Roman Catholic Church ordained and promoted the brutal attack on Irish protestants (*Protestant Telegraph*, "No Surrender," 5 November 1966).

²²¹ Bardon, 1992, 115-147; and Brooke, 29-31.

execution of Charles I in 1649 was illegal - but presbyterians were also threatened by the continued existence of the Confederacy.²²²

Order in Ireland was restored after Cromwell's New Model Army defeated both the royal army and the Confederacy, and implemented a harsh system of land confiscations and transportations: Catholic priests were imprisoned and Catholic worship outlawed. Cromwell granted new lands in Ulster to English adventurers, most of whom were English Baptists and Independents, and who had financially supported the Parliament. After the Restoration in 1660, however, Charles II imposed new legal restrictions on presbyterians. The Act of Uniformity in 1662 required all Presbyterian ministers to use the Book of Common Prayer and to be ordained in the Episcopal manner, while the 1672 Test Act required all office holders to take the Oath of Supremacy and Allegiance to the King and to the Church of Ireland.²²³

The political and theological events of the early to mid 1600s gave the Ulster Presbyterian Church enough confidence to withstand repression and to assure its existence. Cromwell instituted a policy of toleration for Ulster presbyterians. Many of the Presbyterian ministers who fled to Scotland a few years earlier were allowed to return and work as itinerant militant missionaries. Ulster Presbyterian ministers were granted *regium donum*, a royal stipend paid to Presbyterian clergymen. Tying the political developments with an entrenched Ulster

²²² Brooke, 29-31.

²²³ Bardon, 1992, 115-147; and Brooke, 37-42. Paisley's use of historical imagery has, at times, been revisionist. During the civil wars of the 1640s, many Scotsmen and Ulster Scots opposed the New Model Army. But Paisley rehabilitated Oliver Cromwell into a Man of God and a "Christian warrior" to further strengthen militant Protestantism in Ireland: "Oliver Cromwell's mission to Ireland has never been completed. He hoped and prayed for the conversion of the Irish, and he preached Protestantism wherever he went. Catholicism, as in Cromwell's day, has no right to exist in Ireland at all, the priests are intruders who have instigated numerous rebellions. They are poisoning their flocks with false, abominable anti-Christian doctrine and practices. Today we should complete the task, and strive for the conversion of the Irish" (*Protestant Telegraph*, "Oliver Cromwell, a Man of God, a Christian Warrior," 14 October 1967).

Presbyterian Church was the revivalism that many Ulster presbyterians favored. Ulster Scot presbyterians steadfastly adhered to the Covenanting tradition, the Westminster Confession of Faith, and revivalism.²²⁴

Despite the new Ulster presbyterian self-assurance, events in England and Scotland continued to influence the course of Ulster Presbyterianism. Charles II repudiated the Westminster Confession and the League and Covenant and reintroduced bishops into the Scottish General Assembly, causing many ministers to object and once again dividing the Scottish Church. Some Presbyterian ministers would not submit to Episcopal re-ordination or Episcopal authority, while others acquiesced. Although the objecting ministers were deposed for nonconformity, the existence of a semi-organized church enabled the Presbyterian ministers remaining in Ulster to retain their positions. The Carrickfergus presbytery became the nucleus of an expanded Irish Presbyterian Church.²²⁵

When James II ascended to the British throne in 1685, the question of religion and parliamentary rights once again rose to the forefront of English and Irish politics. James' preference for Catholicism alarmed Protestants throughout the British Isles, while his new Irish policies gave dispossessed Irish Catholics the hope that they could regain both their property and of political power. In England, an alliance of seven powerful parliamentarians and nobles chose to thwart James and invite Prince William of Orange, the Dutch Stadtholder, to seize the English crown. William landed at Torbay on the southwest coast of England, and after James took flight to France, the Dutchman took control of England. But James had supporters in Ireland: in the southern provinces Catholics seized control of the towns and garrisons. After solidifying his

²²⁴ Bardon, 1992, 115-147; and Brooke, 13-19.

²²⁵ J.C. Beckett, *Protestant Dissent in Ireland 1687-1780* (London: Faber and Faber, 1948), 27-30; and Brooke, 19-53.

base, the deposed king swept into Ulster. Protestants in the North, however, rallied long enough to give William of Orange the opportunity to land his army at Carrickfergus. While Ulster protestants held two vital towns – Londonderry, under siege for 105 days, and Eniskillen - William was able to deploy his entire army against James. William’s victories at the Battles of the Boyne and at Aughrim impelled James II’s second flight to France, secured the English crown for William, and ensured that the monarchy of the British Isles would forever be Protestant.²²⁶ The events of 1689, particularly the Siege of Derry and the Battle of the Boyne, took on mythical significance for militant protestants, as Paisley’s newspapers columns make clear:

There has always been conflict between Children of God and the forces of evil. In Ireland, the conflict has been particularly prevalent, and the Protestant faith, since the days of St. Patrick, has fought with popery for its very existence. Ulster is now the last bastion of Protestantism in Europe, and perhaps the world. The battles of faith in Ireland were mostly fought in Ulster, and one in particular is in our minds at the moment. That is the siege of Derry in 1689.²²⁷

To solidify support throughout the British Isles, William III granted a Bill of Rights to his protestant subjects, widened religious toleration to include all subjects but Catholics and Unitarians, and conceded triennial meetings to Parliament. At the same time, the conclusion of the Williamite War and a severe famine in Scotland drove new emigration from western Scotland into Ulster, greatly increasing the number of presbyterians in the north. William’s victory and the tolerance his reign professed, and the new presbyterian influx created an environment that allowed Ulster Presbyterianism to form into the Synod of Ulster.²²⁸

²²⁶ Phillips, 148-174.

²²⁷ *Protestant Telegraph*, “The Siege of Derry, 1689,” 5 August 1967.

²²⁸ Finlay Holmes, “The Presbyterian Church in Ireland,” in *Christianity in Ireland, Revisiting the Story*, 124-133; and Westerkamp, 74-104.

William also enacted stronger penal laws to thwart a future catholic rebellion. Additional catholic land was confiscated and by 1700 catholic ownership of Irish land fell to 14 percent of the total acreage. Enforcement of the Penal Laws began slowly, but after William's death in 1702, a new vindictiveness appeared. Catholics could not own guns or a horse worth five pounds, buy land, or enter into leases longer than thirty-one years. Catholics were barred from education and employment as lawyers, army officers, or public officials, while priests and bishops were persecuted. Because of the Williamite Wars, Ulster Presbyterianism began to align with the English crown, while Ulster Catholicism was furthered alienated.²²⁹ As Marilyn Westerkamp argues, the religious identity of the Ulster Scots coalesced during the seventeenth century. This religiosity played an important role in determining protestants' relations with their catholic neighbors.²³⁰

Revivalism accentuated communal divisions in Ulster. John Brewer asserts that Ulster anti-Catholicism differed from the anti-Catholicism in England and Scotland. In Ireland, anti-Catholicism was based on theological differences, and economic and cultural relationships, while in Great Britain the basis was political. An important expression of Irish anti-Catholicism was manifest during revivals. Presbyterian planters did not assimilate into the local society, and because of their Calvinism Ulster presbyterians presumed that they were God's Elect and that catholics were God's damned.²³¹

²²⁹ Bardon, 1992, 148-171 and Phillips, 148-174. How severely the penal laws were enforced have been a matter of academic argument as catholic society still retained some vibrancy. For instance, William Alison Phillips in his history of the Church of Ireland has argued that the laws were not enforced vigorously or brutally, and were only a concern when a French invasion threatened Ireland.

²³⁰ Westerkamp, 15-42.

²³¹ John Brewer and Gareth Higgins, *Anti-Catholicism in Northern Ireland 1600-1998* (London: MacMillan Press, Limited, 1998), 21-28.

DIVISIONS WITHIN ULSTER PRESBYTERIANISM

While Irish Presbyterians were gaining a semblance of tolerance and developing their cultural identity, their church had to contend with internal divisions. Over the previous century the piety of the laity and the Calvinist conservatism of many ministers enabled the Synod of Ulster to maintain its orthodox Presbyterian theology, but official tolerance threatened this militancy. Because Irish Presbyterian ministers could concentrate on theological and Church matters instead of contending with political and religious repression, a minority were able to study the intellectual ideas of the Enlightenment. The Synod of Ulster faced a new theological split, which again originated in the Scottish General Assembly. The Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh employed professors who accepted the Enlightenment and its implied argument that unjust monarchs (and not necessarily ungodly) – in contradiction to Knoxian Calvinism - could be overthrown. Unitarian ideas were openly expressed and dispensed alongside the lectures on enlightened philosophy. To these innovators, belief in the Trinity and reverence for the Westminster Confession were matters of individual conscience. The new ideas upset the laity and much of the church leadership, both of whom maintained traditional Reformed ideals. In response, the Scottish Church imposed a test of conscience, or subscription to the Confession. Those who refused to profess their Calvinism publicly became “Non-Subscribers” and started a movement to secede from the Assembly.²³²

In 1720, the Seceders organized themselves into the Presbytery of Antrim, and two subsequent presbyteries were formed in Armagh and Belfast. Although they were expelled from the Ulster Synod, the three new presbyteries and the Synod of Ulster maintained an amicable relationship. The split was formalized in the 1740s when Non-Subscribers formed an

²³² R.F.G. Holmes, 124-131.

independent, seceding church organization. Theologically, the argument matched the debate between Calvinistic Old Lights and the Arminian New Lights in American Presbyterianism. To laymen, the contention matched a popular and radical Old Light Calvinism based on the sacraments, against the newer Presbyterianism of enthusiasm, conversion, and revivalism favored by New Lighters. The Seceders took the New Light position, and when some of the Irish congregations followed suit, the Synod of Ulster was forced into the controversy.²³³

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL COMPETITION IN ULSTER

By the late 1700s, economic and political changes in Ulster overshadowed theological differences and supplemented the ability of Calvinism and revivalism to mold Ulster protestant culture. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the combined impact of the industrial revolution, the political revolutions in America and France, and catholic emancipation, destabilized both economic and political relations in Ulster society. This destabilization coalesced with the revivalism and anti-Catholicism of Ulster Protestantism to strengthen the division between protestants and catholics.

Economic competition between catholic and protestant workers, and the merchants and industrialists of both traditions created new sectarian strife during Ulster's industrialization. During the first four decades of the eighteenth century, the prosperity of Ulster transformed the region from Ireland's poorest province into its wealthiest. The cultivation of potatoes and other foodstuffs was profitable, and the ready supply of food aided Ulster's industrialization. Access to water and the construction of new roads and canals, stimulated the growing of flax, which enabled the establishment of a local linen industry. Protestants were concerned that catholics

²³³ Brooke, 93-103; Holmes, 124-133; and David W. Miller, "Did Ulster Presbyterians Have a Devotional Revolution?," in *Evangelicals and Catholics in Nineteenth-Century Ireland*, James H. Murphy, ed. (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), 38-54.

were gaining from their role in the linen trade. Most linen manufacturing took place east of the Bann River, between the triangular geographic area bounded by Belfast, Lisburn and Newry, which led to sectarian violence in areas containing a large mixed population of protestants and catholics.²³⁴

The impression of local labor and the imposition of new taxes for infrastructure improvements, however, incited agrarian outrages, such as the houghing of cattle, while increased competition for rural tenancies and the proximity of linen manufacturers increased rents. The growing strife led to the formation of rural defense organizations, most notoriously the catholic Defenders and the protestant Peep O’Day Boys. The violence was random but consistent, taking place as nighttime hit-and-run attacks where lightly armed catholics were effective and occasional set battles that protestants always won. The famous Battle of the Diamond that occurred on September 21, 1795 outside the town of Loughall in county Armagh, illustrated the nature of the conflict: while catholics had the superior numbers, protestants held most of the armaments and easily routed their neighbors. The protestant victors celebrated their victory at the Diamond by forming the Loyal Orange Institution. Originally an organization of Anglican weavers and farmers expressing allegiance to the Crown and a militant evangelicalism, the Order slowly expanded to include all sections and classes of the protestant community. Its propensity for demonstrating its prowess in public helped to create the tradition of religious-based political marching in Ireland. Parading played an important role within the Orange Order, enhancing the identification members held to the organization, inspiring loyalty, and legitimizing Orange violence.²³⁵

²³⁴ Bardon, 1992, 171-182.

²³⁵ Bardon, 1992, 183-239. The first Orange parades took place on July 12, 1796 in Portadown, Lurgan and Warington.

While economic changes exacerbated sectarian hostilities, republican and democratic ideas from the American colonies and from France enabled some presbyterians to reconcile their differences with their catholic neighbors. Many presbyterian radicals adopted the republican ideals of Thomas Paine and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, although support declined when France allied with the American revolutionaries. However, when the threat of a French invasion spurred the English government to form an Irish militia recruited from the protestant gentry, many presbyterians rallied to defend Ireland. But the Volunteers were a mixed blessing for the English government: many of the Volunteers supported republicanism and used their new power to demand legislative independence in Ireland and the easing of the discriminatory laws against catholics. In 1782, Ireland gained parliamentary independence and the majority of the remaining Penal Laws were repealed. The Sacramental Test was revoked in 1780, while the Relief Act of 1793 gave catholics the right to an education at Trinity College, Dublin and the ability to purchase land.²³⁶

While these actions appeased some presbyterian radicals, those who wanted a republic formed the United Irishmen to achieve their aims. Popular amongst presbyterian artisans and farmers, the United Irishmen sought to eliminate the power of the Anglican Ascendancy and to form an alliance with moderate catholics. The United Irishmen were most numerous in northeastern Ulster, an area where the sizable protestant population minimized the fear of catholic political and economic gains. When Britain joined the crusade against Republican France in 1793, the government of William Pitt took an alarmed interest in presbyterian radicalism. The Dublin administration moved both to disarm the United Irishmen and to suppress their political aspirations. Expecting help from a French expeditionary force and

²³⁶ Alvin Jackson, *Ireland: 1798-1998* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, Limited, 1999), 1-22.

seeking to impose a republican parliamentary government, the United Irishmen and catholic republicans revolted.²³⁷

Despite French assistance, the Rebellion of 1798 was defeated and presbyterian radicalism diminished. After 1798, the “Irish Question” became one of Britain’s most pressing political issues. British policy aimed to eliminate political and economic disadvantages for both catholics and dissenters, while at the same time restricting Irish parliamentary independence. The Act of Union of 1801 abolished the Irish parliament and made Ireland an integral part of the United Kingdom. Over the next 120 years, Irish protestants united to secure the Union, and protestant support for a separate Irish parliament disappeared. But emancipation and the Act of Union did not resolve the Irish question. The nineteenth century saw the rise of protestant Unionism and catholic nationalism, and a widening political impasse. Irish presbyterians and Irish anglicans allied together to strongly resisted every British effort to help Irish catholics.²³⁸

Marching was an important element within this partnership. Starting in 1796, protestant organizations paraded to celebrate important anniversaries and to mark territory; such demonstrations were intended to intimidate catholic neighbors and to press a political point. At times, marches were designed to defy authority. For instance, the prospect of Catholic Emancipation inspired large Orange Order parades in July 1829, despite the Suppression Act of 1828 that banned these demonstrations. One hundred and forty years later, the Reverend Paisley would employ similar marches against “apostasy” and catholic civil rights; Paisley’s marches

²³⁷ Bardon, 1992, 183-239.

²³⁸ P.M.H. Bell, *Disestablishment in Ireland and Wales* (London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1969), 41-69 and 110-157; and Jackson, 23-27.

continued the same spirit of protestant defiance to enforce ethnic territorial boundaries and to assert political points.²³⁹

HENRY COOKE AND THE REVIVAL OF '59

The alliance of Ulster Protestantism required that the Church of Ireland develop a tolerance towards the presbyterian and nonconformist minorities; the acceptance of evangelicalism throughout Ulster Protestantism made the new attitude possible. But the evangelical movement in Ireland created new Presbyterian doctrinal conflicts. A theological split developed between the hierarchies and the laity. As a general rule, local churchgoers supported conservative evangelical theology, the evangelistic efforts and itinerant preaching, while clergymen tended to support theological liberalism and Unitarianism.²⁴⁰ For instance, a controversy developed after Unitarians opened the Belfast Academical Institute in 1814 as a Presbyterian institution. In 1821, the Reverend W.D.H. McEwen, a teacher of elocution at the new school, brought the English Socinian John Smethurst to Ulster on a preaching tour, which upset denominational conservatives.²⁴¹ Henry Cooke, who succeeded McEwen as the minister of Killyleagh Presbyterian Church, objected and began a campaign to eradicate Unitarians from the Synod of Ulster. Although Cooke was not universally supported within Irish Presbyterianism – many ministers were sympathetic to Smethurst – Cooke had enough stature to be elected moderator in 1825. Using his position and exploiting fears over Christian liberalism, Cooke ensured that all

²³⁹ Sean Farrell, *Rituals and Riots: Sectarian Violence and Political Culture in Ulster, 1784-1886* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2000), 83-117.

²⁴⁰ Phillips, 325-359.

²⁴¹ Andrew Boyd, *Montgomery and the Black Man: Religion and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Ulster* (Dublin: The Columba Press, 2006), 19-22. Socinians rejected the Trinity and the divinity of Jesus and were forerunners of Unitarianism. To Socinians, Jesus was an extraordinary and sinless man, but not coequal to God. Socinians also believed that human free will limited God's sovereignty – and that scripture was the true revelation of God.

future Presbyterian ministers would publicly support the Trinitarianism of the Westminster Confession.²⁴²

Cooke, and most Ulster evangelical Presbyterians, however, wanted to maintain protestant political unity against the threat of catholic civil rights. Cooke asserted that only a political pact between Irish Presbyterianism and the Church of Ireland would maintain the hegemony of Ulster protestants and assure the political Union with Britain. Cooke campaigned to defeat the non-sectarian National Education System, which would have provided for uniform Bible teaching (with no Protestant bias), attacked Catholic Emancipation and Repeal, and crusaded against both the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland and the Party Processions Act. Cooke instituted a new forceful style of preaching and organized confrontations that often incited sectarian violence. For instance, in 1828 as Catholic Emancipation became law, Cooke's sermons helped to incite numerous riots in Belfast and surrounding cities. Cooke's campaign had its apogee in 1832 when he was the featured speaker at a mass demonstration in Hillsborough, organized by Anglican landowners. At least 60,000 protestants heard the minister plead for Anglican-Presbyterian unity.²⁴³

Cooke's greatest legacy was his ability to mix evangelicalism, political activism and confrontation into the Ulster tradition of militant preaching. A succession of Presbyterian and Anglican preachers who employed the same aggressive style followed in Cooke's footsteps. One such cleric, the Reverend Tresham Gregg, formed the Belfast Protestant Operatives' Society in

²⁴² Finlay Holmes, *Henry Cooke* (Belfast: Christian Journals, Limited, 1981), 31-47; John Jamieson, *The History of the Royal Belfast Academical Institution, 1810-1960* (Belfast: William Mullan and Son (publishers), Limited, 1959), 1-22; and Josias Leslie Porter, *The Life and Times of Henry Cooke, D.D., LL.D., President of Assembly's College, Belfast* (London: John Murray, 1871), 55-71.

²⁴³ Constantine Gibbons, *Red Hand: The Ulster Colony* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972), 178, and Tony Gray, *The Orange Order* (London: The Bodley Head Limited, 1972), 109-118.

Belfast in 1843, as a protestant defense force to replace the temporarily banned Orange Order. Gregg's rhetoric during the Belfast Riots of 1843 incited sectarian violence within the Pound and Sandy Row communities. An anti-Catholic sermon by the Reverend Thomas Drew, the Vicar of Christ Church in Belfast, increased the tensions during the marching season in 1857 and the intensity of the riots that the processions produced. Drew created an unusually tense stand-off between protestants and catholics outside Christ Church, where he joined with two Anglican ministers, the Reverends William McIlwaine and Thomas Wellesley Roe, in organizing a series of public sermons. Street preaching by Anglican ministers was a new phenomenon. Their rhetoric was responsible for ten days of rioting and numerous destroyed houses during that summer, as other provocative evangelical street preachers joined the cause and infected Belfast. After the outdoor sermons were cancelled by city magistrates and the Anglican hierarchy, the Reverend Hugh Hanna, a Presbyterian disciple of Cooke, continued and drew large, angry catholic mobs. As a result, substantial rioting took place. Hanna asserted the right of protestants to publicly evangelize, regardless of the consequences.²⁴⁴

The 1857 riots took place in an atmosphere of revivalism. Earlier in the decade, and in response to declining church attendance and urbanization, young Presbyterian ministers advocated a return to revival and a more emotional style of preaching. Religious enthusiasm broke out in Antrim in March 1859, after two ministers sent by the General Assembly to investigate the American Awakening of 1857 returned to Ireland. Building on the open-air preaching campaigns of the 1850s that were aimed towards reclaiming back-sliding presbyterians and converting catholics, the Revival had both long- and short-term impacts on Ulster Presbyterianism. Liquor consumption dropped and church attendance increased, inspiring

²⁴⁴ Andrew Boyd, *Holy War in Belfast* (Tralee: Anvil Books, 1969), 10-34, and Gray, 147-157.

a new piety into the Ulster Scot community. The Revival, however, introduced a new invectiveness towards Irish Catholics. The secular and religious leadership of Protestant Ulster increasingly employed religious imagery in speeches and sermons. Evangelicalism and its anti-Catholic expressions were associated with radical street preaching and Unionist politics throughout the rest of the nineteenth century. Accordingly, the Revival further embedded evangelism within the Irish Presbyterian tradition, and within the Ulster Protestant identity.²⁴⁵

Paisley was well aware that his campaigns followed in this tradition of forceful preaching and confrontation, and in pursuing evangelicalism, revivalism, anti-liberalism, and anti-Catholicism:

Dr. Henry Cooke was an Evangelical Protestant; he announced Biblical Truth and denounced Popish errors. It is written of him that he preached with a Bible in one hand and a gun in the other. He knew that the cause of Christ was the only cause and it must be defended no matter what the consequences.²⁴⁶

Through Paisley's tactics, the militant street preaching and politics of Henry Cooke and Hugh Hanna reemerged. There are two vital differences between Paisley and his two historical mentors: the theology behind each preacher's political stance and their style of street activism. First, Cooke's traditional Irish Presbyterian evangelism and Hanna's Anglican rhetoric reached out to all Ulster Protestants while Paisley intended his militant fundamentalism for a separatist minority. Second, Cooke, Hanna and their associates incited Protestants, but did not lead mobs themselves, while Paisley was willing to personally confront Catholic marchers. There is a similarity, however, between Hanna and Paisley's methods: while Henry Cooke never advocated a violent confrontation with the British government, Hugh Hanna certainly did. In the summer

²⁴⁵ Brooke, 93 and 143-153; Livingstone and Wells, 7-26; Mitchel, 2003, 46-79; and Ian R.K. Paisley, *The '59 Revival: An Authentic History of the Great Ulster Awakening of 1859* (Belfast: Martyr's Memorial Free Presbyterian Church, 1958).

²⁴⁶ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Dr. Henry Cooke," 14 December 1969.

of 1886, Hanna incited riots against Gladstone's first Home Rule Bill, while nearly one century later Paisley would organize quasi-paramilitary movements to oppose British government policy in Northern Ireland.²⁴⁷

While the political and economic developments of the nineteenth century are important to the formation of a modern Ulster protestant identity, the evangelical tradition of Northern Ireland Protestantism has been equally important. In Northern Ireland, evangelicalism served as not only an attempt to win converts, but also as a means to defend Ulster Protestantism. This was true across the entire spectrum of Northern Irish Protestantism, from the large majority of Anglicans and Presbyterians through the sizeable numbers of Methodists, Baptists, Brethren, and other Nonconformists. Within each church was a large group of evangelicals who contrasted their version of Christianity and their sense of British nationality with Roman Catholicism and Irish catholic nationalism.²⁴⁸

The evangelical identity of Ulster Protestantism would become more radical in the twentieth century as evangelicalism in Ulster fractured. Critical of fundamentalism and separatism, some evangelicals remained in mainstream denominations, such as the Presbyterian Church in Ireland and the Church of Ireland.²⁴⁹ Within the diverse family of Ulster evangelicals developed several small, fundamentalist churches, who shared the same desire to defend Ulster Protestantism, but who were more militant and separatist about the Protestant dimension to the Ulster identity. These protestants saw their role as defending both the true Protestant faith and Northern Ireland's political status. Ulster's equivalent of American fundamentalist militants, they included

²⁴⁷ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Dr. Henry Cooke," 14 December 1986; Farrell, *Rituals and Riots*, 141-150; Gray, 159-172; and F. Eugene Scott, "The Political Preaching Tradition in Ulster: Prelude to Paisley," *Western Speech Communications* Fall (1976): 249-259.

²⁴⁸ Mitchel, 2003, 46-79.

²⁴⁹ Mitchel, 2003, 117.

independent Baptists, evangelical Methodists, and most importantly Paisley's Free Presbyterians. Of all the Protestant denominations and religious leaders in Northern Ireland, no church or cleric professed a stronger desire to combine evangelical religiosity with political activism than the Free Presbyterians and Paisley. In the 1960s, this political evangelicalism became known as "Paisleyism."²⁵⁰

Paisleyism is the product of the religious and political history of Ulster that has been outlined to this point. Its religious dimension derives out of three centuries of Irish Presbyterian evangelism and revivalism, its export to the American colonies and development into fundamentalism, and the repatriation of militant fundamentalism back to Northern Ireland. Politically, Paisleyism connects the English and Scottish Reformations and the relationship that developed between Westminster and Ireland through colonization, plantation and imperialism with the Act of Union and the establishment of the Northern Ireland statelet. Theologically, Paisleyism connected revivalism, the theological controversies within Irish Presbyterianism, and fundamentalism. Paisleyism would never have developed without the uniquely Irish battle pitting protestant Unionism and evangelical identity against Irish catholic nationalism. Paisley's career exemplified this confluence of religiosity and political activity.

²⁵⁰ Mitchel, 2003, 136-155 and 173-185.

CHAPTER 5

A FUNDAMENTAL DEFENSE OF ULSTER PROTESTANTISM: THE DEVELOPMENT OF PAISLEYISM

The first three chapters outlined the influences that were vital to the formation of Paisleyism: the emergence of American fundamentalism, the political and economic development of the Northern Ireland statelet, and the coalescence of evangelism and revivalism into the protestant identity of Ulster. This chapter explores the intersection of these three developments. The Reverend Ian Paisley's Christian and political viewpoints would have developed in a different manner if American Protestant fundamentalism had not been introduced into Ireland and if it had not come during the 1920s, the contentious decade that gave birth to Northern Ireland as a political entity. Although the Irish clergy maintained a steady discourse with American counterparts and were well aware of the developing modernist – fundamentalist controversy of the early twentieth century, the Irish protestant laity came into direct contact with the theological concept through the evangelist crusade of William Patterson Nicholson.²⁵¹

Born in Cottown, outside Bangor, Northern Ireland, in April 1876, Nicholson grew up in a devout presbyterian family. Educated at the Bible Training Institute in Glasgow - an institution that D.L Moody strongly influenced - Nicholson worked as an evangelist in Scotland and Australia before ending up in the United States on the eve of the First World War. Although the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. ordained Nicholson as a minister, he associated with fundamentalists of all denominations and adopted a militant theology. Most of his exposure to fundamentalism and separatism occurred during his stays at the Moody Memorial Church in

²⁵¹ Bruce, 1989, 15-19; and George Marsden, "Fundamentalism as an American Phenomenon: A Comparison with English Evangelicalism," *Church History* 56 (1977): 215-232. All three authors argue that in the early twentieth century, Northern Ireland nurtured a semblance of home-grown fundamentalism, which arose out of the 1859 Ulster Revival.

Chicago and the Los Angeles Bible Institute. In 1920 an illness forced Nicholson to return to Ulster and after addressing a meeting of workers, he began the first of two interdenominational revival and tent campaigns. These efforts were primarily aimed at the protestant working class; for instance, during his second campaign, which began in 1924, the evangelist helped to found the Irish Alliance of Christian Workers (an organization that still exists) to spread the gospel amongst the protestant working class. Many of the workers Nicholson attracted were not churchgoers.²⁵²

During his meetings, Nicholson espoused a theology that resonated with Ulster protestants. Many protestants were wary of the unstable political situation that partition created and were susceptible to the deliverance and millennialism that a revival promised. Working in areas such as the Shankill Road in west Belfast and employing unorthodox methods, like rough, colorful, and “un-Christian” language, Nicholson made an immediate impact. Amazingly, many Ulstermen accepted the message of universal atonement, the promise of being “born-again,” and premillennialism. In addition, extensive newspaper coverage ensured the campaign’s popularity and Nicholson’s notoriety. Nicholson’s revivalism employed populist anti-Catholicism – for instance, he preached that the Free State and the Catholic Church were conspiring to destroy protestant Ulster - which closely associated his message with the local political situation. During Nicholson’s initial campaign, Northern Ireland’s first provincial elections took place. The revivalist’s meetings were held amidst a continual cycle of sectarian street fighting and Irish Republican Army violence. Mark Sidwell has argued that because Nicholson’s preaching

²⁵² Stanley Barnes, *All For Jesus: The Life of W.P. Nicholson* (Belfast: Ambassador Publications, Limited, 1996), 11-103; Mavis Heaney, *To God Be the Glory: The Personal Memoirs of Reverend William P. Nicholson* (Belfast: Ambassador Publications, 2004), 36-38 and 108-111; and Mark Sidwell, “W.P. Nicholson and the Rise of Ulster Fundamentalism,” *Biblical Viewpoint* 28 (April 1994): 93-104.

diverted attention from economic problems and encouraged protestant workers to remain loyal to the Ulster Unionist Party, the protestant ascendancy tacitly supported Nicholson. Sidwell contends the evangelist's second campaign received less evident support from the protestant political and economic leadership because it came at a less contentious time.²⁵³

Nicholson's legacy and his near-prophetic status inspired a devotional renewal amongst a wide spectrum of Ulster evangelicals. These included the Reverend James Hunter, minister of the Knock Presbyterian Church in Belfast, James Kyle Paisley, and W.J. Grier, a young doctoral student at the Presbyterian College, Belfast who had been "saved" during the Nicholson campaign. All three were conservative Calvinists, but because of Nicholson's strong attacks on liberalism and modernism, they overlooked his Arminian idea of unlimited atonement. Like many Irish Presbyterians, Hunter, Paisley, and Greer were concerned over modernism within the Irish and Scottish churches. Nicholson's campaign incited them to act. Although the Presbyterian Church in Ireland had officially condemned Unitarianism and liberal theology during the 1829 schism, support for modernism began to reappear in the late 1800s. For instance, in 1888, Thomas Walker, a professor of Hebrew in Belfast, was found to support German higher criticism, while Magee College in Londonderry dropped its religious test for the academics of its Arts Department. In June 1905, Hunter and the Belfast Presbytery protested the Irish Presbyterian Church's decision to support the United Free Church of Scotland, a new denomination formed out of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland and the Free Church of

²⁵³ Barnes, 60-103, Bruce, 1989, 14-15; Livingstone and Wells, 107-137; and Sidwell, 93-104.

Scotland. The new church did not require its adherents to subscribe to the Westminster Confession.²⁵⁴

During the first two decades of the twentieth century, the theological beliefs of many Irish Presbyterian clergymen and missionaries created friction. Modernist ideas - such as denying any limits on God's mercy,²⁵⁵ insisting that the Bible was not infallible, and that miracles, the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection were mythic truths rather than scientific facts - appeared in a number of Irish Presbyterian publications.²⁵⁶ Hunter took his concerns about the modernist ideas espoused by Presbyterian missionaries to the Assembly and charged the Reverend F. W. S. O'Neill, a missionary to China, with heresy. O'Neill, who professed Arianism and rewrote Biblical tracts in a simpler manner that the Chinese could more easily understand, successfully defended himself.²⁵⁷

The writings that irked Hunter the most, however, were J. E. Davey's *The Changing Vesture of the Faith* (1921) and *Our Faith in God Through Jesus* (1922). Davey, who held the Chair of Biblical Criticism at the Irish Presbyterian College,²⁵⁸ argued that God's grace was available for all, that Christ was not sinless, that the Bible was neither infallible nor the sole Word of God; that there is no original sin, and that Christians should not be required to accept the Trinity as a basis of faith. To Davey, the New Testament did not teach the doctrine of the Trinity. In addition, Davey and Irish Presbyterian liberals supported the ideal of the freedom of

²⁵⁴ Steve Bruce, "Nicholson and Paisley," *Evangelical Voice* 8 (1990): 12-13; and Sidwell, 93-104.

²⁵⁵ Reverend John Waddell, *The Life Here and the Life After* (Belfast: Fisherwick Presbyterian Church, no publication date).

²⁵⁶ Reverend J.T. Anderson, *Talks on the Bible to Sunday School Teachers* (no publication information).

²⁵⁷ The Reverend F.W.S. O'Neill became the moderator of the General Assembly in 1936.

²⁵⁸ The Chair of Biblical Criticism has been renamed the Chair of Old Testament Language, Literature, and Theology.

the individual conscience, even for ordained clergymen. In *The Changing Vesture of the Faith*, Davey argued “Salvation is usually connected with the historic fact of Christ’s death rather than the divine character which it reveals.”²⁵⁹

Hunter took it upon himself to attack what he saw as apostasy and arrogance. In 1926 Hunter began to speak out, drawing large crowds and receiving backing from diverse groups, such as the newly formed Presbyterian Bible Standards League. This support did not prevent a motion of censure against Hunter from the Presbytery of Belfast for his public statements, which broke protocol, or the defeat of Hunter’s appeal to the General Assembly. It was when Hunter charged Davey with heresy that Hunter’s relationship with the Irish Presbyterian Church took a fatal course. W.J. Grier, a student of Davey’s, approached Hunter in April 1926 to complain about the liberal lectures of both Davey and the Reverend James Haire, a professor of Systematic Theology. Using the information Grier supplied, Hunter and the Presbyterian Bible Standards League publicly called for Davey’s dismissal. Once again, Hunter was censured for his public charges and for abjuring the church’s judicial procedures.²⁶⁰

In December, Hunter sought his revenge and formally charged Davey with heresy for teaching theology contrary to the Westminster Confession and for questioning the infallibility of

²⁵⁹ James Ernest Davey, *The Changing Vesture of the Faith* (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1923), 73 and *Our Faith in God Through Jesus; Studies in the Origin and Development of Christian Forms of Belief, Institutions and Observance: Four Apocalyptic Addresses* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1922); and Austin Fulton, *J. Ernest Davey* (Belfast: Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1970), 97-125.

²⁶⁰ Reverend R.J. Beggs, *Great is Thy Faithfulness: An Account of the Ministry of Pastor James Kyle Paisley and a History of the Separatist Testimony in Ballymena* (Ballymena: Ballymena Free Presbyterian Church, no publication date), 11-14; W.J. Grier, *The Origin and Witness of the Irish Evangelical Church* (Belfast: Evangelical Book Shop, 1945), 9-37; and Livingstone and Wells, 53-65. Hunter and his followers also opposed proposed changes to the ordination process: new ministers were no longer asked if they believed in the traditional interpretation of the Westminster Confession or if the Confession faithfully reflected the Word of God.

the Bible. Five charges were brought against the theologian – three lengthy indictments witnessed by W.J. Grier - and under Presbyterian procedure, the church was required to hold a trial at the next General Assembly. The following June, Davey in his defense asserted that Jesus was divine but that his humanity was consubstantial,²⁶¹ that he accepted the Trinity but in a historical sense and not in the strict traditional and fundamentalist context, and that scripture and the Westminster Confession of Faith did not preclude scientific or historical criticism. Wanting to maintain denominational unity over theological purity, the Assembly voted 65 to 11 to exonerate Davey.²⁶² Hunter and his Fundamentalist allies were appalled and appealed the verdict, but the trial and Davey's victory convinced Hunter, Grier and their supporters to withdraw their memberships. In October 1927, they formed a new denomination, the Irish Evangelical Church, a move that preceded Machen and McIntire's denominational schism by a decade. Many fundamentalists within the Presbyterian Bible Standards League, however, did not follow Hunter into the new denomination. Like some conservative American Presbyterians, these clerics chose to confront liberalism and modernism from within the mainstream Presbyterian Church. But there were other Presbyterian fundamentalists who perceived that communion with the church was no longer feasible. These separatists argued that it would be easier to continue to expose and to confront Presbyterian liberal and modernist apostasy from the outside the Presbyterian Assembly.²⁶³

²⁶¹Consubstantiation is the theological doctrine that asserts bread and wine remain in their original form during the Eucharist and are not transformed into the actual body and blood of Jesus Christ. Thus, Davey meant that Jesus was divine spiritually, but not when he was in human form.

²⁶²*Record of the Trial of the Reverend J.E. Davey by the Belfast Presbytery and of the Hearing of Appeals by the General Assembly, 1927* (Belfast: Presbyterian General Assembly, 1927), 4-5.

²⁶³Beggs, 5-14; Grier, 33-58; Livingstone and Wells, 60-69; and Paisley, *My Father and Mother*, 1-10.

JAMES KYLE PAISLEY AND AMERICAN FUNDAMENTALISTS

William Patterson Nicholson's campaigns introduced the Paisley family to the separatist, fundamentalist network. Kyle Paisley's involvement in militantism grew after he became a regular reader of *The Gospel Witness*, the weekly newspaper published by T.T. Shields of Toronto's Jarvis Street Baptist Church. In 1933, Kyle Paisley met the Canadian Baptist and militant fundamentalist who was in Northern Ireland as part of a preaching tour to commemorate the Charles Haddon Spurgeon centenary. Shields, Kyle Paisley and Spurgeon shared a Calvinistic religiosity that also allowed evangelizing to the unconverted; through evangelization the Holy Ghost would lead the Elect to their salvation.²⁶⁴

Shields took much of his preaching style and some of his separatism from Spurgeon, the famous nineteenth-century English preacher whom Kyle Paisley also emulated. Spurgeon's willingness to attack Christian leaders he thought liberal or modernist and his willingness to withdraw from the Baptist Union of Ireland and accept censure for his convictions impressed both Paisley and Shields. Spurgeon called for separation from "apostates," – individuals and denominations - but not from like-minded Christians who remained in their denominations. In a tribute to his parents written nearly fifty years later, Ian Paisley remembered that during his boyhood the Shields and Spurgeon names were revered in the Paisley household.²⁶⁵

A close friendship developed between Kyle Paisley and Shields, as was evident when Shields laid the foundation stone for the new Waveney Road church. They did not agree on

²⁶⁴ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Shields of Canada by Ian R.K. Paisley," 11 November 1967; *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, June 1927, 39-47; and Bruce, 1989, 23-26.

²⁶⁵ Ian H. Murray, *Spurgeon v. Hyper-Calvinism: The Battle for Gospel Preaching* (Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1951), 6-99; and Craig Skinner, *Spurgeon and Son: The Forgotten Story of Thomas Spurgeon and His Famous Father, Charles Haddon Spurgeon* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1999), 79-96. Ian Paisley's older brother was christened Harold Spurgeon Paisley.

every theological issue, however; Shields was not a dispensationalist and espoused a Calvinistic form of fundamentalism that leaned towards amillennialism. Shields saw an apostate and immoral world that needed the redemption of the Second Coming, but in the Calvinist sense that it would only come through God's grace. The Canadian did not believe that Christ would establish his kingdom on Earth, but rather that after his return Jesus would combine Heaven and Earth into Paradise. Kyle Paisley, in contrast, adhered to strict premillennial eschatology.²⁶⁶

Both Kyle Paisley and T.T. Shields were strict moralists, and aggressive evangelicals. They both preached a separatism that argued against modernism and the Roman Catholic Church. In Shields' case, frequent Bible studies and evangelical campaigns, his denunciation of sinful living, such as drinking, gambling, and dancing, and his dictatorial style upset the more moderate (and wealthy) members of his flock. Ten years after his election, the abrasive preacher caused the first split in his congregation, the largest Baptist church in Canada. He also fought the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec over modernism. In the 1920s, Shields attacked McMaster University professors I. G. Matthews and L.H. Marshall for teaching modernist theology and the *Canadian Baptist* for printing liberal editorials.²⁶⁷

According to John Stackhouse, Shields was initially well-respected throughout the American and Canadian evangelical communities. Shields became the president of the Baptist Bible Union of North America, which he organized with William Bell Riley and J. Frank Norris, two important fundamentalist leaders in the U.S. The Bible Union's First General Conference met in Kansas City in May 1925 and included both Canadian Baptists and allies from the Northern and Southern Baptist Conventions. But Shields soon lost support because of his

²⁶⁶ Beggs, 15-24.

²⁶⁷ John Gordon Stackhouse, Jr., "Proclaiming the Word of God: Canadian Evangelicalism Since World War I" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago Divinity School, 1987), 13-33. McMaster University is one of the premiere Baptist schools in Canada.

militant but amillennial stances. For instance, in 1931, Shields orchestrated the expulsion of strict premillennialists from the Union. The Baptist Bible Union purchased Des Moines University in Iowa in 1927, but Shield's dictatorial management and insistence on militant fundamentalism impelled so many students to leave that two years later the university was sold.²⁶⁸

Kyle Paisley took part in similar struggles against the Baptist Union of Britain and Ireland and used the same aggressive style, which he passed on to his son. Three decades later, the Reverend Ian Paisley would utilize this style of confrontation against theological foes and one-time allies alike. The elder Paisley's message attacking apostasy also resonated with his son. Both Kyle and Ian Paisley shared another important theological bond: the willingness to work with Calvinist separatists of diverse denominational backgrounds. Kyle and Ian Paisley would support each other's careers despite Ian's adoption of Presbyterianism. The elder Paisley was invited on numerous occasions to preach to Free Presbyterian congregations, and in 1966 the Waveney Road Church joined the Free Presbyterian Church.²⁶⁹

THE ORDINATION OF THE REVEREND IAN PAISLEY

The Reverend Ian Paisley's religiosity, his crusade as a militant fundamentalist, and his career as a politician are rooted in his childhood and teenage years. Ian Richard Kyle Paisley was born on April 6, 1926, in the city of Armagh. Within the Northern Irish context, there was nothing unusual in the young Paisley's childhood. The Paisley family was not well off, the elder

²⁶⁸ C.A. Rawlyk, *Champions of the Truth: Fundamentalism, Modernism, and the Maritime Baptists* (Montreal: Centre for Canadian Studies, Mount Allison University, 1990), 76-98; C. Allyn Russell, "Thomas Todhunter Shields, Canadian Fundamentalist," *Ontario History* 70 (December 1978): 263-279; Bruce L. Shelley, *A History of Conservative Baptists* (Wheaton, IL: Conservative Baptist Press, 1971), 9-17; and Stackhouse, 13-33.

²⁶⁹ Ian R. K. Paisley, *My Father and Mother* and *The Depths of the Baptist Downgrade: An Exposure of the Infidelity and Unitarianism of the President of the Baptist Union of GT. Britain and Ireland Dr. Howard Williams* (Belfast: Puritan Publications Company, Limited, 1976).

Paisley practiced old-fashioned, stern discipline, and the family was pious. Most of young Ian's relationships were either with family or members of his father's church. It was not exceptional that the younger Paisley came to Christ – or became “saved” – but it is unusual that he did so at age six and after hearing his mother preach. The event gave an early indication to the direction his life would take, and from a young age, Paisley seemed destined for the ministry. Schooling was unexceptional for Ian, although he did well enough to prepare himself for the non-denominational Barry School of Evangelism near Cardiff in Wales, a school run by a fundamentalist Baptist who was a friend of his father. Beginning his religious training at the age of sixteen and in the midst of the Second World War, the young Paisley stayed in Wales for a year before returning to Northern Ireland to attend the Theological Hall of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Ireland as a guest student.²⁷⁰ At both schools Paisley developed a good reputation for public speaking and preaching, skills he promptly made use of at the end of the War.²⁷¹

In the aftermath of the Second World War, Britain saw a revival of church attendance, and in Northern Ireland the interest in Christianity was intense. In the most religious province of Great Britain, northern Irish newspapers routinely carried advertisements announcing church services, and local clergymen were active in social and religious campaigns. Paisley made

²⁷⁰ The Reformed Presbyterians trace their roots back to the 1640 Covenant, adhere to the theology of John Knox, and have a conservative view of contemporary politics.

²⁷¹ Moloney, 2008, 14-16; and Ian R.K. Paisley, *Life's Four Windows: A Sketch of my Life Story, Two Sermons Preached in Martyr's Memorial Free Presbyterian Church on the Thirty-Seventh Anniversary of his Ministry* (no publication information), 6-10. Why Paisley, a staunch Loyalist and Unionist, chose not to enter Britain's war effort is speculative. He was old enough to take part in World War Two's final year, but Ulster protestants did not join the British military in great numbers. There was no conscription in Ulster and Ulster protestants, who had suffered extraordinary high casualties in the First World War, felt that they had done enough for the Union. Because of Paisley's decision not to enter the military in the mid-1940s, there is no record of him using the Allied victory for theological advantage, and he rarely attacked communism until the late 1950s.

important friends around Belfast, such as W.J. Grier, the theological student involved in the Davey heresy trial, and a young minister of the Irish Evangelical Church. Paisley began his ministry as an itinerant, preaching to Irish Evangelical churches, knocking on doors, and appearing at gospel halls and tent missions in Belfast and around the Ballymena area. Paisley presented a simple, fundamentalist message, based on old-fashioned revivalism.²⁷²

During his early period of street preaching, Paisley formalized his preaching and evangelizing technique, utilizing skills learned at school, from his father, and through practice. He combined the American-style emotionalism and “altar calls” used by Moody and Nicholson and the confrontational tactics of Henry Cooke, Thomas Drew, and Hugh Hanna, with a strong Calvinist message against immorality, ecumenism, and modernism.²⁷³

In December 1945, the young evangelist’s career took a fortunate turn when he received an offer to preach to the Ravenhill Evangelical Mission Church. An independent evangelical congregation in East Belfast, Ravenhill’s membership included fundamentalists who had left the Methodist, Baptist and Brethren churches. The Mission church grew out of a split that took place within the Ravenhill Presbyterian Church ten years earlier. During this schism, conservative members withdrew, objecting that some of the girls in the church choir, including the daughter of the church’s minister, were allowed to wear short hair. Paisley quickly became popular with Ravenhill’s congregants because of his strong evangelical and fundamentalist message, his Friday night meetings, and his canvassing of local households and pubs. Paisley was also known for his attacks on the Catholic Church and his rants against the Irish Presbyterian

²⁷² Paisley, *Life’s Four Windows*, 10-14.

²⁷³ Bruce, 1989, 28-38; and Moloney and Pollak, 1-29.

Church's support for ecumenism. By the summer of 1946 and despite his youth, Ian Paisley was invited to become the pastor of the sixty-member Ravenhill mission.²⁷⁴

Paisley's ordination had important connotations, both for his own self-image and for how his future opponents viewed his qualifications as a Free Presbyterian minister. The ordination service that took place in an Irish Evangelical Church in north Belfast on August 1st was not unique, but the gathering did include a wide range of participants. These included Kyle Paisley, Grier from the Irish Evangelical Church, the Reverend Thomas Rowan, a conservative Presbyterian, and T. B. McFarlane, a professor of the Reformed Presbyterian Theological Hall. To Paisley and his supporters, the ordination fit into the Baptist and Brethren tradition. His detractors, however, argued that the ordination did not follow proper Presbyterian procedure; in the future they would argue that Paisley's irregular ordination invalidated his Free Presbyterian ministry. Reformed churches demand a ceremony where the qualifications of the new minister are tested under presbytery guidance, while Baptists leave selection to individual churches. As Steve Bruce points out in *God Save Ulster: The Religion and Politics of Paisleyism*, Paisley was trying to appeal to both the Baptists and the fundamentalist Presbyterians present. The question of the validity of his ordination was not important during Paisley's early career, but as his notoriety grew, Paisley's opponents increasingly pointed to his lack of proper credentials to discredit Paisley's theology and militancy.²⁷⁵

An even more important demonstration of Paisley's connection with militant fundamentalism took place the following week, as Paisley conducted his first service as an ordained minister. During this service, W.P. Nicholson offered a public prayer:

²⁷⁴ Bruce, 1989, 28-38; and Moloney and Pollak, 1-29.

²⁷⁵ Bruce, 1989, 32-34; and Moloney and Pollak 19-24.

I have one prayer to offer this young man. I will pray that God will give him a tongue like an old cow. Go in young man, to a butcher's shop and ask to see a cow's tongue. You will find it sharper than any file. God give you such a tongue. Make this church a converting shop and make this preacher a disturber of Hell and the Devil.²⁷⁶

Paisley's supporters later claimed Nicholson's prayer to be a prophecy of Paisley's career.

Nicholson's occasional attendance at Ravenhill in the 1950s bore witness to his belief in Paisley's future. Nicholson had retired to Ulster and Paisley heard him preach in the Hamilton Road Presbyterian Church and during the evangelist's preaching tour during 1946 and 1947. It is quite possible that the young Paisley was inspired by Nicholson's abrupt style, which attracted people to his meetings. The fundamentalism that Nicholson preached in Northern Ireland in the 1920s and that had influenced Kyle Paisley was undoubtedly passed to the younger Paisley.²⁷⁷

THE GENESIS OF FREE PRESBYTERIANISM IN ULSTER

Paisley's work intensified with frequent prayer meetings, with street evangelism around Belfast, and with the formation of the Free Presbyterian denomination in 1951. In May 1948, Paisley had spoken to the Lissara Presbyterian Church in the small village of Crossgar under the auspices of the National Union of Protestants (NUP), a British political - evangelical organization.²⁷⁸ Paisley's sermon impressed the congregation enough that one member, George Gibson, asked Paisley to preach a gospel campaign to start on Saturday February 4, 1951. The congregation, however, was in the process of appointing a new minister, a procedure that divided the conservative and more liberal members. Because the Reverend Geoffrey Chart, a conservative ally of Paisley's and a speaker for the National Union of Protestants, had been

²⁷⁶ Ian R.K. Paisley, *Nicholson Centenary 1876-1976. From Civil War to Revival Victory* (Belfast: Martyr's Memorial Publishing, 1976).

²⁷⁷ Bruce, 1989, 28-38 and 203-209; Dennis Cooke, *Persecuting Zeal: A Portrait of Ian Paisley* (Dingle: Brandon, 1996), 29-40; Heaney, 139-147; and Moloney and Pollak, 19-28.

²⁷⁸ The political relationship between Paisley and the National Union of Protestants and Ulster Protestant Action, two political-evangelical groups, is discussed in Chapter Ten.

denied the ministerial post, Gibson and other conservative members believed that they were being run out of the church.²⁷⁹

The invitation to Paisley widened the conflict. Expecting a large attendance for Paisley's gospel campaign, Gibson petitioned the presbytery of Down for use of the Church hall. The presbytery initially agreed, but reversed its decision several hours before Paisley was to begin the meeting, claiming that Paisley's appearance violated assembly protocol. (Assembly Rule 254 required prior approval from the presbytery for visiting clerics who were not members of the Irish Presbyterian Church). While the rule was intended to prevent division when one part of a congregation objected to a visiting minister, it was not always invoked. Gibson and a fellow elder tried to countermand the presbytery's order and both were immediately suspended. The day after he had been advertised to preach, Paisley, the two suspended elders, and approximately thirty supporters picketed the Lissara church. They entered the Sunday service while the suspension order was being read and in a grandiose style compared it to the papal bull that asked Luther to repent in 1523.²⁸⁰ They also denounced the timidity of Irish Presbyterian leadership

²⁷⁹ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Elder Joins 'Gospel' pickets in Sunday protest at County Down church," 5 February 1951, and "The New Church of Ulster: Opening Service to-day at Crossgar," 17 March 1951; and *The Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster: Crossgar Congregation* (Belfast: The Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster, no publication date).

²⁸⁰ *The Code: The Book of the Constitution and Government of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland* (Belfast: Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1945), 47-48. Assembly Rule 254 reads: "No Evangelistic Mission in connection with a congregation of the Church, or in premises belonging to a congregation, shall be conducted by any person other than a minister, a licentiate, or a ruling elder of the Church, or an Agent of the Assembly's Committee on the State of Religion, unless and until such person shall have been expressly authorised to undertake such work by the Presbytery of the bounds."

and invoked the memory of Samuel Rutherford²⁸¹, who personified the traditional Presbyterian Church government:

You say it is the Church of our fathers. It is NOT the Church of our fathers. THEY were made of sterner stuff than to tolerate men who betray their trust, and violate their solemn ordination vows. Let us listen to one of these men, the sturdy Presbyterian and saintly Rutherford, who said: "Give not a hair's breadth of truth away, for it is not yours but God's."²⁸²

Although Paisley did hold a gospel campaign in the Crossgar Mission Hall that evening, Gibson and three elders withdrew from the Lissara Presbyterian Church. At a meeting in the mission hall on Killyleagh Street, the four dissidents formed a new congregation. Five weeks later and after a series of meetings, Paisley helped this small group to form the first congregation of the Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster on March 11, 1951.²⁸³ The Articles of the new denomination proclaimed it to be fundamentalist and Reformed and the accompanying manifesto blamed the schism on the liberalism spread by church leaders, most notably Ernest Davey. The document identified the professor's trial and the membership of the Irish Presbyterian Church in the World Council of Churches as the key moments in the transformation of Irish Presbyterianism from orthodoxy to liberalism.²⁸⁴

On April 22, the Ravenhill Mission became the second congregation of the new denomination, now constituted as the Ravenhill Free Presbyterian Church. However, not all members of Paisley's Ravenhill Evangelical Mission Church were interested in becoming Free Presbyterians; when Paisley did maneuver Ravenhill into joining the Free Presbyterian Church, the more independently minded withdrew. Within eight months, two other Presbyterian

²⁸¹ Samuel Rutherford, a Scottish Presbyterian theologian and academic, was also a commissioner to the Westminster Assembly. Rutherford argued that national governments should be Presbyterian, a system Biblically-ordained.

²⁸² *The Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster: Crossgar Congregation.*

²⁸³ Cooke, 1996, 29-40; and Moloney and Pollak, 37-41.

²⁸⁴ *The Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster: Crossgar Congregation.*

churches suffered schisms, and in both instances a minority group seceded to join the Free Presbyterians. The Drumreagh Presbyterian Church in Ballymoney suffered an internal feud between its liberal minister, John Barkley, and evangelicals led by Sandy McAuley. When Barkley left to become the Principal of the Assembly's Theological College in Belfast, McAuley accused William Hyndman, the new minister, of sexual immorality, drunkenness, and physical violence. Consequently, McAuley held meetings outside the church with the help of John Wylie, a member of Ravenhill Free Presbyterian.

The split was once again preceded by a call for Paisley to preach at the church after McAuley and associated evangelicals heard the young evangelist during a gospel campaign in Crossgar. When McAuley and Wylie brought Paisley to the nearby Cabra Schoolhouse in April 1951, the evangelist spoke against Presbyterian modernism and the immorality within the Drumreagh church. This inspired McAuley and a small group to form the Cabra Free Presbyterian Church, meeting at first in a large tent next to the schoolhouse. During the inaugural service for the new congregation, four hundred Presbyterians heard Paisley preach against Professor Davey, apostasy, and the World Council of Churches.²⁸⁵

Soon after, another congregation formed in Rasharkin after that church split over the minister's ill-treatment of his wife. As in Drumreagh, Wylie and a few dissidents held meetings denouncing the minister, the Reverend Ernest Stronge. After listening to Paisley, a group of evangelicals decided to form another Free Presbyterian church.²⁸⁶

²⁸⁵ Ian Paisley to Carl McIntire, 28 May 1951, McIntire Collection, Special Collections, Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries (all letters contained in the McIntire Collection are, at the date of submission of this dissertation, unprocessed and not in the current catalogue of the Princeton Theological Seminary Library); Dennis Cooke, 1996, 29-40; and Moloney and Pollak, 37-41.

²⁸⁶ Karen Heggarty, *From Vision to Victory: The History of the Ballymoney Free Presbyterian Church* (no publication information).

Some of Paisley's detractors have argued that the young preacher took advantage of non-theological disputes to build his new denomination.²⁸⁷ This argument, however, does not explain why so many dissidents left the Irish Presbyterian Church. Paisley's message resonated with those Presbyterians frightened by modernism, ecumenism, and the changing social mores of the post-war period. Steve Bruce notes correctly that Free Presbyterians respected the young Paisley, liked his preaching style, and were concerned about the apostasy in the Irish church. From the start of his ministry, Paisley was not only interested in spreading the Gospel, but also with preaching the proper gospel to those he considered to be God's elect. Under Calvinist theology, this required a public stand against apostasy.²⁸⁸

Between 1951, when the first five congregations were founded, and 1966 when Paisley was committed to jail for the first time, nine more Free Presbyterian churches were formed.²⁸⁹ While the Free Presbyterian Church expanded, it did so in a limited manner and in a restricted geographical area. The first Free Presbyterian churches were, with several exceptions, east of the Bann River and in areas with a substantial Presbyterian population. Bruce notes that Free Presbyterian growth took place in either Ulster's conservative and rural "Bible Belt" – counties Antrim and Down – or in areas surrounding Belfast, Ireland's center of liberal Presbyterianism. The proximity to Belfast is important: fundamentalist and conservative Presbyterians in eastern Ulster were more exposed to the liberal Presbyterianism of the church's leadership, its ministers

²⁸⁷ Moloney and Pollak, 42-51. The authors are two such accusers and base their argument on Paisley's willingness to seize on disputes such as the morality of a minister/pastor or congregant. Moloney and Pollak's argument does not take into consideration that to fundamentalists such as Paisley, immorality and ecumenism both break God's commandments and are all part of the same apostasy.

²⁸⁸ Bruce, 1989, 39-62.

²⁸⁹ Paisley's imprisonment in July 1966 delineates the end of the first spurt of growth for Free Presbyterianism; the new congregations were established due to disaffection with mainstream Presbyterian liberalism.

and professors, and were more willing to act against them than their fellow Presbyterians in western Ulster.²⁹⁰

There is no proof that Paisley had a long-term plan to form his own denomination, but once he did, he was no longer an independent Baptist, with Reformed Presbyterian training; he was in open competition with both the Irish Presbyterian and the Irish Evangelical Churches. The one factor that inhibited the growth of the new church was a shortage of ministers. The exclusiveness of the new church's theology and its militant fundamentalism made it difficult to find competent ministers who strictly adhered to Paisley's convictions. As the Free Presbyterian Church and Paisleyism grew, Paisley needed ministers loyal to his message and crusade, followers who would propagate his interpretation of the gospel. An attempt to send candidates to the Free Church of Scotland theological college in Edinburgh, which the Irish Evangelical Church also used, did not produce the desired results. Within two months after the Free Presbyterian Church was founded, the Edinburgh college agreed to take five Free Presbyterian students, but few were accepted afterwards. This early shortage was partially solved in October 1952 when the new denomination opened its own Bible college, which became an important factor in church growth.²⁹¹

During the first decade of the Free Presbyterian Church, Paisley's stature and notoriety in Northern Ireland grew at a slow, but steady pace. Paisley was making a name for himself through his evangelizing efforts and his work with the National Union of Protestants. But he was known primarily within the protestant church and political community around Belfast and

²⁹⁰ Bruce, 1989, 59-62. The new Free Presbyterian congregations were at Mount Merrion and Sandown Road in East Belfast, and at Whiteabbey, Ballyhalbert, Coleraine, Dunmurry, Limavady and Armagh.

²⁹¹ Paisley, 1989, 46-50.

counties Antrim and Down, and to a small but widening segment of the secular working class community.

PAISLEY'S INTRODUCTION TO AMERICAN MILITANT FUNDAMENTALISM

Paisley's rise in the Northern Irish fundamentalist community came at a time that the Reverend Carl McIntire expanded his international fellowship. Although his relationships in Asia and Latin America proved important, McIntire also became interested in the religious situation within Northern Ireland and the British Isles. McIntire's attacks on the Catholic Church resonated with Irish Protestantism and Northern Irish politics. McIntire developed relationships with many Christians in Northern Ireland; however, his early relationships with W. J. Grier and Norman Porter are the most important. Norman Porter, an unemployed engineer and a fundamentalist Baptist had substantial connections with American militant fundamentalists. When McIntire met Porter, the Irishman was the secretary and treasurer of the Orangefield Baptist Church in east Belfast, and active in the National Union of Protestants and Northern Irish politics. Orangefield professed a strict conservative Calvinism and amillennial eschatology, which helped Porter in his political career. Being amillennial (and not premillennial) enabled evangelicals to more easily support Porter: if he was a premillennial political activities would have subjected Porter to charges of hypocrisy. He was elected to the Northern Ireland parliament in 1953 as an Independent Unionist for Clifton ward, north Belfast. The relationship between McIntire and Porter continued in the 1950s as Porter helped to form the National Union of Protestants,²⁹² Ulster Protestant Action, and the Evangelical Protestant Society (EPS). The EPS affiliated with the British Evangelical Council, which was set up to unite evangelicals, to

²⁹² The National Union of Protestants, founded in 1942 in England, attacked High Church practices within the Church of England, and tried to thwart the perceived Anglican move towards Rome.

propagate the Calvinist and fundamentalist protestant Christian faith, to combat the ecumenical movement, and to protect the Ulster Protestant heritage.²⁹³

McIntire visited Belfast in 1951, where he preached to the Botanic Avenue Irish Evangelical Church. During his stop in Northern Ireland, the American crusader stayed at the home of W. J. Grier, the minister of the Botanic Avenue Church. McIntire returned to the city again in 1955 for a two-day visit, where he spoke to a rally in the Mountpottinger Y.M.C.A. sponsored by the Evangelical Protestant Society. At this meeting, billed as ‘A Special Protestant Rally,’ McIntire talked about the liberal attitude of the World Council of Churches towards ecumenism and the Roman Catholic Church, and the Council’s leanings towards communism. McIntire answered the Irish hospitality and under his auspices Porter and other northern Irish Baptists spoke at ICCC meetings in the United States. For instance, Porter spoke to the ICCC meeting in Philadelphia in August 1954 and at McIntire’s Collingswood, New Jersey church. Visiting clerics, especially important international personalities, lend credence to the importance of any ministry.²⁹⁴

²⁹³ *Introducing the Evangelical Protestant Society* (Belfast: Evangelical Protestant Society, no publication date); J. Claude Macquigg, *The Minnis Mills Tapestry: 1922-1968 Diaries, Warp and Weft of a Local Church* (Belfast: JC Macquigg, 2005), 173-177; and Norman Porter, *He Shall Reign For Ever And Ever: A Brief History of the Orangefield Baptist Church* (Orangefield Baptist Church, no publication date), 3-9. The Evangelical Protestant Society was formed out of the Irish branch of the National Union of Protestants, after Paisley won a legal battle winning the NUP’s Northern Irish assets. Porter and his allies chose to quit the group and drop the NUP name, which Paisley continued to use. The Porter - Paisley political relationship is discussed in pp. 148-159 and in Chapter Ten.

²⁹⁴ email from John Grier; “A Special Protestant Rally,” flier distributed by the Evangelical Protestant Society, March, 1955; and Carl McIntire, *Servants of Apostasy* (Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1955), 347. W. J. Grier was Chairman of Council (Moderator) of the Irish Evangelical Church for the 1942-1943 and 1977-1978 terms, which shows his stature within the denomination (The IEC rotated the office of Chairman on a yearly basis, in the traditional Presbyterian fashion). John Grier, the son of W.J. Grier is the proprietor of the Evangelical Book Shop in Belfast. The shop was founded by James Hunter in 1926.

It is not clear exactly when Paisley first met McIntire, but the earliest publicly accessible correspondence between started immediately after the Free Presbyterian Church was established and after McIntire had been in Belfast to preach to Greer's Botanic Avenue Church.²⁹⁵ During this visit, the American had met Paisley and several members of the Ravenhill Church. By late 1951, Carl McIntire considered the young preacher a "personal friend," and expressed interest in developments within the Northern Ireland fundamentalist community.²⁹⁶

MAURA LYONS AND THE FETHARD-ON-SEA BOYCOTT

In the early 1950s, Paisley spent most of his efforts expanding the evangelizing efforts of the Free Presbyterian Church. He channeled much of his energy into old-fashioned gospel missions or on trips to NUP meetings in England, but some of his focus was directed towards the print media. In April 1955 the Free Presbyterian Church published the first issue of *The Revivalist*, a monthly periodical that gave Paisley and the church a new venue to espouse Free Presbyterian theology and to attack immorality, Protestant liberalism, the ecumenical movement, and the Catholic Church.

The Reverend Ian Paisley was little known outside the fundamentalist and Presbyterian communities in Ulster until noticed by local newspapers in the mid-1950s. Most important was the Maura Lyons controversy in 1957, which made headlines and increased Paisley's notoriety. In autumn 1956, evangelists from the Elim Pentecostal Church were active within the Star Clothing Company in Belfast, a company that employed both catholic and protestant women. They were able to convert Lyons, a fifteen-year-old catholic clothing worker, who they introduced to both Paisley and Norman Porter. The young catholic was afraid to confront her

²⁹⁵ Ian Paisley to Carl McIntire, no date (but marked by McIntire as having been received on 28 May 1951), McIntire Collection.

²⁹⁶ Carl McIntire to Ian Paisley 28 May 1951, McIntire Collection; and Carl McIntire to Ian Paisley, 9 November 1951, McIntire Collection.

family and several Free Presbyterians – including John Wylie - helped Maura flee to England and eventually to Scotland.²⁹⁷

When the press discovered the story, it not only became sensational news, it attracted the attention of the police. Abetting Maura's flight to Great Britain was a criminal offense, but since Paisley was not personally involved in that aspect of the affair, he chose to publicize the controversy with little fear of prosecution. Paisley held a large meeting at the Ulster Hall (a municipal auditorium in Belfast city center) where he played a tape recording of Lyons recollecting her conversion. Paisley received substantial publicity and the press coverage continued as the girl remained in hiding. Despite an initial reluctance on the girl's part and possibly because of Paisley's continued attempts to publicize the affair, Maura Lyons returned to her family the following May. It is clear the Paisley knew more about Maura Lyon's whereabouts than he was willing to tell the police, but he refused to publicly confirm this fact during her stay in Great Britain or to Belfast High Court during Lyons' custody hearing after she returned home. Paisley, however, told the Ulster Hall crowd that he would "do time for Protestant liberty" in order to support Lyon's conversion.²⁹⁸

²⁹⁷ Moloney and Pollak, 67-76. According to Moloney and Pollak, Lyons initially fled to the home of a Free Presbyterian. But since Paisley was on his honeymoon in Scotland, they approached Norman Porter's Catholic Evangelical Fellowship. As Paisley returned home that evening, he quickly ordered his deputy, Wylie, commandeer the operation.

²⁹⁸ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Maura Lyons Papers to Be Sent to Attorney-General," 11 May 1957, "Prayer For Maura at Church Service," 13 May 1957, and "Cases Against Two Clergymen Withdrawn," 6 September 1957; and Moloney and Pollak, 54-76. Although there are many accounts of the Maura Lyons affair, Moloney and Pollak show it in its true light. The event was pure tabloid and their account is written in a tabloid-like format. In *Paisley*, Moloney and Pollak's informative account of the Free Presbyterian preacher, the writers present an interesting side note. About the same time that Maura Lyons returned to Northern Ireland, another girl at the Star Clothing Company converted to Free Presbyterianism. Kathleen Kelly, however, was Church of Ireland and despite Paisley's efforts, the press declined any interest in a protestant switching protestant churches. As Moloney and Pollak point out, catholic to protestant

The Lyons' affair not only began a string of confrontations with civil authority over the next fourteen years, it also increased his notoriety amongst the local population, elevated his stature within the local and international communities of militant fundamentalists, and exposed Paisley's confrontational style. Ed Moloney points out that in Ulster, conversions of catholics to Protestantism were always done quietly. But the publicity surrounding Maura Lyons not only embarrassed many evangelicals, it helped to incite instances of anti-Protestantism in the Republic of Ireland. The most notable of these instances was the Fethard-on-Sea Boycott. The Fethard-on-Sea controversy developed when a protestant woman separated from her catholic husband and took her two children to Belfast. In retaliation catholics boycotted the protestant-owned shops in the town as a means to pressure the woman into bringing the children back to the Republic.²⁹⁹

The Maura Lyons case and the Fethard-on-Sea boycott took place in the midst of an evangelizing battle between protestants and catholics in Northern Ireland that intensified during the 1950s. Paisley and the Free Presbyterian Church, however, were not as active in the efforts directed towards catholics, as were other fundamentalists and evangelists in Ulster. While Paisley was not afraid to confront the Catholic Church, as the Lyons case illustrates, Free Presbyterians did little to convert catholics. Norman Porter, the National Union of Protestants, and Catholic Evangelical Fellowship were much more involved in the battle to "save" catholic

conversions, or vice versa, made headlines in Ireland; changing denominations within the same creed did not.

²⁹⁹ Moloney, 2008, 68-71.

souls. Paisley and the Free Presbyterians were more interested in expanding their church and battling what they perceived to be protestant apostasy.³⁰⁰

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST ECUMENISM AND PROTESTANT “APOSTASY”

Paisley and the Free Presbyterian Church were also concerned about any perceived political threat from Catholicism or any attack on the Northern Ireland statelet, such as the IRA campaign in the late 1950s. Paisley and the Free Presbyterian Church tacitly helped organizations such as the NUP and Ulster Protestant Action to confront political initiatives orchestrated by the Catholic Church or proposed by liberal Unionists. Such issues during the 1950s and early in the following decade included public expenditures on catholic schools, public gestures to the catholic community from Unionist politicians, and the visit of Princess Margaret and the Queen Mother with the Pope in Rome in March 1959. (Queen Elizabeth also met privately with Pope John XXIII in Rome in May 1960).³⁰¹ Paisley, Porter, and other evangelicals also used catholic attacks on Protestant evangelicals in Ireland, as well as instances of political and religious persecution of protestants in catholic countries, as evangelizing tools within the protestant community and as weapons against ecumenism. *The Revivalist*, *The Irish Evangelical* (the organ of the Irish Evangelical Church), and the *Ulster Protestant* (a periodical Norman Porter helped to

³⁰⁰ J. H. Whyte, *Church and State in Modern Ireland 1923-1979* (Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1998), 322-324. Norman Porter worked with the Catholic Evangelical Fellowship to convert catholics to evangelical Christianity.

³⁰¹ *Ulster Protestant*, “Belfast Corporation and the Union Jack,” January 1959, “Another Black Day For Protestant Britain,” March 1959, “Unionism and Romanism,” December 1959, and “Royal Visit to Pope: Shocks Protestant Conscience,” June 1961; and Moloney, 2008, 53. The Unionist overtures to catholics included suggestions that catholics could join the Ulster Unionist Party, as well as talks between the Orange Order and the catholic Nationalist Party.

found) routinely carried stories about persecution of protestants in catholic countries - with particular interest in the 1950s and 1960s on Colombia, Spain, and the Republic of Ireland.³⁰²

But during the 1950s, Paisley's confrontation with what he perceived as apostasy in the Irish Presbyterian Church and with the ecumenical movement brought him the most public attention and elevated his stature among militant fundamentalists throughout the British Isles and in the United States. Paisley consistently attacked Irish Protestant denominations belonging to the World Council of Churches, most vociferously the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Paisley sincerely despised the WCC's goals. The Irish Presbyterian Church's membership in the WCC gave him an easy target to attack and a forum to attract the militant evangelicals of Northern Ireland. Paisley's public targets also included the British Council of Churches (the British branch of the WCC), J. Ernest Davey, who was made Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly in 1952, and Donald Soper, President of the Methodist Church in England. These attacks were at first confined to Paisley's pulpit, but in early 1952 – a year after he first met the Reverend Carl McIntire - Paisley began orchestrating public protests.³⁰³

³⁰² Examples are: *The Irish Evangelical*, "A Protestant in Spain," September 1957; *Ulster Protestant*, "Five Ulster Counties Struck Eleven Times by I.R.A. Gunmen," January 1957, "Oppression of Protestants in Spain," June 1957, "N. Porter Visited the Village of Fethard-On-Sea," August 1957, "Ulster Government Subsidises Romanism," October 1957, "Bible as Football – Preachers Molested in "Christianity-Steeped" Town: PROTESTANTS OF ULSTER TAKE NOTE!," October 1958, "Orange Leader Trapped," October 1962, and "Fresh Reports on Colombian Persecutions," January 1960.

³⁰³ *Presbyterian Herald*, "A Bible Week" in Dublin," April 1954; *Church of Ireland Gazette*, "Conference on Church Unity," 2 January 1959; and Dennis Cooke, *Peacemaker: The Life and Work of Eric Gallagher* (Peterborough: Methodist Publishing House, 2005), 71-84. The *Annual Report of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland* had an 'Inter-Church relations' section, while the annual *Minutes of the Methodist Conference* contained a 'Co-operation with Other Churches,' section throughout the 1950s. Throughout the 1950s, ecumenical activities within Ireland were restricted to more mundane matters: inter-denominational Bible studies and youth groups, inter-church relations, cooperation between Presbyterians and Methodists in rural areas of Ulster and in the Republic where church attendance could not support more than one church, and support for the World Council of

Paisley's first public demonstrations took place outside a British Council meeting in Belfast in April 1952, and two months later in front of the General Assembly, as Irish Presbyterians elected Ernest Davey Moderator. In front of the Assembly, Paisley burnt copies of Davey's books and articles, a tactic mimicking those McIntire employed in demonstrations against the World Council of Churches. In a sermon delivered three years later, while the June 1955 General Assembly was in session, Paisley appealed to Presbyterians to leave both the church and the Student Christian Movement. Paisley's message resonated with some students, as the students belonging to the Evangelical Union - a union of Presbyterian seminary students - also attacked Davey and refused to pray with other members of the Student Movement. The attack drew attention from the Assembly for its schismatic nature: in a speech to the Assembly, the Right Reverend John Knowles, the outgoing moderator, blamed the actions of the students on unnamed outside influences, an obvious reference to Paisley and the Free Presbyterian Church.³⁰⁴

Paisley's protests and demonstrations brought him the legal trouble Paisley seemed to desire. Paisley's first arrest took place in 1957 in Donaghadee. Cited for making a public disturbance and summoned to court, Paisley and John Wylie used megaphones to evangelize

Churches. Such cooperation was generally limited to the Presbyterian and Methodist churches and included sharing the costs of building new churches and maintaining older ones, as well as joint worship services. Irish ecumenism was basically a theological exercise amongst clerics. For instance, in December 1958, a series of informal three-day conferences began at the Murlough House in Dundrum, outside Dublin, between Church of Ireland, Congregationalist, Methodist, and Presbyterian leaders to discuss church unity. For a good overview of the Irish ecumenical movement see: Eric Gallagher and Stanley Worrall, *Christians in Ulster 1968 – 1980* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982). For the history of ecumenism in England see: Adrian Hastings, *A History of English Christianity 1920-1990* (London: SCM Press, Limited, 1991).

³⁰⁴ *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland* (Belfast: Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1955); *Belfast Telegraph*, "Students Threaten To Divide Church," 7 June 1955, and "Bigger Church Division on the Way He Says: Views of Free Presbyterians," 8 June 1955; and Moloney, 2008, 50-57. It is interesting to note that the Paisley-led protests in 1952 were not mentioned in the *Belfast Telegraph*.

along the town's beaches. Their court appearance and the dismissal of the charges made the Northern Irish press, which increased Paisley's prestige amongst his supporters.³⁰⁵

Paisley and his allies were also deeply concerned with the modernism and social activism of the churches on the British mainland. A major target was Dr. Donald Soper, who dabbled in politics, espoused socialism and a radical social gospel, and talked fondly of Russian Premier Khrushchev. Soper had been an outspoken pacifist during the Second World War, remained active in the Labour Party, sat on the London City Council, and was active in left-wing social campaigns such as the Peace Pledge Union and the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. The Methodist liberal and future British Lord, who regularly spoke at Speaker's Corner in Hyde Park, preached a modernist theology, including denying the divinity of Christ and the Virgin Birth. He was also a major supporter of ecumenism. In August 1959, Soper spoke at an open-air meeting in Ballymena. Paisley, John Wylie, and Harold Magowan, the minister of the Antrim Free Presbyterian Church, arrived with banners attacking Soper. The protestors heckled and argued with the Methodist cleric for close to an hour. Soper taunted the Free Presbyterians by calling them "intellectual rabbits," and praised Soviet communists for being more Christian than these fundamentalists. During the confrontation, Soper was prevented from speaking to the audience, and one layman, Joseph Kyle of Ballymena, threw a Bible at the English Methodist. Paisley's notoriety was such that he was accused of throwing the Bible himself. The following day, Wylie and members of Ulster Protestant Action again heckled Soper as he tried to speak at Carlisle Memorial Methodist Church in Belfast.³⁰⁶

³⁰⁵ Moloney, 2008, 79-80.

³⁰⁶ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Dr. Soper Speaks in Belfast Blitz Sq: Stop H-Bomb production call," 19 April 1954; and Moloney and Pollak, 81-89.

Three weeks later, Paisley, the two Free Presbyterian ministers, and the two laymen were summoned to court under the Public Order Act for interrupting a public meeting. Two hundred spectators watched as Desmond Boal, a Loyalist barrister from the Shankill Road, Belfast and future political ally of Paisley's, defended the preacher, while two hundred more waited outside.³⁰⁷ Each defendant was fined five pounds, but the following Sunday Paisley told a packed Ravenhill Church that he would refuse to pay. The size of the congregation and the three hundred who could not enter the church that morning indicated Paisley's growing support amongst militant fundamentalists in Northern Ireland. The next day, George Allport, the owner of a small Belfast magazine, *The Unionist*, paid the fine for the three clerics, arguing that a prison sentence for either Paisley or the two ministers would upset Unionist solidarity in the upcoming British General Election. Allport stated that he disagreed with Paisley's tactics, but expressed some sympathy with Paisley's message.³⁰⁸ Paisley was disappointed in his inability to become a Protestant martyr: "This is a complete surprise to me. Our prophecy that the people behind the persecution would pay the fine, has come true. My attitude is still the same. We wish to go to jail. I was not consulted about the payment, otherwise I would have opposed it stoutly."³⁰⁹ The court case and Allport's payment made the front pages. The news reports were the biggest media coverage Paisley enjoyed in his early career, and was an ominous indication of the growing notoriety Paisley had gained outside of Free Presbyterian churches.

³⁰⁷ Desmond Boal helped to co-found the Democratic Unionist Party with Paisley in 1971, was an associate of Norman Porter (Boal and Paisley first met in the Belfast office of the Evangelical Protestant Society), and represented Mrs. Cloney, the protestant woman involved in the Fethard-on-Sea boycott.

³⁰⁸ *Belfast Telegraph*, "The Dr. Soper Incident – Free Presbyterians Summoned," 21 August 1959, "Queues for Case Against Free Presbyterians," 2 September 1959 and "Applause As Paisley Says 'I Won't Pay,'" 7 September 1959; Bruce, 1989, 71-3; Marrinan, 65-73; and Moloney and Pollak, 93-96.

³⁰⁹ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Fines Paid for Three Free Presbyterian Clergymen," 8 September 1959.

Two months later, a smaller incident in Coleraine, which was also covered in the *Belfast Telegraph* and involved Free Presbyterians, but not Paisley, showed how easy it was for the new church to receive press. During a council meeting, the mayor of Coleraine charged that the Free Presbyterian church allowed its ministers to attack other protestant churches during public meetings and to use loudspeakers on top of moving cars. Previously, such actions would not have made the Northern Irish press.³¹⁰

Such publicity, however, was a double-edged sword. At times, Paisley received a hostile response. In March 1960, Paisley was jeered at Queen's University during a meeting sponsored by the University Labour Group where the Free Presbyterian discussed the aims of Ulster Protestant Action. The Labour Group usually attracted thirty people, but because of Paisley the meeting drew a group of 350 students and visitors. Some shouted republican slogans or asked questions such as "What about Maura Lyons?"³¹¹

In late October 1960, Paisley and John Wylie held a protest against Dr. George MacLeod, the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and another future British Lord, during the Scotsman's short speaking tour of Ulster. MacLeod led an experimental ecumenical community on the island of Iona, where participants lived communally and traded ideas on how the church should deal with the modern, industrialized world. The Iona community also allowed visiting clerics to hold church services, using their own rituals. Paisley and Wylie were incensed that a Greek cleric had been allowed to celebrate an Orthodox Mass. The Free Presbyterians charged that MacLeod and Iona were promoting a return to Catholicism. The two Free Presbyterians organized a protest when MacLeod spoke at the Delrada Grammar

³¹⁰ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Free Church Ministers Come Under Attack," 2 November 1959.

³¹¹ *Belfast Telegraph*, "'Sieg Heils' Greet Rev. Ian Paisley: Uproar at Queen's Univ. Meeting," 8 March 1960.

School in Ballymoney and after he had finished his talk on the Iona community peppered MacLeod with questions. MacLeod was also prevented from speaking in Coleraine when the Elders' Fellowship of the Coleraine Presbytery, influenced by Paisley and the protests, withdrew his invitation.³¹²

In March 1961, twelve Free Presbyterians picketed the Donegall Square Methodist Church when Bishop Sante Uberto Barbieri, the Methodist Bishop of Argentina and the President of the World Council of Churches, spoke. The following month, they picketed Dr. Stanley Jones, the American missionary attacked by McIntire and the House Un-American Activities Committee the previous decade, who was speaking at the Carlisle Memorial Methodist and at the McCracken Memorial Presbyterian churches in Belfast. Dr. Jones, who had sympathized with communism in the 1930s and denounced the bombing of Germany in the Second World War, compared Free Presbyterian tactics to those of the Soviet Union.³¹³

In March 1962 the new Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, Dr. Archibald Craig, made a visit to Rome to attend the centenary celebrations at St. Andrew's Kirk, but also held talks with the Pope, the first of many visits from British clerics. Although essentially courtesy calls, Craig's visit, the subsequent visits by the Anglican Archbishops Fisher and Ramsey, and that of Reverend Leslie Donaldson, the President of the British Methodist Conference, were to Paisley part of a large conspiracy by ecumenical Protestant leaders to sell-

³¹² *Belfast Telegraph*, "Iona Community Head Banned in Coleraine: Elders' Fellowship Oppose Visit," 24 October 1960.

³¹³ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Belfast Church Service Picketed by Free Presbyterians," 10 March 1961, and "Dr. Jones Answers the Free Presbyterians: U.S. Missionary Called near-Red," 10 April 1961.

out Protestantism to Rome. Two years later, Jack Glass and Paisley joined Scottish militant fundamentalists to protest outside the Scottish General Assembly.³¹⁴

In May 1962, Paisley returned to the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, leading a protest outside the General Assembly in Belfast that denounced the membership of the Irish Presbyterian Church in the WCC. In October 1962, Paisley protested the talk in Coleraine by the Reverend Austin Fulton, ex-Moderator of the Irish Presbyterian Assembly, when Fulton discussed his trip to India to attend the World Council of Churches conference. Although Paisley believed the press was trying to downplay the crusade of the Free Presbyterian Church, by mid-1962, the efforts of the Free Presbyterians and their militant fundamentalist allies were beginning to create division within the Methodist and Presbyterian churches in Ireland. The continued ecumenical efforts and the exploratory talks on church unity by protestant leaders were inciting a more vocal opposition within the Presbyterian Church.³¹⁵

In the early 1960s, developments within the British Anglican community also upset Paisley and British militant fundamentalists. A movement of High Church Anglo-Catholics within the Church of England – which had been active since the 1920s - wanted to reinstall more Catholicism into Anglican practice and theology. Their support for sacraments, vestments and a more Catholic prayer book worried Irish Anglicans, who were generally more evangelical and “Low Church.” Irish fundamentalists outside the Church of Ireland were generally unconcerned with the Anglo-Catholic movement until the Church of England decided to send observers to

³¹⁴ *Belfast Telegraph*, “Scottish Moderator See Pope,” 28 March 1962; *The Scotsman*, “Moderator Arrives in Rome: Vatican Visit Will Do Good,” 22 March 1962, “Pope to Meet Moderator at the Vatican,” March 20, 1962, and “Pastor Glass to Protest Against His Former Ally,” 15 June 1976; *Ulster Protestant*, “Another Betrayer of Protestantism!” March 1963; and Marrinan, 54-70.

³¹⁵ *Protestant Telegraph*, “Paisley Pickets at the Assembly” 7 June 1962; and Gallagher and Worrall, 32-33.

Vatican II. The Church of Ireland initially planned to send observers, but under pressure from Irish Anglicans, decided against the move.³¹⁶

The decision by English Anglicans upset protestants in Northern Ireland, none more so than Paisley. To Paisley, Anglican-Catholic rapprochement threatened the constitutional link between Northern Ireland and Great Britain. The Church of England and the protestant nature of the British monarchy were important elements within the British Constitution and the British Empire and a historical connection to the English Reformation. To Low Church Anglicans and Paisley, the prospects of an Anglican-Catholic rapprochement could influence British politics, allowing for more Catholic presence in parliament and the prospect of a Catholic Prime Minister.³¹⁷

Although Archbishop of Canterbury Geoffrey Fisher's talk with the Pope in December 1960 lasted less than an hour, it was the first time that an Anglican leader had visited Rome. In addition, Fisher's visit came only twenty months after that of the Queen Mother and Princess Margaret. When the 100th Archbishop of Canterbury, Michael Ramsey, proposed to modernize the Book of Common Prayer and use new experimental forms of worship for a period of seven years, and to decide these matters without the consent of parliament, the concerns of Low Church Anglicans and North Irish protestants seemed prophetic. Many protestants viewed it as the opening shot of an Anglican-Catholic reunion.³¹⁸

In August 1962, Paisley announced that his church would counterattack by visiting Rome during the Vatican conference and distributing 15,000 Italian-language copies of the Gospel According to John. Accompanied by two Free Presbyterian ministers, John Wylie and John

³¹⁶*The Revivalist*, "Romanism and the Romanisers in Church of Ireland Exposed," December 1964; and Adrian Hastings, 193-205 and 522-531.

³¹⁷ Paisley, *The Battle of the Reformation*.

³¹⁸ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Dr. Fisher is in Rome For Historic Meeting," 1 December 1960; and *Ulster Protestant*, "Reformers Betrayed," December 1960, and "The Lambeth Prophet," February, 1961.

Douglas, the British, Northern Irish and Italian press extensively covered Paisley's visit to Rome in October. In fact, the BBC interviewed Paisley in London while he was in transit to Rome, despite the preacher's protest on October 7th outside Broadcasting House in Belfast, the BBC's headquarters in Northern Ireland. Approximately one hundred supporters had watched Paisley nail two posters to the building that proclaimed: "The BBC, the Voice of Popery," and another denouncing the BBC's refusal to air his denunciations of the Vatican Council and the Pope. The Italian and Vatican authorities were thus warned of Paisley's intentions and they detained the three clerics for questioning.³¹⁹

Paisley's proposed Vatican trek impressed his followers and his American allies, and consequently in August 1962 Paisley and the Free Presbyterian Church were invited to the annual convention of the McIntire-led International Council of Christian Churches in Amsterdam. The focus of the militant fundamentalist meeting was to protest the Third Assembly of the World Council of Christian Churches, held in New Delhi the previous year. By attending the International Council meeting in Amsterdam, Paisley and the Free Presbyterian Church expanded their fellowship with American militant Fundamentalists.³²⁰

Although the new friendships would add a new dimension to the contentious triangular relationship between Paisley, northern Irish fundamentalists and the clerics of the mainstream Protestant denominations, it is interesting to note that during the 1950s there was one instance when some Irish and British modernists and militant fundamentalists agreed. This was their opposition to American "New Evangelical," neo-fundamentalist revivalists and evangelists who came to the British Isles, most notably the Reverend Billy Graham. At first Paisley, Norman

³¹⁹ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Anglican Observers to Visit Vatican: Rome Council Invitation is Accepted," 5 July 1962, "A Very Protestant Plan for a Vatican Visit," 23 August 1962, and "Rev. Ian Paisley Protests at BBC," 8 October 1962.

³²⁰ Cooke, 1996, 124-126.

Porter, and McIntire cautiously supported Billy Graham, and the Free Presbyterians criticized J. Ernest Davey for denouncing Graham's gospel as "a rather old-fashioned form of the Protestant faith." Paisley, McIntire and other militant fundamentalists, however, grew to dislike Graham because of his willingness to cooperate with clerics and churches considered in apostasy, and because of Graham's opposition to predestination. Graham stood on the extreme Arminian side of the orthodox theological spectrum. Graham's ministry became associated with the New Evangelism of the Fuller Theological Seminary in California, which pushed a theology of traditional evangelism and social action, and utilized worship services that mixed a fundamentalist message with emotional music and altar calls.³²¹

The Billy Graham Crusade drew millions throughout the British Isles. While protestant churchmen across the theological spectrum supported Graham for the interest his revivals garnered in Christianity, both militant fundamentalists and modernists were hostile. They both disliked Graham for his revival techniques and considered his emotional conversion calls shallow and temporary. Paisley and militant fundamentalists particularly despised the advice Graham gave to converts. Crusade prayer leaders told new Christians that it was acceptable to remain within their home denominations, including the Roman Catholic Church. But jealousy might have been another motive for Paisley's envy: during the 1950s, the press that the Free Presbyterians received was not as substantial or as positive as the news reports on Graham's crusades.³²²

³²¹ George Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelism* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987), 45-93 and 157-171. Billy Graham, however, was not very involved in social action; his primary focus was to "save" souls.

³²² *Belfast Telegraph*, "Crusade Organiser in Belfast," 1 April 1955, "Dr. Shuler Will Choose Belfast Topic Tonight," 15 June 1955, "Billy Graham Has Set Back Religion," 24 July 1956, and "Billy Graham: 'Negligible Impact'," 18 November 1957; *Protestant Telegraph*, "Is

The popularity of Billy Graham and the success of his crusades contrasted with the limited acceptance of the revivalist and militant fundamentalist message of the Reverend Ian Paisley and the Free Presbyterian Church. Paisley and the Free Presbyterians only made the news when they caused a disturbance, unlike Graham whose Christian message drew millions and inspired a new ‘born-again’ experience for thousands of attendees. The militant fundamentalist opposition to Graham’s tactics and theology illustrates the parameters to what Paisley and like-minded fundamentalists considered true revivalism. Paisley and the Free Presbyterian Church would restrain emotionalism within church services and during public meetings. In addition, a proper revival had to be based on a Calvinist message, which was designed to attract the Elect and to support Ulster Protestantism’s position as part of God’s chosen people.³²³

MILITANT FUNDAMENTALISM IN ULSTER

As the Reverend Ian Paisley’s ministry grew and his fellowship with American militant fundamentalism became increasingly important, Paisley’s relationships with Irish fundamentalists began to deteriorate. During the early 1950s, animosity between Paisley and other Irish fundamentalists developed as Paisley established his ministry and began to build the Free Presbyterian Church.³²⁴ Paisley was upset because the Irish Evangelical Church (IEC) would not support his new church and would not let him preach to their congregations. He was also concerned over the IEC’s contact with non-separatist fundamentalists. For their part, the Irish Evangelicals believed Paisley was divisive to the fundamentalist community, and despite

Billy Graham Also Amongst the Pro-Romanists?” 18 June 1966, and “Billy Graham Sends His Converts Back to Rome,” 24 June 1967; and Gasper, v-viii.

³²³ *Irish Presbyterians, the Downgrade Continues!* (Belfast: The Free Presbyterian Church, 1955).

³²⁴ Much of the conflict came down to a contrast in style. While Paisley was willing to attack fellow fundamentalists he believed to be apostate, both verbally and in print, other Northern Irish fundamentalists thought such assaults should be limited to liberal and modernist Protestant clerics.

previous support, they would not let him preach in their churches. In addition, the Irish Evangelical Church argued that Paisley should have joined their small denomination, and went so far as to denounce the founding of the first Free Presbyterian Church at Crossgar. Paisley also accused the Irish Evangelical Church of conspiring to force his resignation from the National Union of Protestants. The IEC backed the NUP's new treasurer, Reverend Eric Borland of the Irish Presbyterian Church, despite the fact that the Irish Presbyterians belonged to the World Council of Churches, and banned Paisley from speaking at their annual convention.³²⁵

The trouble with Porter and the IEC had transatlantic implications. Carl McIntire tried to balance his interest in the new Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster with the demands of the ICCC, and took on the role of mediator. While Paisley warned McIntire that not all members of the National Union supported the work of the International Council, McIntire wanted the relationships between the Free Presbyterian Church, Norman Porter and the Irish Evangelical Church to be harmonious; peace in Northern Ireland would benefit the ICCC. Shortly after meeting Paisley in 1951, McIntire wrote to the young clergyman inquiring why his new church had not joined with the Irish Evangelicals. Paisley replied that the IEC was not vibrant, that they despised his fervent style of ministry – for instance, his all-night prayer meetings – and that the *Irish Evangelical* refused to cover Paisley's ministry. Paisley also complained about the Irish Evangelical's semi-apostasy: "our greatest danger in Ulster is not the modernists, but professed evangelicals who try to malign our work, either because they are actuated by jealousy, or want to walk the middle road of compromise."³²⁶ McIntire replied that he was concerned over Paisley's criticism of Porter and W.J. Grier, and argued that all true evangelicals must work together: "we

³²⁵ Ian Paisley to Carl McIntire, 28 June 1951, McIntire Collection; Carl McIntire to Ian Paisley, 8 October 1951, McIntire Collection; and Ian Paisley to Carl McIntire, 7 March 1952, McIntire Collection.

³²⁶ Carl McIntire to Ian Paisley, 4 October 1951, McIntire Collection.

are brethren and by the grace of God we must and should get along together. I do not want to become involved in the differences and difficulties which you are having locally.”³²⁷ When Grier helped to plan a conference in Edinburgh the following spring, and was reluctant to allow Paisley to attend, McIntire gave Paisley further conciliatory advice:

I do hope that you will go to him as a real brother. You are going to have to learn to work together with other brethren who differ with you in various matters but are agreed concerning the great doctrines of the faith. You can build your work without tearing down the Irish Evangelical work or their church. Ireland is big enough. We are protestants...³²⁸

This was curious advice from a cleric as divisive as McIntire. While the American militant fundamentalist was willing to confront members of the American Council of Christian Churches that he found in apostasy, McIntire appeared overly concerned with local infighting that could harm the ICCC.

The dispute in Northern Ireland was of limited importance to McIntire until the Free Presbyterian Church began inquiring about membership in the International Council of Christian Churches. The Irish Evangelical Church had informed the ICCC that they would resign from the Council if the Free Presbyterians were admitted. In a letter to A. Warnaar, Jr., the director of the ICCC, W.J. Grier warned that that his church had no respect for Paisley: “Ian Paisley is an ecclesiastical adventurer...changes his viewpoints when necessary...specifically his position on baptism...first Paisley is a Baptist, then a pedobaptist, now Free Presbyterian...leaves it an open question how he is a Presbyterian...”³²⁹

Paisley had his own concerns about the company that the International Council of Christian Churches was keeping in the British Isles. He wrote to the organization’s headquarters in

³²⁷ Carl McIntire to Ian Paisley, 11 March 1952, McIntire Collection.

³²⁸ Carl McIntire to Ian Paisley, 8 April 1952, McIntire Collection.

³²⁹ W.J. Grier to A. Warnaar, Jr. (ICCC/Amsterdam), 4 February 1953, McIntire Collection.

Amsterdam and questioned the theological orthodoxy of some ICCC members, complained that others were in the World Presbyterian Alliance – an apostate organization – and asked why a vice president of the International Council had preached in a Belfast church affiliated with the World Council of Churches. Kyle Paisley also wrote to McIntire and questioned why Norman Porter and the Irish members of the ICCC were trying to recruit the Baptist Union of Ireland into the Council, a group from which Paisley’s father split in the 1920s. The elder Paisley also inquired why Grier, Porter, and the Irish Evangelical Church were working to stop attendees to an ICCC conference in Edinburgh from speaking at his Baptist church or those of the Free Presbyterians.³³⁰

In May 1956, Warnaar notified the Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster that its application to the International Council of Christian Churches would be denied as long as the Free Presbyterians feuded with both the IEC and the Evangelical Protestant Society. Warnaar noted that the Free Presbyterian Church was doctrinally correct, but that they must cooperate with other fundamentalists in fellowship with the ICCC. While McIntire was on the International Council’s credentials committee, the group also included Grier and Porter and the American militant had to acquiesce to the collective decision. McIntire was no stranger to controversy and under different circumstances he might have taken Paisley’s side. In the mid-1950s, however, the Irish Evangelical Church and the Evangelical Protestant Society were more important to his international crusade against apostasy and communism than were Paisley and the young Free Presbyterians.³³¹

³³⁰ J. Kyle Paisley to Carl McIntire, 18 March 1955, McIntire Collection.

³³¹ Ian Paisley to A. Warnaar, Jr., no date (but with a notation by Warnaar as have receiving the letter on 1 December 1953), McIntire Collection; and A. Warnaar, Jr. to Ian Paisley, 17 June 1956, McIntire Collection.

The friendship between McIntire and Ian Paisley developed cautiously and grew out of a shared theology - a mutual dislike of Catholicism, modernism, and Communism - and an interest in each other's activities. For instance, in March 1952, McIntire inquired why the Free Presbyterian Church would no longer send students to study under the Free Church of Scotland. Paisley wrote back to complain that the Free Church had reneged on its promise of help made immediately after the Crossgar schism in 1951, and that the Scots were spreading false testimony about the incident.³³² Paisley kept McIntire informed of his demonstrations and activities against the Irish Presbyterian Church and the World Council of Churches. By the late 1950s, however, McIntire became more interested in Paisley's campaign against modernism and ecumenism in Ireland. In 1957, the *Christian Beacon* reprinted articles taken from *The Revivalist* that denounced Billy Graham. But it was the Free Presbyterian attack on Donald Soper in Ballymena and Belfast that particularly sparked McIntire's interest. The affair drove McIntire to ask why "this valiant for the truth (Paisley)", who "courageously exposes the W.C.C." was not in the International Council of Christian Churches.³³³

McIntire's enthusiasm for Paisley took another positive step in 1961 when the British Isles suffered its own controversy over new Bible translations. During that year, the work of four committees representing translators and literary advisors from all of Britain's major Protestant denominations was published. The *New English Bible*, which replaced the *English Revised Version*, went beyond a simple revision and retranslated the New Testament into modern

³³² Ian Paisley to Carl McIntire, 23 August 1951, McIntire Collection; Ian Paisley to Carl McIntire 7 March 1952, McIntire Collection; Carl McIntire to Ian Paisley, 11 March 1952, McIntire Collection; and Dennis Cooke, 1996, 108-111.

³³³ While there are no letters between McIntire and Paisley about the Soper incident, McIntire's file containing his correspondence with Paisley contains press clippings on various topics of interest including Ballymena. In the file, McIntire kept a copy of the front page of the 3 September 1959 edition of the *Ballymena Daily Telegraph*, whose headline blasted Paisley's refusal to pay the fines against the Free Presbyterian clergymen.

colloquial English. Paisley promptly attacked the new translation. In April 1961, McIntire purchased 7000 copies of Paisley's pamphlet, *The New English Bible – A Version or Perversion?* to distribute to his followers. In a letter to Norman Porter, McIntire expressed his pleasure with Paisley's pamphlet, which must have pressed home to Porter Paisley's rising stature with the militant fundamentalist leader. Christian clergymen honor each other in several important ways: one is to invite a respected cleric another to preach to their congregation and another is to purchase another's writings. When a prolific writer and speaker, such as McIntire does this, the symbolism is profound.³³⁴

While McIntire's interest in Paisley grew, he still had to consider the ICCC as a whole and take the different relationships into consideration. McIntire wanted to retain a strong relationship with Porter and the Irish Evangelical Church; in correspondence with Norman Porter, McIntire praised Grier: "we truly love that brother." It appears in early 1961 that Paisley asked McIntire to come to Northern Ireland and take part in a joint evangelistic crusade, but McIntire declined the request as the ICCC would not back an effort to which either Porter, the Evangelical Protestant Society, or the IEC would object. In this manner, McIntire made an effort to retain the bond between Porter, Grier and the International Council of Christian Churches. McIntire

³³⁴ Carl McIntire to Norman Porter, 20 April 1961, McIntire Collection; *Christian Beacon*, "Presbyterian Minister in Ireland Publishes New English Bible Review," 27 April 1961; and Ian R. K. Paisley, *The New English Bible: Version or Perversion?* (Belfast: Free Presbyterian Church, 1961). Paisley objected to numerous items concerning the new translation. Most importantly, Paisley despised the fact that Professor C.H. Dodd, a Welsh New Testament scholar whose views on eschatology militant fundamentalists considered heretical, was in charge of the project. Numerous colloquial retranslations caught the attention of detractors, such as in Genesis 1: 1-2 "a mighty wind" replaces "the Spirit of God" and Acts 20:7 "Saturday night" replaces "first day of the week." The article is the earliest that mention of the Reverend Ian Paisley in the *Christian Beacon*.

reiterated to his northern Irish allies the ICCC's position that the Free Presbyterian Church could not join the international organization until Paisley reconciled with both men.³³⁵

By the spring of 1962, however, the Irish Evangelical Church resigned from the ICCC. W.J. Grier and his church disliked the strict exclusionist policy of the organization and McIntire's autocratic style. A frustrated Porter remained on the International Council's executive committee, but complained to McIntire that Paisley's public hostility was hurting his attempts to convince the Baptist Union of Ireland to join the international organization. In return, Paisley did not understand why Porter, who was the president of the Baptist Union of Ireland in 1962, would keep his denomination within the apostate Baptist World Alliance. Paisley also inquired why Porter continued fellowship with subsequent Baptist Union presidents, especially Dr. Howard Williams who espoused modernist tenets. Paisley criticized the Baptist Union of Ireland on two additional points. First, the Union sold a booklet written by Reverend (and British Missionary Society secretary) J.B. Middlebrook that denied that salvation came through Christ's crucifixion, and second, the Union invited Middlebrook to speak at Antrim Road Baptist Church in March 1963. Paisley claimed that Porter began a behind-the-scenes campaign to discredit him, citing a letter Porter wrote to Pastor William Mullan of Lurgan Baptist Church denouncing the Free Presbyterian. A closer look gives credence to Paisley's charge: in the letter, Porter argued condescendingly that the Free Presbyterians were acting as if they were members of the International Council of Christian Churches. To illustrate his point, Porter charged that Paisley's denomination regularly distributed ICCC literature, although it was

³³⁵ Carl McIntire to Norman Porter, 14 March 1962, McIntire Collection.

not a member of the organization. However, in Paisley's defense such actions are common within the militant fundamentalist community and rarely draw negative comment.³³⁶

Although Norman Porter was still being invited to North America to preach, and Americans such as Harvey Springer were going to Ulster to conduct evangelical campaigns with Porter, the Free Presbyterians were gaining more notoriety than Norman Porter or the Evangelical Protestant Society. Paisley's growing fame, however, could not stop Springer, a member of the International Council of Christian Churches, who was aware of the Paisley – Porter feud, from appearing with Porter. As an independent Baptist, Springer still found common ground with his fundamentalist Irish counterpart.³³⁷

At the same time, important events were happening in the world of ecumenism and McIntire saw the need for strong allies, such as Paisley and the Free Presbyterians. The World Council of Churches held a third Congress in New Delhi in late 1961, while the Roman Catholic Church prepared for the Second Vatican Council. The aspect of the New Delhi assembly that upset militant fundamentalists was the WCC's proposal to merge with the International Missionary Council, the admittance of the Russian Orthodox Church as a member and the renewed call for church unity.³³⁸ To counter these threats, the International Council of Christian Churches organized its Fifth Plenary Congress in Amsterdam and geared up for a series of counter-demonstrations.³³⁹ It was under these circumstances that McIntire invited the Reverend

³³⁶ Norman Porter to Carl McIntire, 5 April 1961, McIntire Collection; and Paisley, *The Depths of the Baptist Downgrade*.

³³⁷ *Western Voice*, "Pray For Ireland," 5 August 1965 and "Highlights From Ireland," 16 September 1965.

³³⁸ David P. Gaines, *The World Council of Churches: A Study of its Background and History* (Peterborough, NH: Richard R. Smith Company, Inc., 1966), 1007-1019.

³³⁹ Carl McIntire to Ian Paisley, 19 April 1961, McIntire Collection; and Carl McIntire to Norman Porter, 15 April 1965, McIntire Collection.

Ian Paisley and the Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster, and Kyle Paisley and the Gospel

Tabernacle to Amsterdam as observers, an invitation the elder Paisley was happy to accept:

I am planning to be present at the fifth Plenary Congress 1962...We are Bible-Believers and hold the Historic Reformed Faith. We are in the mist (sic) of Apostasy, and nothing short of a Twentieth Century Reformation will meet the need of the hour. You are doing great work. Wishing you every blessing in the name of the Lord.³⁴⁰

The invitation in 1962 to the Free Presbyterian Church and J. Kyle Paisley to attend the ICCC's Fifth Plenary Congress in Amsterdam as observers was an important event in Paisley's international ascent. During this conference, the Paisleys and the Free Presbyterians were invited into the International Council. It was in Amsterdam that the Reverend Ian Paisley met Bob Jones, Jr, for the first time, a relationship that within six years would transcend the Paisley-McIntire friendship.

Several months after visiting Amsterdam, Paisley travelled to Rome to protest the opening of the Second Vatican Council. The trek, which took place in October 1962, added to the publicity Paisley and the Free Presbyterian Church received throughout the British Isles and within the international militant fundamentalist community. In a letter to McIntire, Paisley inquired whether the American militant leader would be in Rome and invited McIntire to Northern Ireland for a gospel campaign.³⁴¹ McIntire and the International Council heartily supported the trip to Rome, as McIntire wrote to Paisley: "If you could put on an effective demonstration you will get the most world-side (sic) publicity that anyone in our movement has ever had. I wish I had the money to send you so you could take 100 men from Ireland."³⁴²

McIntire wrote to Norman Porter about the crusade to the Vatican: "of all the places in the world, Ireland is where it ought to come. It seems to me, Norman, that with your Roman Catholic issue

³⁴⁰ J. Kyle Paisley to Carl McIntire, 14 March 1962, McIntire Collection.

³⁴¹ Ian Paisley to Carl McIntire, 25 September 1962, McIntire Collection.

³⁴² Carl McIntire to Ian Paisley, 29 September 1962, McIntire Collection.

in the North of Ireland, with the WCC developing like it is, there ought to be some very fine openings in the North of Ireland.” McIntire referred to the chances to confront the perceived tyranny of Rome.³⁴³ Norman Porter’s backing of Paisley’s effort, however, was more cautious. While stating that his group would not accompany the Free Presbyterians to Rome - Paisley’s planned demonstrations adequately represented Northern Ireland - Porter also warned that if the ICCC backed the protest, it would hurt the efforts of the International Council amongst Christians in Great Britain.³⁴⁴

After the Free Presbyterian Church was given ICCC membership in February 1963, the feud between Paisley and Norman Porter and the Irish Evangelical Church intensified. Many militant fundamentalists in North America still supported Porter, and he continued to be a frequent speaker in the United States and Canada and a contributor to the militant press. In September 1965, the *Western Voice* published a front-page article describing Dr. Springer’s trip to Northern Ireland.³⁴⁵ Paisley, however, was gaining a higher-level of support from militant fundamentalists within both the British Isles and from the international community. Paisley’s emerging power was such that leaders like McIntire did not want to alienate the Free Presbyterians. The *Christian Beacon* began a more extensive coverage of the Free Presbyterian Church.³⁴⁶ But

³⁴³ Carl McIntire to Norman Porter, 2 October 1962, McIntire Collection.

³⁴⁴ Norman Porter to Carl McIntire, 28 September 1962, McIntire Collection.

³⁴⁵ *The Christian Beacon*, “Norman Porter to Give Devotions at 6th Plenary Session of the ICCC,” 10 June 1965; *The Gospel Witness*, “Why Bible-Believing Baptists Cannot Join the Ecumenical Movement: Address by Mr. Norman Porter Delivered at the International Baptist Conference, Mulhouse, France, August 4, 1965,” 25 November 1965; and *Western Voice*, “Highlights From Ireland,” 16 September 1965. For instance, Porter gave the opening devotion at the sixth Plenary Session of the ICCC in August 1965, and was a featured speaker three years later at the Fundamental Baptist Congress of North America in Cincinnati. Porter and the Evangelical Protestant Society also remained in the International Council of Christian Churches.

³⁴⁶ e.g. *Christian Beacon*, “Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster Acts in True Protestant Tradition,” 28 February 1963. The article covers Paisley’s protests against British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan’s visit to the Vatican.

Paisley showed little interest in finding common ground with Porter and the Irish Evangelical Church. Instead, in letters written to McIntire between November 1963 and February of the following year, Paisley outlined his new complaints: Grier allowed ministers of the Irish Presbyterian Church to preach from his pulpit, most notably Donald Gillies, a fundamentalist who would not leave his denomination. In addition, Porter and W.J. Grier attended dinners at which Catholics and ecumenical professors from the Irish Presbyterian College were present, placing both Ulstermen in ecumenical communion with apostates, and the Irish Evangelical Church hired Robert Cleland, a former Free Presbyterian officer excommunicated for sexual immorality.³⁴⁷ In these letters, Paisley attacked Porter and the Evangelical Protestant Society for their membership in the National Association of Evangelicals. Paisley also did not like the fact that Porter was an officer in the British Missionary Society and was the chairman of the British Evangelical Council - two apostate organizations - and that Porter criticized the Strict Baptist Churches, a group consisting of twenty-six congregations from the various regions of the British Isles. Paisley believed that these controversies were drawing sarcastic comments in Northern Ireland from clergymen associated with the World Council of Christian Churches; to Paisley, the snide insinuations were embarrassing the Twentieth Century Reformation in Ulster.³⁴⁸

The Paisley - Porter feud finally culminated in the official withdrawal of the Evangelical Protestant Society from the International Council of Christian Churches in May 1967. McIntire,

³⁴⁷ Ian Paisley to Carl McIntire, 28 November 1963, McIntire Collection; and Ian Paisley to Carl McIntire, 1 February 1964, McIntire Collection.

³⁴⁸ *Christian Beacon*, "Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster, Ireland Acts in True Protestant Tradition," 28 February 1963; *Gospel Witness*, 18 July 1968; *New York Times*, "Modernist Clerics Assailed at Parley," 16 August 1962; Ian Paisley to Carl McIntire 8 September 1962, McIntire Collection; Carl McIntire to Ian Paisley, 29 September 1962, McIntire Collection; Carl McIntire to Ian Paisley, 4 December 1963, McIntire Collection; Ian Paisley to Carl McIntire, 2 February 1964, McIntire Collection; Brian Green and Ian Paisley to Carl McIntire, 4 May 1965, McIntire Collection; Carl McIntire to Ian Paisley, 13 May 1965, McIntire Collection; and Adrian Hastings, 522-531.

however, needed to retain allies in the British Isles and the International Council of Christian Churches. His relationships with many militants – in America and elsewhere - had soured and he was therefore reluctant to break all fellowship with Norman Porter. He asked Porter to reconsider the withdrawal of the EPS: “Please don’t go away this way. You and Paisley are brothers in Christ, washed in His blood and with Paisley being used by God as he is today, there is a way of understanding on your local level. I am sure the Babylon Church is upon us and the current that is taking all back to Rome is broadening.”³⁴⁹ According to McIntire, the feud between Paisley and Porter was a plot orchestrated by the Catholic Church. Paisley’s growing importance, however, effectively sidelined Porter. By the spring of 1968, when Paisley attended his third Bible Conference at Bob Jones University, Norman Porter had ended his fellowship with the North American militant fundamentalist community and restricted his religious and political affairs to the British Isles.³⁵⁰ During the summer of 1970, Porter immigrated to Australia. To the militant fundamentalist community, the Reverend Ian Paisley had become the primary proponent of Bible Protestantism in Ireland.³⁵¹

³⁴⁹ Carl McIntire to Norman Porter, 12 May 1967, McIntire Collection.

³⁵⁰ Norman Porter to Carl McIntire, 22 November 1966, McIntire Collection; Evangelical Protestant Society to A. Warnaar, Jr./International Council of Churches, 8 May 1967, McIntire Collection; “Bible Conference Speakers,” Archive Research Center, Bob Jones University, Greenville, SC; and Porter, 3-9.

³⁵¹ *Protestant Telegraph*, “Ecumenical Porter,” 29 August 1970.

CHAPTER 6 THE CRUSADE AGAINST O'NEILL AND ECUMENISM

Until the early 1960s, Paisley's notoriety was confined to the Northern Irish religious community and to a small group of militant fundamentalists in North America and Great Britain. But during the five-year period between 1963 - when Terence O'Neill was elected the leader of the Ulster Unionist Party and appointed the Prime Minister of Northern Ireland – and August 1968 when the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association took their message to the streets of Ulster, Paisley became well known throughout North America and the British Isles. Paisley's confrontation with O'Neill and the civil rights movements propelled him from a little-known but vocal proponent of militant fundamentalism in Northern Ireland, into a respected figure amongst the international community of militant fundamentalists. Paisley believed that O'Neill's overtures to the catholic community constituted "political ecumenicalism." To Paisley such a policy was tantamount to inviting the Roman Catholic Church into Northern Ireland's political, cultural, and economic relationships. Paisley also believed that the Roman Catholic Church and Irish republicans organized the civil rights movement. These beliefs transformed his religious crusade against Irish Protestant ecumenism and liberalism into a political campaign against the O'Neill administration and catholic civil rights.

Before March 1963, Paisley's activism was primarily concerned with spreading the militant fundamentalist gospel and confronting apostasy in the Anglican, Methodist, and Presbyterian Churches.³⁵² The Free Presbyterian Church espoused a traditional Calvinism and was interested

³⁵² During the 1960s, ecumenicalism as an international movement was concerned with three basic concepts: Church unity, cooperation among Protestant denominations, and discussions between Protestant churches and the Roman Catholic Church. In the British Isles, ecumenicalism took place in two regional settings, talks amongst the various English, Irish, and Scottish churches and between the Church of England and the Catholic Church. Because the

in spreading the Gospel, not confronting political issues. The Church addressed social issues only when they threatened Calvinist mores. Yet events were underway that galvanized Northern Irish fundamentalists and set the stage for Paisley's move into politics in the 1960s. The acceptance of the British welfare state in Northern Ireland, the reappearance of Irish republican terrorist activity in 1956, and the revitalization of the ecumenical movement seemed part of a political conspiracy organized by the Roman Catholic Church and communists to destroy Irish Protestantism.³⁵³

While Northern Irish militant fundamentalists did not see an urgency to political action in the 1950s, the viewpoint changed after 1963 when Terence O'Neill, the Northern Irish Prime Minister, began a campaign to modernize the Ulster economy and to find a rapprochement with Catholics throughout the island. The Protestant opposition to O'Neill and the "Catholic conspiracy" was diverse, but a small vocal group dominated the discourse: these were the "Paisleyites" led by the Reverend Ian Paisley. Paisleyites objected to O'Neillism, a program designed to eliminate the economic and political divisions that beset Northern Ireland. O'Neill attempted to reconcile the policies of the Protestant-run Northern Ireland government – designed to maintain Protestant economic and political control – with the aspirations of the province's Catholic minority.³⁵⁴

Church of England was the established church in England and because the British constitution required the royal family to remain Protestant, the talks between the Vatican and Canterbury were of great interest to the Protestants of Northern Ireland.

³⁵³ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Romans Recruit Reds," 7 March 1970; and Bruce, 1989, 1-17.

³⁵⁴ *Belfast Telegraph*, "'Civil Rights' – Then Communism," 17 May 1969; and *Christian Beacon*, "Papal Pattern for World Church Emerges," 8 July 1965.

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND TO PAISLEYISM: THE NORTHERN IRELAND STATELET 1922 – 1963

Created in December 1922 from six of Ulster's nine counties, the Northern Ireland statelet was a political arrangement designed to prevent a catholic-protestant civil war. The agreement did not settle Ireland's sectarian problem, however, or create a harmonious relationship between the British Empire and the new Irish Free State. The partitioning of Ireland and the establishment of the Irish Free State were only intended as short-term solutions; both the British and Irish governments reasoned that economic necessity and political reality would drive northern Irish protestants to unify with the south. However, the creation of two parliaments, one in Belfast controlled by protestants (Stormont) and the other in Dublin dominated by catholics (The Dail), made reunification unlikely. Both parliaments were given the power to veto unification and consequently the British government could not force Stormont to unite with the Irish Free State against its will. To retain the Union with Great Britain, the protestants in the north needed to control a majority of the seats in the Stormont assembly.³⁵⁵

Political developments over the following three decades did not help the impasse. In 1937, Articles 2 and 3 of the Irish Free State's new Constitution asserted its jurisdiction over Northern Ireland. The withdrawal of the Free State from the British Commonwealth and the creation of the Republic of Ireland in 1949 reinforced protestant defiance in Ulster and forced the British parliament to pass the Ireland Act (1949), which reiterated Northern Ireland's political position within the United Kingdom. The British government felt the need to reassure the protestants that Northern Ireland would not be forced out of the Union.³⁵⁶

³⁵⁵ Bardon, 1992, 479-485.

³⁵⁶ Bew, Gibbon, and Patterson, 1995, 81-110; and Michael Farrell, *Northern Ireland: The Orange State* (London: Pluto Press, 1976).

The Catholic identity of Irish nationalism grew more pronounced after partition, as the protestant element within Irish nationalism dissipated. The Irish Constitution of 1937 granted the Roman Catholic Church a special position in the culture and politics of the nation. Although the Catholic Church in Ireland did not receive a state endowment, Catholic social policy quickly interposed itself into government policy. Protestants believed that the political culture in the Free State was designed to drive protestants out of Ireland entirely. The Censorship of Films Act (1929) and the Criminal Law Amendment Act (1935) which prohibited the sales or importation of contraceptives, both reflected Catholic morality. The Catholic Church oversaw the education of the vast majority of catholic children and the Catholic hierarchy objected to catholics attending Anglican Trinity College. The hierarchy's defeat of the Mother and Child Scheme in 1950 revealed its political power.³⁵⁷

Deeply threatened by the "Catholicization" of the Free State, protestants in Ulster based their cultural identity on an affinity with British and imperial culture. The Ulster Unionist Party (UUP) and the protestant ascendancy wasted little time in creating in Northern Ireland a protestant state for a protestant people. Protestants solidly voted for the UUP. The Party, which retained power from 1921 until Stormont was suspended in 1973, imposed economic and political restrictions on the catholic minority to impel catholics to emigrate in order to seek employment. A vital part of the protestant plan involved local government councils, which were reconstructed and their boundaries redrawn to ensure that protestants maintained control over urban and rural councils with large catholic populations. To retain segregated working-class

³⁵⁷ Patrick Murray, *Oracles of God: The Roman Catholic Church and Irish Politics, 1921-1937* (Dublin: University College Press, 2000), 108-169; and Whyte, 1-46 and 196-238. The Mother and Child Scheme required free compulsory health testing for children and a choice of doctor, but the hierarchy attacked the scheme as contrary to Catholic social teaching, and asserted that the scheme would lead to abortion and birth control. In response, the government dismissed Browne as health minister.

neighborhoods, public housing allotments were doled out at the discretion of local councillors. Protestant and catholic councilors gave preference to protestant and catholic constituents, respectively.³⁵⁸

The constant threat of Irish Republican Army (IRA) violence – despite a lull in 30s & 40s – and the existence of a minority population disloyal to the new statelet, created a sense of embattlement among Ulster protestants. To help combat the IRA, the armed Ulster Special Constabulary was established in September 1920 to supplement the unarmed local police forces. In April 1922 the *Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Act (Northern Ireland)* gave the government of Northern Ireland the authority to take any step necessary to preserve law and order, including the suspension of habeas corpus and the internment of suspected terrorists.³⁵⁹

Catholics in the north unwittingly helped the Stormont government by insisting on a separate educational system for their children and by accepting both the benefits of the public dole and ineffective political leadership. Catholic politicians acquiesced to the corrupt public housing system and concentrated their political efforts on eliminating partition instead of fighting for catholic political rights within Northern Ireland and improving catholic living conditions. By the 1950s, as the British welfare system implemented a standard of living better than in the Republic of Ireland, catholics in Northern Ireland were generally complacent. Most rejected the IRA's border campaign (1956-1962) and some quietly supported the Union between Northern Ireland and Great Britain.³⁶⁰

³⁵⁸ John Harbinson, *The Ulster Unionist Party 1882-1973: Its Development and Organization* (Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 1973).

³⁵⁹ *Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Act (Northern Ireland), 1922* (Belfast: HMSO, 1922).

³⁶⁰ John Biggs-Davison and George Chowdhary-Best, *The Cross of St. Patrick: The Catholic Unionist Tradition in Ireland* (Abbotsbrook, UK: The Kensal Press, 1984), 385-394; and John A. Oliver, *Working at Stormont* (Dublin: Institute of Public Administration, 1978).

However, the Ulster Unionist Party's dominance did not go unchallenged. Economic problems weakened protestant working class support for the Northern Ireland government. During the 1930s, unemployment rose as high as 27 percent, causing riots that witnessed instances of support between catholic and protestant workers. The refusal of Stormont to integrate into Britain's government-controlled war production during the Second World War helped to create a surge of protestant electoral support for independent Unionist populists and the Northern Ireland Labour Party (NILP). The NILP won two seats in Belfast, and forced the UUP to implement most British social welfare policies, although the British treasury paid a majority of the expense. By the end of the 1950s, Northern Ireland's economy was in recession and the North Ireland Labour Party made significant inroads into the protestant vote. In 1962, the vote for the NILP peaked, with the party receiving 28 percent of the votes cast in Belfast and capturing four Stormont seats.³⁶¹

O'NEILLISM

When Terence O'Neill took office on March 24, 1963, he inherited the governance of a province that was at an economic, political and cultural crossroads. On the one hand, the Ulster Unionist Party's hold onto power, and the union with Great Britain seemed secure and community relations had improved. Tension between the protestant and catholic communities had relaxed, as sectarian violence declined. Most catholics did not support the Irish Republican Army campaign in the late 1950s, the nationalist minority was increasingly complacent towards unification and catholics were more willing to accept the British welfare state. In the early 1960s, some moderate Unionists proposed that their party allow catholic membership, while the

³⁶¹ Bardon, 1992, 467-612; Bew, Gibbon, Patterson, 1995, 81-110; and Marc Mulholland, *Northern Ireland at the Crossroads: Ulster Unionism in the O'Neill Years 1960-9* (London: MacMillan Press, Limited, 2000), 12-27.

Orange Order and the Nationalist Party - the constitutional catholic party – were engaged in conversations over community relations.³⁶²

But the local economy faced difficulties. Employment opportunities within Northern Ireland's three main industries - shipbuilding, linen and agriculture - were in sharp decline, which created a politico-economic dilemma for the UUP. As the local economy stagnated, Northern Ireland's government was straining to finance welfare benefits during a time of declining tax revenues. Increasingly Northern Ireland relied on the British government to finance its budget. These economic difficulties translated into increased political competition for the Ulster Unionist Party and for the Northern Ireland Labour Party to gain votes amongst the protestant working class in Belfast.³⁶³

To remedy the economic situation and to keep his party in power, O'Neill looked to foreign investment, which required both the support of the catholic minority and improved relations with the Republic of Ireland. In order to achieve this goal, O'Neillism proposed limited political, economic and cultural gestures towards the catholic community. O'Neill made overtures to the catholic community, such as visiting catholic hospitals and schools, and inviting the Catholic Bishop of Down and Connor to the Belfast City Hall for a reception. While these efforts might seem trivial, in the Northern Irish context, they were significant indeed. O'Neill was the first Northern Ireland prime minister to reach out to the catholic community. Catholics responded positively: in February 1965 the Nationalist Party decided to participate fully in Northern Irish politics and agreed to become the official opposition at Stormont. The O'Neill administration

³⁶² Mulholland, 1-11.

³⁶³ Mulholland, 38-57.

also devised several economic plans to improve the province's infrastructure, as well as programs of limited urban renewal and designs for a new university.³⁶⁴

While many Catholics and moderate Protestants showed appreciation for O'Neillism, the far-reaching reform program created expectations within the Catholic community that Northern Ireland's government could not meet. Civil rights leaders and social activists demanded more than O'Neill could deliver without alienating the Protestant community. Most importantly, O'Neillism did not address the core demands of the minority community for more public housing, voting rights in local council elections for all citizens, the elimination of gerrymandering in Londonderry and other cities with a large Catholic population, and reform of the Royal Ulster Constabulary.³⁶⁵

To make matters worse, the Unionist leader could not restrain radical elements within his Party and the Protestant community. O'Neill met political opposition from the UUP right-wing and from working-class loyalists, but more importantly, he inspired an outcry from Paisley. Of all the opponents to O'Neill's policies, it was Paisley who made the loudest and most active response; Paisley opposed virtually every liberal and conciliatory move that the O'Neill government made with denunciatory sermons, public speeches, and public demonstrations. The combination of O'Neill's inability to thwart Paisley's crusade against political liberalism and his

³⁶⁴ Bardon, 1992, 633; Mulholland, 12-44; and Terence O'Neill, *The Autobiography of Terence O'Neill* (London: Granada Publishing, Limited, 1972), 153. These plans included: *The Matthew Report* (October 1962) to develop a new city, Craigavon, to facilitate industrial development; *The Wilson Plan* (July 1963), a £900 million scheme for new housing, water and sewage infrastructure, education, health services and new roadway; and *The Lockwood Report* (1964) to establish a second university for Northern Ireland.

³⁶⁵ Coogan, 1995, 60-81.

demonstrations against the civil rights movement, and the slow implementation of social and economic reforms, created a violent reaction from the catholic community.³⁶⁶

The Paisleyite and militant fundamentalist assault on O'Neill began three months into the new Prime Minister's administration. On June 3, 1963, William Jenkins, the Lord Mayor of Belfast, flew the flags at City Hall at half-mast to honor the death of Pope John XXIII and O'Neill sent an official condolence to Cardinal William Conway, the Catholic Archbishop of Armagh. The next day an outraged Paisley preached to four hundred supporters at the Ulster Hall, after which he led an illegal march to city hall to protest what he described as the defilement of the building. Because they had failed to get a police permit for traditional marches, Paisley and six supporters were summoned to court. Seven weeks later, Paisley held another meeting at the Ulster Hall where he threatened: "There is going to be trouble in this city before this whole matter is over."³⁶⁷ The next day, Paisley led a procession of Free Presbyterians to the Belfast Petty Session Court, where he pleaded not guilty and made a spirited defense. The preacher cross-examined a RUC District Inspector and demanded the appearance of the Lord Mayor to answer several countercharges. The whole event made good press, but Paisley was found guilty and given the choice of a ten pound fine or two months in jail. Once again, Paisley promised to accept the jail time, but an English businessman, Peter Courtney, anonymously paid Paisley's fine and those of four colleagues were paid.³⁶⁸ Although skeptics in Ulster believed that Paisley knew who paid the fines, he protested in a telegram to O'Neill that the Unionist

³⁶⁶ Bardon, 1992, 631-634; Moloney and Pollak, 115-133; and Mulholland, 8-92.

³⁶⁷ *Belfast Telegraph*, "I Want Lord Mayor as Witness – Paisley," 25 July 1963.

³⁶⁸ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Summons Against Reverend Ian Paisley," 8 July 1963, and "I Won't Pay Fine, Says Mr. Paisley," 26 July 1963; *Ulster Protestant*, "Protest March Leads to Court: Minister Fined," August 1963; and Moloney, 2008, 106-108.

administration did so to sabotage his attempted “martyrdom” and to minimize the impact his imprisonment would create:

Congratulations to you (O’Neill), the Minister of Home Affairs, the Crown Solicitor, the police and the Unionist Lord Mayor, on not permitting your own law to take its course, and on arranging for my fine to be paid. No Surrender!³⁶⁹

Paisley was inspiring contentious acts from supporters. John Wylie conducted a religious service near a Gaelic football pitch in predominately catholic Dunloy and was assaulted by catholic residents. Both because Gaelic football is associated with catholic nationalism (catholics almost exclusively play the sport), and of the demographics of the town, the service was provocative. Paisley’s rising notoriety led to death threats and the church on Ravenhill Road was vandalized - both acts the Free Presbyterians blamed on catholic activists. In September 1963, windows at his church were damaged despite a police guard, and Paisley claimed he received death threats through the mail.³⁷⁰

The following April, an edition of the *Belfast Telegraph* publicized Paisley’s claims, which he reiterated to a crowd of 2,000 supporters in the Ulster Hall who were commemorating the Larne gun-running incident in April 1914. Paisley also used the Larne commemoration to accuse the *Belfast Telegraph* of bias and to declare a crusade of “No Surrender.” Basing his message on Daniel 3:18³⁷¹ - all of Paisley’s public meetings start with and are based on a passage of Scripture - Paisley interpreted the words “we will not serve thy gods” to mean “no surrender” for Ulstermen. After this flurry of publicity, the next three months were fairly uneventful for

³⁶⁹ *The Revivalist*, “Fines Paid, Editor and His Colleagues Not to Go to Prison,” September 1963.

³⁷⁰ *Belfast Telegraph*, “Rev. Ian Paisley Tells of Threats,” 27 April 1964; and Moloney, 2008, 106-108.

³⁷¹ This effort had enabled Ulster protestants to land over two hundred tons of armaments and 24,000 guns, to arm the Ulster Volunteers and to thwart the implementation of Irish Home Rule. “But if not, be it known unto thee, O King, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou has set up.” (King James Version)

Paisley, except for his wife's campaign for alderman,³⁷² his denunciations of the Belfast press for anti-protestant bias, and Paisley's own consistent attacks on the ecumenical movement.³⁷³

When the Fisherwick Presbyterian and University Road Methodist Churches in Belfast invited two Catholic priests to speak to the youth clubs of their respective congregations in the spring of 1964, Paisley threatened "monster" demonstrations. Despite support from their church bodies, both churches felt it best to abort their plans. Reverend John Withers of Fisherwick explained his reasons:

Fortunately it was not possible to record the strident, hysterical, even filthy abuse which has been hurled at me through the telephone, for such a record would be a grim embarrassment to my friends in the Presbyterian Church who differ from me in love and understanding. They would be ashamed of the company they are forced to keep. All persecution, apartheid, and discrimination are born of fear or insecurity, and my love of Christ, while not perfect, is strong enough to cast out all fear of the Pope of Rome or any other self-appointed Pope. I am so glad that the 'monster demonstration' has been called off, for we already know the 'Monster.'³⁷⁴

Although many clergymen condemned Paisley as a religious bigot, he did find support from more traditional Presbyterians who asserted that defending the Reformation was not intolerant. Most notable were the Reverend Donald Gillies of the Agnes Street Presbyterian Church in Belfast – a cleric Paisley had denounced to the Reverend Carl McIntire - and from Presbyterian members of the Evangelical Protestant Society. Despite their past differences, Paisley also found support from within the Evangelical Presbyterian Church,³⁷⁵ but these Presbyterian fundamentalists argued that Paisley was not the only protestant who objected to the presence of

³⁷² Mrs. Paisley's early political career is discussed in Chapter Ten.

³⁷³ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Protestant Paper Needed, Says Paisley," 17 August 1964; and Ian R. K. Paisley, *Souvenir Booklet: The 50th Anniversary of the Larne Gun-Running. Thanksgiving Service on Sunday, 26th April, 1964 in the Historic Ulster Hall* (Belfast: Puritan Printing Company, 1964).

³⁷⁴ *Fisherwick Messenger*, "Fisherwick Involved in Controversy," April 1964.

³⁷⁵ Formerly the Irish Evangelical Church, the denomination changed its name in March 1964.

the Catholic priests. Probably because of the notoriety he received and partially due to the vindication he must have felt, Paisley wrote to Carl McIntire and boasted of his victory over Presbyterian apostasy and Roman Catholicism.³⁷⁶

In October 1964, Northern Ireland's political parties participated in a British General Election that many expected the Labour Party to win. Historically, the Conservatives had been more attached to the Union with Northern Ireland than Labour, and during the run-up to the election campaign Labour party leader Harold Wilson made public comments promising to extend social justice to Catholics in Northern Ireland. Because of the economic difficulties, the Ulster Unionist Party expected a strong challenge from the Northern Ireland Labour Party. In addition, the mixed constituencies of Belfast expected unusually tense electoral battles. Northern Ireland uses the British system of "winner takes all" for national elections, and because a majority of Protestants voted for the UUP and a majority of Catholics voted Nationalist, only the seats in constituencies with a mixed Catholic – Protestant population were strongly contested between the Unionists and the Nationalist Party. During the election, the UUP faced Northern Ireland Labour Party opposition in Belfast for seats in areas with a Protestant majority.³⁷⁷

One of the bigger fights loomed in West Belfast, an area that included Catholic and Protestant voters. The election pitted the Republican Billy McMillen, an NILP candidate, and Jim Kilfedder of the Ulster Unionists, against Harry Diamond, a founder of Republican Labour. Because of Protestant unemployment the Belfast shipyards – which were located in the electoral

³⁷⁶ Ian Paisley to Carl McIntire, 1 February 1954, McIntire Collection; *Belfast Telegraph*, "No Tolerance in Protesting, They Say," 10 February 1964; *The Irish Evangelical*, "Fisherwick Session and the Word 'Evangelical,' March 1964, and "Protestant Councilors Who Went to Mass Attacked," 22 June 1965; and *The Revivalist*, "Free Presbyterian Protest Stops R.C. Priests' Inter-Church Meetings," February – March 1964, and "Protest March Stops Ecumenical Meeting in Church of Ireland, Carnalea, Bangor," May 1965.

³⁷⁷ Moloney and Pollak, 114-117; and Mulholland, 44-49.

district – the Ulster Unionist Party was concerned over losing protestant votes to the NILP. During the short election, the UUP looked for any situation that would help the Unionist vote. They found one when McMillen displayed an Irish tri-colour in the front window of his campaign office, located on Divis Street, a small street close to city center. While flying the Irish flag was not illegal, the Royal Ulster Constabulary could cite the *Flags and Emblems (Display) Bill (Northern Ireland), 1954* and demand the removal of any flag or symbol that was deemed a threat to public order.³⁷⁸ A *Belfast Telegraph* article publicized the appearance of the flag and Paisley decided to take up the defense of protestant honor. Holding a rally in front of City Hall on September 27th, Paisley threatened to lead a march to seize the Irish tri-colour, a move that would have undoubtedly created sectarian violence. Paisley backed down, however, when the Minister of Home Affairs, Brian McConnell, banned the march. While at this time Paisley was willing to confront Protestant churches, he seemed unwilling to orchestrate public violence.³⁷⁹

Hoping to thwart the street fighting that would result and at the same time appease Paisley, the RUC removed the flag the following morning. Unfortunately, a small group of catholic teenagers, who had been expecting the Paisley march, were waiting and a series of battles broke out with the police. During the day, the number of catholic rioters expanded to an estimated 2,000. Three days later serious trouble broke out again, when McMillen once again displayed the tri-colour and the Royal Ulster Constabulary once again removed it. The fighting involved water cannons, petrol bombs, and reportedly a few members of the Irish Republican Army. While the trouble spread to other cities, including Enniskillen, Dungannon and Coleraine, the

³⁷⁸ *Flags and Emblems (Display) Bill (Northern Ireland), 1954* (Belfast: HMSO, 1954).

³⁷⁹ *Belfast Telegraph*, “Republican Sympathisers Block Road: Scenes in Divis Street” 30 September 1964; and Moloney and Pollak, 114-117.

violence on Divis Street was the worst that Northern Ireland had seen since the early 1930s. In retrospect, sectarian feeling had become more intense: the Divis Street riots convinced some younger catholics, such as Gerry Adams - the future IRA and Sinn Fein leader - to become interested in politics.³⁸⁰

Paisley denied that he and the Unionist government had acted in collusion, but there were catholics who believed that such an arrangement had been made. Gerry Fitt, the Republican Labour MP for the Belfast Docks constituency, charged in a Stormont speech that Paisley and the Minister of Home Affairs, Brian McConnell, had discussed his proposed march before the events took place and that the whole event was a conspiracy to attract votes for Kilfedder:

I say in this case and I suggested it when it happened that the Government, in collusion with Mr. Paisley, agreed to give him the credit for taking down the tricolour in Divis Street. They agreed to give him the credit and the Unionist Party in this country will some day live to regret that agreement which was reached between the parties.³⁸¹

Cahir Healy, the Nationalist Party MP for South Fermanagh, argued that Paisley was disrupting the democratic process:

Where is the freedom that people are supposed to enjoy at Imperial elections if Paisley is going to determine what flag can be used and what speeches are going to be made? I suppose that Paisley had some form of public opinion behind him but I would suggest that it is the least informed and indeed the most ignorant and provocative in the whole community.³⁸²

Such assertions improved Paisley's stature within both the militant fundamentalist and the secular protestant working-class communities – attacks on Paisley were making headlines for both the militant and Loyalist causes. There were even hints that Paisley's tactics were similar to

³⁸⁰ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Republican Hint They Will Withdraw Flag," 2 October 1964, "Replacement of Flag Blamed for Troubles," 8 October 1964; Gerry Adams, *Free Ireland: Towards A Lasting Peace* (Niwtot, CO.: Roberts Rinehart, 1986), 38-47; and Moloney and Pollak, 115-117.

³⁸¹ Parliament of Northern Ireland, Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons (HMSO: Belfast, 1965), 2878.

³⁸² Northern Ireland (1965), vol. 57, col. 2845-2850.

those of the American militant right wing. The August issue of *Focus* magazine referred to Paisley's growing power within the Unionist, Loyalist and evangelical communities, and to his McCarthyite tactics.³⁸³

Not all Ulster protestants, however, were willing to elevate Paisley to the role of Messiah. The bulk of the protestant community and the government were supportive of the police and Edward Gibson, chairman of the Ulster Young Unionist Council, asked leaders of the UUP to disassociate the party from Paisley's activities. Gibson asserted to the Stranmillis Debating Society that elements within the Ulster Unionist Party were developing Paisleyite tendencies. Many protestant leaders were far more forthright in their condemnation. Some clergymen, such as John Withers of Fisherwick Presbyterian Church in south Belfast, had been issuing warnings about Paisley for several years: "Some offer tolerance to Dr. Ian Paisley in Ulster to-day simply because they do not take him seriously. At worst, this is a form of personal contempt, and many who shrug their shoulders murmuring, "Let him alone," are guilty of just that – personal contempt."³⁸⁴ Others seemed to awaken to the threat of Paisleyism for the first time. Professor Robert Corkey, the ex-Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, told the Northern Irish Senate that Paisley had won a following of "thoughtless people, who are as apparently as brainless as himself."³⁸⁵ During a service in Belfast in early 1965, Eric Gallagher warned Ulster protestants of the road that lay ahead:

1965 will demand of the churches in Northern Ireland a clear and uncompromising stand. The threat of religious freedom and liberty is as great from Protestant fascism as from any form of Roman totalitarianism... the churches, by their silence, have unwittingly conspired to allow these self-appointed defenders of the faith to be

³⁸³ *Focus*, "The Militant Protestant Monthlies," 8 August 1965.

³⁸⁴ *Fisherwick Messenger*, January 1962.

³⁸⁵ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Ex-Moderator Blames 'Brainless' Protestant for Riots," 7 October 1964, "Gibson Warns of Paisley Tendency in Unionist Party," 21 November 1964; and Adams, 1-8.

regarded as the representatives of the authentic teaching of Christ. The good and decent folk in Germany – and there were far more of them than the other kind – woke up too late to what the Nazis were doing. Ulster Christianity could all too easily sell the past to the religious fascists.³⁸⁶

The Divis Street riots brought an unusual display of Christian unity when the Churches Industrial Council, an organization consisting of Catholic, Methodist, Presbyterian and Anglican clergymen, publicly appealed for peace. According to Eric Gallagher - who ran the East Belfast Mission and who was a future President of the Irish Methodist Conference - this appeal was the first public initiative in Northern Irish history that included both Catholic and Protestant clerics. Paisley's response was in sharp contrast, when on October 4th he told a Sunday night service in the Ulster Hall: "Make no mistake we are in the battle and this is an evil day." Paisley asserted that Protestant churches were appeasing Catholics and also took the opportunity to attack the World Council of Churches, claiming that the international organization abetted the conspiracy.³⁸⁷

The press in the Irish Republic and throughout the British Isles noticed Paisley's growing popularity and the reluctance of Unionists to denounce him. After a speech to the Royal Commonwealth Society in London, Terence O'Neill was asked about the riots by a reporter for the *Times*. O'Neill would not disassociate himself from Paisley and only asserted that the Reverend's actions were "not commended." The reserved response is indicative of the respect that the UUP showed for Paisley's growing popularity; the Ulster Unionists did not want to

³⁸⁶ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Minister Denounces 'Religious Fascists,'" 4 January 1965.

³⁸⁷ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Churches Unite in Appeal for Peace in City," 2 October 1964, "We Are Not Giving Up Our Heritage, Says Mr. Paisley," 5 October 1964, "Replacement of Flag Blamed for Troubles," 8 October 1964; and Dennis Cooke, 2005, 113-114.

alienate Paisley's followers. Whatever O'Neill thought of Paisley's crusade at this time, the Prime Minister's insistence on a muted response would change in early 1965.³⁸⁸

Simultaneously, Paisley's opinion of the new policies of the O'Neill administration drastically altered in mid-January, when O'Neill made what is arguably the biggest decision of his administration. Consulting only senior civil servants and not members of his own cabinet, the Prime Minister invited the Irish Taoiseach, Sean Lemass, to Stormont for friendly consultations. Northern protestants vilified Lemass for his role in the 1916 Easter Rising, for his past membership in the Irish Republican Army, and for his previous militancy towards the Irish Free State. (The Free State had interned Lemass during the Irish Civil War in the 1920s.) As Taoiseach,³⁸⁹ however, Lemass had instituted a new economic program to increase industrial output, exports and jobs and had lessened the political rhetoric aimed at Northern Ireland and partition. Just as O'Neill sought rapprochement with the Republic of Ireland, Lemass advocated similar approaches to the Unionist government. The previous Prime Minister of Northern Ireland, Sir Basil Brooke had ignored the overtures Lemass made towards the Belfast government in the early 1960s. Brooke followed the unwritten policy of the Stormont government that no official political or economic contacts would be made with the Republic until the Dublin government recognized the constitutional position of Northern Ireland. O'Neill, however, broke with the policy.³⁹⁰

In the late evening of January 13, 1965, Lemass appeared at Stormont for several hours of informal talks. Meeting with the press the following morning, O'Neill's cabinet publicly

³⁸⁸ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Activities of Mr. Paisley are not Commended," 13 November 1964.

³⁸⁹ The Taoiseach (a Gaelic word) is the head of government in the Republic of Ireland and usually the leader of the largest parliamentary party. The position is equivalent to prime minister.

³⁹⁰ Bardon, 1992, 630-633; and Moloney and Pollak, 18-121.

supported the talks, as did a majority within the protestant and catholic communities. Speaking to the Stormont assembly, Gerry Fitt noted that besides Paisley, only two people in the north objected to the overtures: Desmond Boal and Edmond Warnock, two MPs who were allies of the militant preacher. After a lengthy debate, the Northern Ireland House overwhelmingly passed a motion in support of the O'Neill-Lemass talks.³⁹¹

During the following year, however, discontent over the talks developed within the Unionist party, and in April 1965 a dozen rebel MPs held a closed meeting to find a way to force O'Neill's resignation. O'Neill's autocratic style and refusal to appease the Unionist right wing constricted his power base. The prime minister's preference for working with civil servants instead of government ministers increased disaffection with the Prime Minister's agenda. Although the opposition to O'Neill from within the UUP was not a serious threat at this time, during the several months following the Lemass talks the opposition to O'Neill increased. For instance, the decision to locate a new state university in protestant Coleraine instead of Londonderry, which had a catholic majority, upset many protestants and catholics in the west of Ulster.³⁹² Nevertheless, the majority of Northern Ireland's public and the Ulster Unionist Party, including Brooke and the protestant ascendancy, continued to stand behind the Prime Minister. A special two-hour meeting of the Ulster Unionist Party voted to back O'Neill, and in the

³⁹¹ Moloney and Pollak, 118-121.

³⁹² Londonderry is Northern Ireland's second largest city, but its location in the extreme west of the province and its catholic majority (70 percent in 1965), meant that the city did not receive as much economic investment, proportionally, as did Belfast. Since the new university would have been a good economic stimulus as well as a prestigious move, and because Magee College, located within the city, would have provided the core of the new school, a majority of protestants and catholics in the city wanted Londonderry to be selected for the new university (Bardon, 1992, 630-635).

provincial election the following November, the number of votes cast for O'Neill and the UUP increased at the expense of the Northern Ireland Labour Party.³⁹³

In contrast, Paisley and his supporters consistently and unanimously opposed the Lemass meeting. The afternoon following the talks, Paisley and two Protestant Unionist politicians, Belfast Alderman Albert Duff and Councillor James McCarroll delivered a protest letter to the Prime Minister's private secretary. The letter charged O'Neill with dictatorial policies, appeasement towards the Irish Republic and the republican movement, and the outright betrayal of protestant heritage. Travelling the several miles to the parliament building in a car covered with a large Union Jack and holding placards reading "No mass, no Lemass," and "I.R.A. murderer welcomed at Stormont," Paisley and his supporters were met by the press and television cameras on their arrival. The following week at a meeting in the Ulster Hall, Paisley referred to O'Neill as a "Lundy" (Ulster-protestant slang for a traitor), organized a sizeable protest march through the city center to the Belfast Telegraph building, and called for a general election to oust the prime minister. The O'Neill-Lemass talks were also denounced in *The Revivalist*, which commended Boal and Warnock for being the only two MPs to confront the issue within the Northern Ireland parliament. The magazine continued the old argument that the talks were part of a larger ecumenical conspiracy that aimed to reunite Protestant churches under Rome's authority.³⁹⁴

³⁹³ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Paisley's Power Fast Growing – Eire Journal," 5 November 1964, "Most Back Benchers to Support Capt. O'Neill," 22 January 1965, "O'Neill is Backed: No Threat to Constitution Says Ex-PM," 1 February 1965, and "Unionists Back O'Neill," 8 April 1965; *The Revivalist*, "An Open Letter sent to the Prime Minister When His Secret Meeting with Ulster's Would-Be Destroyer Lemass, was Disclosed," February/March 1965; Northern Ireland (1965), vol. 59, col. 294-297; Bardon, 1992, 626-630; Moloney and Pollak, 117-121; and Mulholland, 80-90.

³⁹⁴ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Mr. Paisley Takes Protest Letter to P.M.," 15 January 1965, "Mr. Paisley Issues Call For General Election," 26 January 1965, and "Placard-bearing Paisley

Paisley and his supporters were further incensed when O'Neill made a reciprocal visit to Dublin on February 9, 1965. Preceded by a visit from the Northern Irish Minister of Commerce Brian Faulkner to discuss economic cooperation, this second round of talks was again exploratory and informal. O'Neill, however, found it necessary to alleviate militant and loyalist fears and to assert publicly that no formal agreements were made. O'Neill called a meeting of the Ulster Unionist Council in Wellington Hall, Belfast, in order to have his new policies officially approved. Once again, Paisley and his supporters hit the streets of Belfast and protested wherever O'Neill spoke publicly. For instance, John Wylie and a small group picketed O'Neill's talk at the Castlerock Orange Hall in west Belfast on February 19th, while hundreds of supporters protested the Lemass meetings in a march to the UUP's headquarters in Glengall Street. Because of the O'Neill-Lemass talks, and despite a lull in larger protests throughout the rest of 1965, the Reverend Ian Paisley and his followers – now dubbed "Paisleyites" by the *Belfast Telegraph* - began a concerted crusade against O'Neillism.³⁹⁵

Protesters Miss Premier," 26 February 1965; and *The Revivalist*, "The Great Betrayal," February/March 1965.

³⁹⁵ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Faulkner in Dublin," 4 February 1965, "O'Neill in Dublin: Ulster P.M. in Second Talk With Lemass," 9 February 1965, "Not Right Time For North-South Council: O'Neill," 19 February 1965, "Extremists Flayed" Premier Attacks 'Flag-Burning Fools," 20 February 1965, "Placard-Bearing Paisley Protestors Miss Premier," 26 February 1965, "Unity Will Endure – PM: Packed Unionist Council Meeting Hears Policy Approved," 5 March 1965, "Paisleyism is not a New Thing: Liberal," 22 March 1966 (article quotes Reverend A. H. McElroy, President of the Liberal Association of Northern Ireland), "Paisleyism 'Abhorrent,' Says Mr. Heath in Letter," 10 October 1966, and "Overwhelming Opposition to Paisleyism: Fourth Report From NOP's Survey of Public Action," 12 December 1967. The 26 February 1965 edition of the *Belfast Telegraph* contains the first reference to Paisley's supporters as "Paisleyites;" a tacit recognition that the Reverend Paisley had an organized and substantial following. Further references to "Paisleyism" implied that the movement had its own theology.

THE 1916 EASTER RISING

Because of the Easter Rising commemorations that were planned for Ulster and the Republic in the spring of 1966, sectarian, political and religious tensions were on the rise in Northern Ireland. Paisley's crusade exploited the situation. *The Revivalist* proclaimed 'The Challenge of 1966,' a militant-fundamentalist program to thwart the perceived resurgence of Romanism and the expansion of ecumenicalism.³⁹⁶ A pamphlet Paisley wrote several months later urged protestants to remember past Protestant sacrifices:

Now there are voices raised in our Province today which advocate a course of forgetfulness. They tell us that the sooner we forget the great epochs of history, the sooner we forget about 'Derry, Aughrim, Enniskillen and the Boyne' the better for us as a people... Let it be said, and let me say it without fear of contradiction, that there are even leaders in Church and State who are apostles of this doctrine of forgetfulness... This text says, 'Remember, thou was a bondsman in the land of Egypt'... if there's one thing Ulster needs to remember it is this, that four hundred years ago they were bondsmen and under the Egyptian slavery of pagan popery. Let me say this: wherever there is bondage, wherever there is tyranny, wherever there is superstition, wherever the people are subjugated, there you will find the iron heel of the Roman Catholic Church, the jack-boot of the Vatican.³⁹⁷

In spite of an increasing inclination towards political activities, Paisley and the Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster reasserted a revivalist message:

The Free Presbyterian Church is an evangelistic gospel preaching church. It believes in Revival and in the power of believing prayer. It has no desire to build on any other man's foundation. It seeks to win souls to Christ rather than members to a denomination.³⁹⁸

But to Paisley, the answer to ecumenism and Catholic tyranny lay not only in a fundamentalist devotion to scripture and in the practice of traditional reformed Christianity, but also in the defeat of O'Neill's policies. Paisley had to thwart the ecumenical ideals wherever they appeared: for instance, Sir George Clark, the Grand Master of the Orange Order, expressed

³⁹⁶ *The Revivalist*, "The Challenge of 1966," January 1966;

³⁹⁷ Ian R.K. Paisley, *Protestants Remember!*, a pamphlet published in 1966.

³⁹⁸ *The Revivalist*, "The Armagh Manifesto," October 1965.

a willingness to talk with catholic leaders. In early 1966, Paisley wanted the new bridge over the river Lagan in Belfast to be named after Edward Carson, who had led the Ulster Volunteers against Home Rule in 1914, but after Lord Erskine (the Lord Governor of Northern Ireland) objected, Northern Irish militants had to accept ‘Queen Elizabeth II Bridge’ instead. Paisley perceived every concession to the catholic community or the ecumenical movement as an attack on Protestantism.³⁹⁹

Paisleyites reacted strongly against plans of the catholic community to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the 1916 Easter Rising in Dublin. Both moderate Nationalists and radical republicans planned to hold marches to honor the anniversary, which Paisley and many in the protestant community viewed as a challenge to protestant ascendancy. Paisleyites were outraged when O’Neill commemorated the 1916 Rising in Ballycastle by delivering the opening address to a protestant-catholic conference at the Corrymeela Centre on Easter weekend. Billed as ‘Community 1966,’ the cross-community effort aimed to bridge sectarian differences over the upcoming celebrations. But there were also warnings that O’Neillism was losing moderate protestant support: the select vestry of the Church of Ireland in Londonderry opposed the Anglican churches within the Republic that planned to hold commemorative services, while the Evangelical Fellowship of Ireland formed to confront Irish Protestantism’s “Romeward movement.”⁴⁰⁰ Nate Minford, the Unionist MP for Antrim addressed Stormont on the possibility of a Paisleyite – catholic confrontation:

³⁹⁹ Moloney and Pollak, 129-131; and Mulholland, 92-93.

⁴⁰⁰ *Belfast Telegraph*, “P.M. to Lead Protestant – Catholic Conference,” 5 April 1966; *Protestant Telegraph*, “Orange Call for 1916 Celebrations ban rejected by O’Neill: N.I. Government Capitulates to the Rebels,” 28 May 1966; and *Ulster Protestant*, “About Turn for I.C.M.,” February 1966 and “New Group Will Unite Protestants,” March 1966.

We are approaching a period when in fact, unless the Government keeps very rigid control of our affairs, (Paisley) could inflame hatred in his own particular and peculiar way.⁴⁰¹ ...we want to be perfectly certain that those Protestant people, or seemingly Protestant people, who can inflame passions will also, if need be, be taken into account when we are trying to maintain peace at this time. There is a great fear in this country and in this House for anybody to mention the name of Ian Paisley, but he can do damage in this country. I am not doubting his loyalty, but we have got to understand that we are not going to have another Divis Street simply because Ian Paisley says such and such a thing is wrong.⁴⁰²

Minford expressed the angst of those moderate protestants who did not want the commemorations to take place, but also did not condone Paisleyite activities.

Many Ulster protestants, however, believed that the catholic community was making political advances at their own expense; as a result, the Paisleyite crusade won growing protestant support. To take advantage of the new support, Paisley agreed to form the Ulster Constitution Defence Committee (UCDC) and an auxiliary group, the Ulster Protestant Volunteers (UPV), to coordinate political and religious activities and to create an organization a secular loyalist could join. The UCDC was the idea of the printer Noel Doherty, and was intended to be a political action group and to control Paisleyite marches and rallies. Paisley headed the organization and had ultimate authority over press releases, political candidates, and discipline. The group also contained a twelve-man committee, or the twelve apostles of militant-fundamentalist political action. The UCDC set up the UPV as a subgroup, constituted into divisions designed to correlate with Stormont's parliamentary constituencies. The UPV provided Paisley with secular working-class street activists willing to attack the O'Neill administration and the Northern Ireland civil rights movement. There were strict membership requirements and bylaws for both groups: no catholic or convert to Protestantism could join the UCDC, nor could any member of the Royal Ulster Constabulary, except for 'B' Specials, who were the police

⁴⁰¹ Northern Ireland (1966), vol. 62, col. 1542-1544.

⁴⁰² Northern Ireland (1966), vol. 63, col. 230-232.

reserve. Those who joined the Volunteers were to be street soldiers for public demonstrations and a militia to confront the expected Irish Republican Army resurgence during the 1916 Rising commemorations.⁴⁰³

With the formation of the UCDC and with steady recruitment into the UPV, Paisley was ready to confront the catholic 1916 Commemoration parades and planned a series of counter-demonstrations. Concerns over Paisley's planned marches and over IRA activity forced the Northern Irish government to limit the scope of the Easter rising commemoration parades on April 17th. The government mobilized 10,000 'B' Specials, canceled trains from Dublin, and set up numerous border checkpoints. Several Paisleyite marches were canceled in Armagh and Newry – two towns with sizable catholic populations – but the demonstration Paisley led in Belfast curbed the corresponding catholic parade that was to march from the city center to Anderstown in west Belfast. Paisley purposely chose a route that would pass the assembly point for the catholic parade, forcing the Unionist government to restrict the route for the catholic march. Although both the catholic and Paisley's demonstrations were unauthorized, and thus illegal, the government did not prevent Paisley's counter-march. The size of Paisley's parade, which the *Protestant Telegraph* estimated at 10,000 marchers and 30,000 supporters, and the appearance of several Ulster politicians made the demonstration too large to stop. During the parade several important comments were made: one symbolic, when a five-minute wreath-laying ceremony was held to commemorate the Ulster Volunteer Force of the 1910s, and the other verbal when Paisley declared war on O'Neillism. The bias the government had shown by limiting the catholic march and the security measures installed during the week made some

⁴⁰³ *Ulster Constitution Defence Committee and Ulster Protestant Volunteers Constitution and Rules; and Steve Bruce, The Edge of the Union: The Loyalist Political Vision* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 18-20.

catholics re-evaluate their commitment to supporting O'Neill. In addition, catholic activists were determined to thwart future Paisley marches and demonstrations.⁴⁰⁴

Another consequence of O'Neill's policies was the reformation of the Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF). Named after the protestant militia that formed in 1912 to defend Ireland against Home Rule, the new paramilitary organization was founded in late 1965 by two opposing factions: small rural groups and a group of loyalists in urban Belfast who met in the Standard Bar on the Shankill Road. Because the UVF is a secret organization, it is impossible to determine the extent of its original membership and to determine the powers behind its formation. One original member, Augustus 'Gusty' Spence, however, claimed that members of the UUP recruited him. There is no evidence to prove Spence's assertion, and Steve Bruce points out that the UVF had a motive for claiming official support that did not exist.⁴⁰⁵

The Ulster Volunteer Force planned a two-pronged campaign: on the one hand, to murder known members of the Irish Republican Army and to instill fear within the catholic community, and on the other hand, to create the impression that O'Neill's policies were encouraging a resurgence of the IRA. After announcing the start of their campaign in a press release, the UVF went on a short-lived spree of shootings and petrol bombings. Two shots were fired into the house of John McQuade, the Stormont MP for the Shankill area, and the UUP headquarters was

⁴⁰⁴ *Belfast Telegraph*, "2 Anti-1916 Parades Off: Cancellation Decision Made 'In Interests of Peace,'" 9 April 1966, "Paisley Criticizes the Prime Minister," 18 April 1966 and "Paisley Parade," 18 April, "'Volunteers' Will Cover all Province, Says Paisley," 11 May 1966; *The Revivalist*, "40,000 Protestants Protest in Belfast," May 1966; Steve Bruce, *The Red Hand: Protestant Paramilitaries in Northern Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 19-22; Bruce, 2007, 80-89; Moloney and Pollak, 122-131; and Smyth, 13. Steve Bruce places the size of Paisley's anti-1916 Rising parade at 6,000. While the *Belfast Telegraph* made no official estimate on the number of marches, their account stated that 5,000 people heard Paisley speak at Carlisle Circus immediately afterwards. Partially because the Belfast march made its point, and partially because of expected trouble, Paisley did cancel marches in Armagh and Newry, two towns with sizeable catholic populations.

⁴⁰⁵ Bruce, 1992, 17 and Roy Garland, *Gusty Spence* (Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 2001), 48.

hit by an ineffective bomb, both attacks designed to be blamed on republicans. On May 7th, a petrol bomb was thrown at a catholic-owned pub on the Shankill Road, but unfortunately the missile killed an elderly protestant woman who lived next door. Three weeks later, a young and drunk catholic laborer was shot after Spence and his UVF team failed to find Leo Martin, their intended target and a well-known republican. But on June 26th the UVF made an important mistake: three catholic barmen were shot while drinking in the Malvern Arms, a pub also near the Shankill Road, and one of the targets died from his wounds. Unfortunately for the Ulster Volunteers, several off-duty policemen were in the pub and the UVF assailants were quickly arrested, tried and sentenced to prison. Consequently, the government proscribed the Ulster Volunteer Force, the first protestant group to suffer this fate in Northern Ireland. The Stormont government believed the proscription had ended the problem, but it appears that the UVF continued as a small clandestine organization, training and recruiting members until it reemerged after the “Troubles” began.⁴⁰⁶

During the interrogation and trial of the Malvern Street assailants, direct links between the Ulster Volunteer Force, the UCDC, the UPV and Paisley were insinuated. The police pointed out that members of the UVF were also active in the Ulster Protestant Volunteers, the UCDC and the Free Presbyterian Church. Noel Doherty, for example, who belonged to the UCDC, had ties to the UPV and the Ulster Volunteer Force. In the summer of 1966, Doherty was charged and convicted for plotting to steal gelignite in Loughall and expelled from the UCDC upon his arrest. O’Neill himself claimed during a speech to Stormont on June 29th, that a leading member of the Ulster Volunteer Force was also an official of the UCDC. In his speech, O’Neill cited police reports that Paisley had on at least two occasions welcomed UVF members to a meeting. Paisley

⁴⁰⁶ Garland, 44-59; and Moloney and Pollak, 136-138.

stridently denied the assertions. While Paisley did not deny making the statement supporting the UVF, he claimed it was taken out of context – Paisley welcomed all protestants to his meetings, including members of the police forces. In addition, Paisley charged that the Royal Ulster Constabulary secretly tape-recorded his public speeches, an accusation O’Neill publicly affirmed.⁴⁰⁷

Paisley’s support for violence and his connection to the Ulster Volunteer Force remain a matter for debate. The UCDC and the UPV officially banned violence and there is no proof that Paisley took a role in illegal activities. In addition, Paisley consistently and promptly denounced any person, such as Doherty, when they were arrested. Yet Paisley offered tacit moral support and inspiration for the UVF through his rhetoric, speeches, and sermons. In an off-repeated statement used to discredit Paisley, one of the Malvern Arms assailants, Hugh McClean reputedly told the police interrogators: “I am terribly sorry I ever heard of that man Paisley or decided to follow him.” But it was a policeman who placed the statement in the police report and McClean’s attorney asserted to the court that his client never made it. In addition, Gusty Spence and the Ulster Volunteer Force deny a direct link between Paisley and their group, but that members such as McLean were inspired by Paisley’s politico-religious rhetoric.⁴⁰⁸

PAISLEY, RAMSEY, AND THE WHORE OF BABYLON

Paisley and militant fundamentalists in Northern Ireland viewed the developing relationships between the government of Great Britain and the Vatican, and between the High Church

⁴⁰⁷ Northern Ireland (1966), vol.64, col. 820-821; Moloney, 2008, 129-137; and Moloney and Pollak, 132-144.

⁴⁰⁸ *Belfast Telegraph*, “Exchange on U.V.F. Closed,” 30 June 1966; David Boulton, *The UVF 1966-73: An Anatomy of Loyalist Rebellion* (Dublin: Torc Books, 1973), 54-56; Bruce, 1992, 19-26; and Moloney, 2008, 133-135. O’Neill confirmed Paisley’s charges in a speech to Stormont made on June 29, 1966. The Prime Minister stated that the Royal Ulster Constabulary tape-recorded all of Paisley’s public speeches.

Anglicans in England and the Catholic Church, as threats to Irish Protestantism and the British constitution. When Prime Minister Harold MacMillan arranged for an audience with the Pope, and when Queen Elizabeth II sent a Catholic peer to represent the Crown at the funeral of the Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal William Godfrey, in January 1963, the Free Presbyterian Church sent a telegram to 10 Downing Street protesting the government's betrayal of the Act of Settlement and of Britain's Protestant heritage. Carl McIntire published the Free Presbyterian protest within his American media, which gave substantial publicity to the new member of the International Council of Christian Churches.⁴⁰⁹

Alongside his attacks on the O'Neill administration, Paisley took every opportunity to protest or to lead marches against ecumenicalism and Protestant apostasy. In October 1964, Paisley and the Return to the Reformed Faith Council of Great Britain and Ireland, which included Jack Glass and Brian Green, sent a cable to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U. Thant, complaining that the Pope had flown over Northern Ireland; because of bad weather, Pope Paul VI's flight to New York had been diverted across Ulster. The cable charged "Adherents of the reformed faith refuse to recognize the validity of the Pope's right to be an advocate of peace. The past alliance of the Vatican with the Fascist dictators, Hitler and Mussolini, and its present alliance with Franco indicate the true nature of the Papacy."⁴¹⁰ In mid-October, Paisley protested the invitation of a Catholic chaplain to attend the dedication of the new wing of the Royal Maternity Hospital in Belfast. In January 1966, Paisley wired Queen Elizabeth II, attacking the decision to allow Father Thomas Corbishley, a Catholic priest, to say

⁴⁰⁹ *Christian Beacon*, "Mac's Rome Visit Protest by Free Presbyterians," 28 February 1963 and "Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster, Ireland Acts in True Protestant Tradition," 28 February 1963.

⁴¹⁰ *Belfast Telegraph*, "The Pope Flies Over Ulster," 4 October 1965, and "Paisley Protest Over Invitation," 13 October 1965.

the closing prayers at Westminster Abbey. Paisley led a protest outside the Abbey that included twenty-three members of the International Council of Christian Churches and directed a march that passed Whitehall and Trafalgar Square. On his return home, Paisley stated to the press that the protest was "...worthwhile. It has made this matter known to English people, who know nothing about Protestantism and will help to rouse them to their Protestant heritage."⁴¹¹

Despite extensive coverage, Paisley complained that the Northern Irish press was not fair to fundamentalist Protestants and that protestant-owned newspapers were under the control of ecumenical laymen. Accordingly, he adopted another tactic that American militant fundamentalists employed and created his own bi-monthly "newspaper." Spurred in part by the refusal of some newspapers, most importantly the *Belfast Telegraph*, to place ads for Paisleyite rallies, a plan was laid in early 1966 for publication of the *Protestant Telegraph* and the establishment of a Free Presbyterian printing company (Puritan Printing). The first issue of the *Telegraph* was published that April. Printed media was important to Paisley as he could not express his views on the radio. In Northern Ireland using the airwaves was not available to smaller sects or clergymen deemed controversial by the BBC's Central Advisory Body in London.⁴¹²

In March, Paisley was back in London, preparing to travel to Rome to protest the decision of Michael Ramsey, the Archbishop of Canterbury, to visit the Vatican and meet with the Pope -

⁴¹¹ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Queen Gets 'Stop Priest' Wire From Mr. Paisley," 14 January 1966, "23 From Ulster to Join Priest Protest," 19 January 1966, "Abbey Protest Was Worthwhile – Paisley: Will Help Arouse the English," 22 January 1966, and "Protestants Don't Get Fair Show, Says Mr. Paisley," 3 January 1966.

⁴¹² *Belfast Telegraph*, "Paisley Joins in London Protest," 18 March 1966; Jonathan Bardon, *Beyond the Studio: A History of BBC Northern Ireland* (Belfast: Blackstaff Press, Limited, 2000), 141-153; and Moloney and Pollak, 122-128.

the first meeting between the heads of the Anglican and Catholic churches since the 1500s.⁴¹³ At the time, Ramsey was publicly promoting the idea of reuniting the English and Roman Churches. The International Council of Christian Churches picketed Lambeth Palace and marched through London and the ICCC delegation heckled Ramsey and Bishop John Moorman at Heathrow Airport as they boarded their plane for Rome. Paisley, John Wylie and Belfast Councilor James McCarroll flew on the same flight with Ramsey, and after landing in Italy met Jack Glass from Glasgow and two Londoners, Brian Green and Robert Hood, an Anglican vicar. Paisley and Wylie were denied entrance into Italy, although their four companions were granted a visa. Glass, Green and McCarroll heckled Ramsey while he celebrated communion in All Souls Anglican Church in Rome. The protests generated substantial publicity, but did not prevent the Anglican-Catholic talks from taking place.⁴¹⁴

At the end of the three-day meeting the Pope and the Archbishop issued a statement promising serious dialogue over theological issues would begin between their two churches. Carl McIntire and the International Council took great interest in Ramsey's activities and the protest; for instance in September 1962 the ICCC staged a protest against Ramsey during his

⁴¹³ Paisley asserted four basic objections to Ramsey's trip: the British Constitution made such a visit illegal; the articles of the Churches of England and Ireland prohibited it; the visit violated British history (it was an insult to the *Book of Martyrs*); and it was against Biblical teachings (Ian R. K Paisley, *The Archbishop in the Arms of the Pope of Rome! Protestant Ministers in the Hands of the Police of Rome!* (Belfast: Puritan Printing Company, 1966). The pamphlet includes a statement from the International Council of Christian Churches written by Carl McIntire on March 22, 1966, denouncing the decision of the Vatican police not to admit Paisley and his group, as a violation of the Covenant of Human Rights of the United Nations. It is interesting that McIntire wanted U.N. policy to be observed – this was an organization that McIntire and fellow American militant fundamentalists consistently denounced as un-Biblical and un-American.

⁴¹⁴ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Scenes as Dr. Ramsey Takes Plane to Rome," 22 March 1966, and "3 Questioned in Rome: Belfast Man Led From Church After Protest," 23 March 1966; and *The Revivalist*, "Archbishop of Canterbury Publicly to Give Pope Embrace of Peace in Rome," March 1966, and "Revs. Ian Paisley and John Wylie Deported From Rome," April 1966.

visit to the United States. Not only did the *Christian Beacon* run several articles about the visit to Rome – reprints of information that British militant fundamentalists provided - McIntire also took the opportunity to publicize and condemn the ecumenism within the worldwide Anglican community. He wrote a letter to Ramsey deploring the Church of South India and the Church's expulsion of fundamentalist Anglicans who belonged to the International Council.⁴¹⁵

Paisley returned home to a mixed reception, receiving ridicule and condemnation in the secular press and a lukewarm response from Irish fundamentalists, but a hero's welcome at the Ulster Hall. Some evangelicals, however, thought Paisley had gone too far and were reluctant to give the militant additional publicity. For instance, one man attending the talk in Belfast had the courage to question Paisley's protest against Ramsey, as did Dr. T.A.B. Smyth, an ex-Moderator of the Irish Presbyterian Church. While the *Evangelical Presbyterian* (the new name of the *Irish Evangelical*) covered the Archbishop's visit to Rome and condemned the road towards reunion, it did not mention Paisley, his companions or their protests.⁴¹⁶

Paisley's continuing protests were having an effect on his opponents: prior to the Divis Street riots most Protestant clerics ignored Paisley. But as Paisley's crusade became more visible, more Protestant clergymen spoke out. While Paisley was on his way to Rome, the Reverend A.H. McElroy, the president of the Liberal Association of Northern Ireland, charged that Paisleyism was not a new idea and that it was part of the Irish protestant heritage, traceable to the 1700s. McElroy also charged that Ulster protestants were not true Protestants, but

⁴¹⁵ *Christian Beacon*, "Archbishop Ramsey's Tour of U.S.A. to be Challenged by Mass Meeting in Columbia, S.C.," 13 September 1962, "Mac's Rome Visit Protest by Free Presbyterians," 28 February 1963, "McIntire Letter," 24 March 1966, and "Ian Paisley Protests Ramsey Visit to Rome," 24 March 1966.

⁴¹⁶ *Christian Beacon*, "Ramsey Expresses Two Hopes, Didn't Notice Fundamentalists," 7 April 1966; and *Evangelical Presbyterian*, Notes and Comments Column: "Primate's Path to Rome," March 1966, "Rome and Modernism," April 1966, and "The Keynote of the Second Vatican Council," May 1966.

culturally were anti-Catholic Britons. In addition, McElroy asserted that Paisleyism was based on an illiterate fundamentalism, acceptable to 80 percent of Ulster protestants.⁴¹⁷

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND “MARTYRDOM”

The rapprochement between the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church was not the only ecumenical apostasy that upset Paisleyites. Paisley and militant fundamentalists were also concerned with developments within Irish Presbyterianism. For instance, the leadership of the General Assembly and of the Presbyterian education system supported the ecumenical movement and refused to denounce liberal and modernist ideas. The Irish Presbyterian Church was a member of the World Council of Churches and had not officially condemned Ramsey’s trip to Rome, and accordingly, Irish Presbyterians were an object of Paisley’s scorn.⁴¹⁸

Every June the Presbyterian Church in Ireland holds its annual Assembly in Belfast and in 1966 Paisley was determined to make his opinions known to that church body. Although Paisley and supporters had been protesting outside the Assembly for several years, the protest in 1966 and his subsequent arrest and imprisonment elevated Paisley within the international fellowship of militant fundamentalism into the foremost defender of Ulster Protestantism. After the General Assembly began its annual convention in Belfast in June 1966, Paisley organized an intensive campaign of denunciation and harassment. On June 6th, Paisley announced that he would lead a

⁴¹⁷ *Belfast Telegraph*, “Minister Won’t Curb Paisley Parades,” 12 May 1965 and “Paisleyism is Not a New Thing: Liberal,” 22 March 1966.

⁴¹⁸ There were voices within Irish Presbyterianism, however, that disapproved of the Anglican-Catholic dialogue and membership in the WCC. Within the *Presbyterian Herald*, Reverend Donald Gillies, minister of Agnes Street Presbyterian Church in Belfast, was given an outlet to express fundamentalist grievances (*Presbyterian Herald*, “Opposition to W.C.C., by Donald Gillies,” July/August 1966). For a better understanding of the theological views of Presbyterians who opposed the ecumenical movement see: Donald Gillies, *Unity in the Dark* (London: The Banner of Trust, 1964).

protest march from the Ravenhill Free Presbyterian Church in east Belfast to the General Assembly, which met in the city center. The Ministry of Home Affairs reluctantly approved the route, arguing that the government did not see the potential for violence. However, the march was provocative to the catholic community, as it passed through the catholic Markets neighborhood, an area situated between Ravenhill and the city center and where no protestant march had been allowed to pass since the 1930s. The Free Presbyterian marchers carried anti-catholic placards, which aggravated the situation. When Paisley and his supporters marched through the Markets, approximately two hundred catholics formed a human wall in front of the Albert Bridge and refused to let the Paisleyites into Cromac Square.⁴¹⁹

The march proceeded after the Royal Ulster Constabulary dispersed the crowd, but the police action provoked a lengthy battle with the local catholic community. Catholic politicians, such as Eddie McAteer, the leader of the Nationalist Party, and moderate protestant supporters of the O'Neill administration questioned the judgment of the Home Affairs Minister. The Presbyterian General Assembly also attacked the government and in addition passed a resolution denouncing Paisley's extremism. Anti-O'Neill Unionists and Paisleyites were nevertheless jubilant. They blamed catholics for the violence, asserting that the Paisleyites had been barraged with bricks, glass and other missiles. Paisley boasted his accomplishment: "This is the first Protestant parade through the market area for 30 years. It is quite a victory."⁴²⁰ Paisleyite demonstrators approached their original target that evening when the preacher and a large group of followers picketed the General Assembly. Attendees to the Assembly, including the Northern Ireland Governor Lord Erskine and his wife, were verbally abused as they entered the Assembly

⁴¹⁹ Moloney and Pollak, 131-135.

⁴²⁰ *Belfast Telegraph*, "200 Bar Way to Paisley March," 7 June 1966 and "Rioters Clash with Protest March in Cromac Sq.," 7 June 1966.

Building. The protest alienated moderate Presbyterians who were shocked at the treatment of their church leaders and the harassment of the Erskines, but gained Paisley new supporters from anti-ecumenical protestants and from within the Orange Order.⁴²¹

On June 6th Stormont began a week-long debate on the Markets and Assembly disturbances. The *Belfast Telegraph* published an editorial that called the debate a crucial test for Stormont, and asked whether the institution would stand for law and order or for civil disobedience. Most of the comments made within the Northern Ireland parliament were against Paisley. Pro-O'Neill MPs, such as Nate Minford, questioned why the Minister of Home Affairs had allowed the march to proceed, while Nationalists and republicans, such as Gerry Fitt, asserted that Paisley's antics were harming community relations. Minford called for a public inquiry. Minford personally attacked Paisley for a statement that the UCDC telegraphed to McConnell, denouncing the police for their actions against the protestors outside the Assembly Hall.⁴²²

The strongest condemnation of Paisley came from O'Neill, whose lengthy comments not only questioned the preacher's patriotism but argued that continued British support for the status quo in Northern Ireland required responsible government in Ulster:

I am not prepared to accept lectures on loyalty from such a source (Paisley)...I have been accused of "selling our Constitution down the river bit by bit and inch by inch." But respect for the Ulster Constitution can only be founded on respect for Ulster. If a Fascist movement were to be allowed to rule the roost in Ulster then our Constitution might indeed be in danger. Of course there are a few misguided people who believe in the infallibility of Mr. Paisley. Let us, then, recall a couple of his former threats. A year ago, when Mr. Lemass came to Stormont, this man threatened that any Unionist candidate who spoke in favour of that visit would be opposed at the next election...Another threat was to the effect that if I visited Dublin I would never be

⁴²¹ *Presbyterian Herald*, "Right of Assembly," July/August 1966; and *Protestant Telegraph*, "R.C.'s Savagely Attack Protestant Parade: General Assembly wants Government Forces to Suppress Protestant Protests," 18 June 1966.

⁴²² *Belfast Telegraph*, "Demand By Paisley for an Inquiry," 9 June 1966, and "Parades Debate: Test for MPs," 13 June 1966; and Northern Ireland (1966), vol. 64, col. 19-24, 135-136 and 394.

permitted to return. Well, here I stand, Mr. Speaker... Now, I understand members of this House are being threatened with personal violence if they dare to raise their voices. Respectable citizens lift their telephone receivers and are forced to listen to a torrent of disgusting language followed by threats of violence, or their telephones ring all night so that they cannot sleep. These are not the activities of a political party seeking the support of the electorate but the sordid techniques of gangsterism. To those of us who remember the thirties the pattern is horribly familiar. The contempt for established authority; the crude and unthinking intolerance; the emphasis upon monster processions and rallies; the appeal to a perverted form of patriotism; each and every one of these things has its parallel in the rise of the Nazis to power.⁴²³

O'Neill's eloquent and well-argued speech, which detailed the Paisleyite tactics and accused Paisley of intolerance and fascism, received a receptive audience in the catholic and moderate protestant communities. But many anti-O'Neill Unionists and loyalists felt that the Prime Minister's portrayal of Paisley amounted to appeasement. Although few MPs dared defend violence, they did accuse the catholics of the Markets community of provoking the violence and wondered why they were ready for Paisley with a large stockpile of missiles. J.E. Warnock of St. Anne's, Belfast went so far as to blame O'Neill's policies for the rise in sympathy towards Paisley.⁴²⁴

Some Unionists called on the government to prevent further outrages, while Brian McConnell, the Minister of Home Affairs, asserted that the government would not allow such disturbances and marches to happen again. Paisley would not back down, and in the week leading up to the Stormont debate over the Cromac Square and Assembly disturbances, Paisley held meetings at the Ulster Hall to assert his defiance. He also announced a June 16th parade of UPV divisions to take place in Belfast. McConnell rejected the call from a Nationalist MP to ban Paisley's public appearances. The Belfast City Council overturned a Nationalist proposal to bar Paisley use of the city-owned Ulster Hall by a vote of 33-11. Despite the ban on parades and

⁴²³ Northern Ireland (1966), vol. 64, col. 307-311.

⁴²⁴ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Riot 'Provocation' Deplored by 12 Unionists," 10 June 1966 and "Mr. Paisley's Plan for City Parade," 13 June 1966.

public meetings, Paisley held a rally at the Ulster Hall to denounce O'Neill and the Unionist government and the militant fundamentalist led a march on June 16th that went from the Shankill Road to the City Center.⁴²⁵

The protest at the General Assembly led to summonses against Paisley, the Reverends John Wylie and Ivan Foster, Belfast City Councilor James McCarroll (who had accompanied Paisley to Rome), and three lay supporters. On July 6th the Belfast Magistrates Court issued a charge of unlawful assembly. The new legal trouble dramatically increased Paisley's popularity amongst Northern Irish protestants disenchanted with O'Neillism and the ecumenical discussions of protestant churches. Due to appear in court on July 18th, Paisley planned a pre-trial march through the city center. The government initially threatened to ban the march, but allowed it with a ban on offensive placards. Preparing for his case, Paisley's legal advisers managed to get magistrate Albert Duff, a Belfast City Alderman and Protestant Unionist, to issue summonses to Lord and Lady Erskine, Prime Minister O'Neill, the Home Affairs Minister Brian McConnell, and assorted other luminaries, including the Lord Chief Justice. In addition, Dr. Alfred Martin, the Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly and several Presbyterian clergymen were called to court.⁴²⁶

On the 18th, Paisley held a short service at the Ravenhill Road Free Presbyterian Church and then proceeded solemnly to the Magistrates Court with hundreds of supporters and spectators following behind. By the time the court case began spectators occupied every seat in the court and over one thousand Paisleyites were locked outside the court singing hymns. Paisley and his

⁴²⁵ *Belfast Telegraph*, "McConnell Vows: Never Again," 9 June 1966, "Minister Will Not Put Ban on Paisley," 14 June 1966, "Paisley Returns to Attack on PM," 17 June 1966, and "Paisley Can Use Hall by 33-1 Vote," 1 July 1966; and *Northern Ireland* (1966), vol. 64, col. 20-25, 334-338, and 820-821.

⁴²⁶ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Paisley Wants the Governor as a Witness," 11 July 1966.

co-defendants called no witnesses for their defense and neither O'Neill, McConnell nor the Erskines appeared, or did any of the summoned Presbyterian clergymen show up. Paisley made a statement to the court that he and his co-defendants had been unfairly maligned in the press and in the Stormont debates, and that it was unjust that Lord and Lady Erskine were not compelled to appear. Paisley argued that many of the charges thrown at him and his fellow defendants concerned their alleged abuse of Lady Erskine.⁴²⁷

The court held for the police and argued that while the protest did not begin as an unlawful assembly, the actions of the defendants deteriorated into a criminal offense. Paisley, Wylie, Foster, McConnell and two supporters were fined thirty pounds each and required to post a bond binding them to keep the peace for two years. Only the defendants could sign the bond, and if they failed they were to be imprisoned for three months.⁴²⁸ The next morning Paisley, Wylie and Foster took the stage in the Ulster Hall and declared that they would not pay the fines or sign the peace bond. Paisley stated that he "chose to go to prison and make a martyr of himself."⁴²⁹ The Free Presbyterian Church published an article in the *Protestant Telegraph* several weeks later to explain their moderator's defiance: his imprisonment would publicize the bias that Northern Ireland's legal system showed towards loyalists, it would bring further pressure against the policies of the O'Neill government, and it would show that the case against him had no merit. Paisley further charged that he was given the option of a peace bond so the O'Neill government

⁴²⁷ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Unlawful Assembly Charge Against Paisley," 6 July 1966, and "Paisley March to Court May be Banned," 7 July 1966.

⁴²⁸ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Government Will not Ban Paisley Court Parade," 16 July 1966, "1,000 Locked Out at Paisley Court," 18 July 1966, "Paisley and 5 Others Fined," 19 July 1966, and "No Defence Witnesses at Paisley Court," 19 July 1966; and Moloney and Pollak, 132-135.

⁴²⁹ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Paisley Says He Will be MP at Stormont," 20 July 1966.

would not have to imprison him. This would leave only a small fine to pay and one that the Unionist administration could once again take care of.⁴³⁰

On July 20, 1966, Paisley, Wylie and Foster were remanded to Crumlin Road Jail. For the first two nights of Paisley's jail sentence, several thousand Paisleyites assembled outside the jail, holding a vigil. On the third night rioting broke out, which the police ended with water cannon. On the 23rd approximately 2,000 Paisleyites assembled at the West Belfast Orange Hall to begin a march to the city center. But because of the trouble at Crumlin Road Jail the night before, the police restricted the march to the Shankill area. In spite of the efforts of Dr. Stanley Cooke, the acting moderator of the Free Presbyterian Church, to prevent trouble, the marchers proceeded towards the city center. They were stopped at Peter's Hill at the end of the Shankill Road, and again the RUC used water cannon to disburse the crowd. According to police reports, most of the hooligans arrested during the Shankill riots were teenagers and not members of the Free Presbyterian Church.⁴³¹

To prevent further trouble, O'Neill and his cabinet invoked the Special Powers Act and imposed a three-month ban on all marches and parades within fifteen miles of Belfast City Hall and any public meeting consisting of four or more persons. Only traditional parades by organizations such as the Orange Order, the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the Salvation Army received an exception. In addition, all marches outside the excluded area were closely scrutinized and the three parades to protest Paisley's imprisonment already planned by the Ulster Constitution Defence Committee for Glengormley, Lisburn, and Hillsborough were banned. But Home Affairs Minister McConnell agreed to meet with a twenty-man Paisleyite deputation at his

⁴³⁰ *Protestant Telegraph*, "The Reasons Why I Chose Jail by Ian R.K. Paisley," 30 July 1966.

⁴³¹ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Police Hose Crowd: Marchers Defy Order to Halt," 23 July 1966.

home in Lisburn on July 28th. Although the meeting did not alter the special order, it is indicative of Paisley's growing stature that McConnell felt it was necessary to talk to the group.⁴³²

Paisley's, Wylie's and Foster's fines were again anonymously paid, but since all three clergymen would not sign the peace bond, they remained in jail. But this time they were civil, not criminal prisoners, and their new status gave them better rights. One important right was the ability to write a weekly letter, which Paisley used to address his church and to explain his plight to friends in the United States. In addition to the letter to his church, Paisley wrote a commentary on the New Testament book of Romans as a theological statement of his fight against Terence O'Neill. In *An Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans: Prepared in the Jail Cell*, a lengthy treatise on God's sovereign grace, Paisley argued that his imprisonment was the Will of God and preordained as part of God's Plan for Free Presbyterians, an important family within God's Elect. According to Paisley, throughout history God has blessed "special" men with imprisonment, during which they wrote about the love and spirit of God. As had the Apostle Paul, Paisley suffered jailing as a way of evangelizing for his church, and for the benefit of militant fundamentalism.⁴³³

Paisley turned what was a minor criminal act into a case of "martyrdom" for the defense of Bible Protestantism. Within a year, seven new Free Presbyterian congregations were founded, and Paisley proclaimed that God had brought revival to Ulster. Free Presbyterian ministers were invited to churches across Ulster to explain Paisley's martyrdom; between June 1966 and New

⁴³² *Belfast Telegraph*, "Parade Ban Welcomed," 26 July 1966.

⁴³³ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Cabinet Tackles Unrest: Stronger Security Possible After Week-end Violence," 25 July 1966, "Fines on Paisley and 2 Others are Paid," 2 August 1966, and "Minister to See Paisley Delegates," 28 July 1966; and Ian R.K. Paisley, *An Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans: Prepared in the Prison Cell* (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1966).

Year's Day 1968, the number of Free Presbyterian congregations almost doubled. In addition, more of the secular protestant working class began to look to Paisley as a protestant hero.⁴³⁴

On October 19th Paisley became the first Free Presbyterian prisoner to be released from Crumlin Road Jail. While only a small crowd was on hand at the prison, Paisley received a hero's welcome from the Ulster Loyalist community and from the international militant fundamentalist fellowship. A larger celebration planned by the Free Presbyterian Church had been banned by the new Minister of Home Affairs, William Craig, but the following Sunday, the 23rd, the Free Presbyterians were allowed to hold a 'welcome back' rally in the Belfast suburb of Dundonald. This meeting included the Reverends Wylie and Foster, who had also been released.⁴³⁵

Militant fundamentalists in the U.S. rejoiced in Paisley's release and not only publicized the event within their newspapers; they came to Northern Ireland to take part in the celebrations. Bob Jones, Jr. and six ACCC ministers attended a 'Reformation Rally' at the Coleraine Free Presbyterian Church on November 5th and along with two thousand supporters, took part in a Sunday night service at the Ulster Hall two days later. Jones participated in daily prayer meetings at the Ravenhill Road Free Presbyterian Church and spoke at the city hall in Armagh. A catholic crowd protested the meeting; Paisley and Bob Jones, Jr. claimed that the catholics hurled insults and stones as they left the church service. On his return to the United States, Jones began planning a major speaking tour for Paisley, including a stop in Tulsa, Oklahoma to address

⁴³⁴ *The Gospel Witness*, "The Battle if the Reformation: Why It Must Be Fought Today," 8 June 1967; and International Council of Christian Churches, *Concerning Rev. Ian Paisley*. Belfast, N.I. (Cape May, NJ: Bible Presbyterian Church, 1966).

⁴³⁵ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Jail Rally Ban: Released Minister's Proposal Called Defiance," 19 October 1966.

the Christian Crusade. Jones believed that the amount of press coverage given to the Irishman's imprisonment would draw extensive interest.⁴³⁶

The expanded interest Americans showed in British speakers had become apparent during a rally organized by the American Council of Christian Churches in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. On September 24, 1966, the Second Convocation on Religious Freedom highlighted the trouble that McIntire, the ACCC and Paisley were having with government authority. Reverends Brian Green from London and William Beattie from Northern Ireland gave their testimonies about the protest at the Presbyterian General Assembly in Belfast. Green argued that true Bible Christians in both the British Isles and North America faced religious persecution from the government, the mainstream secular media, and a resurgent Roman Catholic Church.⁴³⁷

This series of meetings in Northern Ireland, the appearance in Ulster of American militant fundamentalists and of British militants in the U.S. were turning points within the militant fundamentalist fellowship between Americans and the Anglo-Irish, and showed to Paisley that his jailing had been a landmark in his career.⁴³⁸ The new bond was also evident when Paisley (from jail) wrote to Bob Jones and Carl McIntire gleefully praising his imprisonment as God's will and new martyrdom for Protestantism:

How real is the Lord's presence! How sweet is communion with him! How blessed is the Book! How wonderful are the doctrines of gospel grace! We sang for we cannot be silent, His love is the theme of our song, with the prisoner Samuel Rutherford we can say how with deeper meaning: 'with mercy and judgement; my web of time we wove; and aye the dews of sorrow; were listed by his love; I'll bless the hand that you

⁴³⁶ Bob Jones, Jr., *Cornbread and Caviar* (Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1981).

⁴³⁷ *Christian Beacon*, "British Delegates Arrive for Second Convocation for Religious Freedom," 22 September 1966; *The (Philadelphia) Bulletin*, advertisement for the Second Convocation on Religious Freedom, 22 September 1966; and *Protestant Telegraph*, "18,000 Attend Harrisburg (U.S.A.) Rally," 8 October 1966.

⁴³⁸ Bob Jones, Jr. to Billy James Hargis, 7 November 1966, Fundamentalism Files.

did, I'll bless the heart that planned; when throwed where glory dwelled, in Immanuel's land.⁴³⁹

Paisley had grown from a leading figure within Ulster fundamentalism and the religious life of Northern Ireland and into an important member of international militant fundamentalism. The legal trouble also sparked a sudden increase in the membership of Free Presbyterian churches. Between July 1966 and the end of 1969, twelve new Free Presbyterian congregations were formed in Londonderry, Lisburn, Dungannon and nine smaller towns. Paisley's popularity grew amongst secular and Loyalist working-class protestants, augmenting Paisleyism as an alliance between rural evangelicals and urban secular protestants. This partnership would be of immense importance as Paisleyites took to the streets of Ulster to confront Northern Ireland's civil right movement.⁴⁴⁰

⁴³⁹ Ian Paisley to Bob Jones, Jr., "Letters and Visits to Prisoners," 16 August 1966, Fundamentalism Files; and Bob Jones, Jr, 1981, 145-151.

⁴⁴⁰ Bruce, 1989, 81-89, and 2007, 270.

CHAPTER 7

CIVIL RIGHTS FOR THE GREEN, THE BLACK, AND THE ORANGE

As they awoke to New Year's Day, 1967, it seemed to both Paisley and O'Neill that they had strengthened their stature amongst their respective supporters. Paisley was a new "martyr" within the international fellowship of militant Protestantism, and the Free Presbyterian Church was beginning to expand its membership and plan new congregations after a decade of limited growth. O'Neill, meanwhile, retained the support of the Ulster Unionist Party, as well as the moderate leadership of the protestant and catholic communities. Most local Unionist Associations upheld O'Neill when a special party vote was taken on September 24, 1966, and Unionist MPs unanimously backed the Prime Minister three days later.

O'Neill, however, would soon see his career shortened. Dissidents within the UUP and the Orange Order – whose members solidly supported the Unionist party - and catholic activists within the newly formed Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association in January 1967 began a series of events that put intense pressure on the O'Neill administration, weakening its ability to introduce reforms or to alleviate protestant concerns. Although the erosion of support for O'Neill within the Ulster Unionist Party and the protestant community, as well as from his moderate catholic supporters was not yet outwardly evident, from the day Paisley walked into the Crumlin Road Jail, the Northern Ireland Prime Minister could never simultaneously satisfy Paisleyites and the catholic community. New factors now entered the arena.⁴⁴¹

THE EARLY CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT IN NORTHERN IRELAND

During the closing years of the 1960s, the focus of Paisley's crusade shifted from opposing Christian apostasy and the policies of the O'Neill administration to battling the emerging civil

⁴⁴¹ Mulholland, 109-114.

rights movement in Northern Ireland. To Paisley and militant fundamentalists, the movement was nothing more than a thinly disguised coalition of Irish republicans, communists, and the Roman Catholic Church. They were convinced that the movement threatened the constitutional status of Northern Ireland and the existence of Bible Protestantism in Ulster. Between August 1968 and the outbreak of sectarian violence one year later, Paisley turned the efforts of his crusade against civil rights activism.⁴⁴²

In January 1967, both the United States and Northern Ireland were contending with indigenous civil rights movements, which were, however, moving in different directions. In America the movement for racial equality ebbed as African-Americans gained voting rights and access to integrated schooling and as civil rights activists radicalized. The civil rights movement of large street marches and local activism had largely run its course, and Americans were beginning to accept the reality of integrated schools and public facilities. Proponents of social change now focused on implementing the Great Society and confronting Black Power and the Vietnam War. Across the United States civil rights activists were turning from direct action protests into anti-war and anti-establishment activities.⁴⁴³

In Northern Ireland catholic activists were beginning to escalate their demands for political and economic equality. Civil rights activism had been the vocation of a small group of middle class catholics and a coalition of Labour and Liberals MPs in Westminster who had been willing to give Terence O'Neill time to affect meaningful reforms. But in January 1967, the Northern Ireland civil rights movement gave notice that its patience had run out. Over the next thirty

⁴⁴² *Protestant Telegraph*, "CRA = IRA, C.R.A. – Civil Rights Association, I.R.A. – Irish Republican Army," 19 November 1968.

⁴⁴³ David Farber, *The Age of Great Dreams: America in the 1960s* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1994), 263-268.

months the events that transpired in Northern Ireland and the United States transformed the careers of both the Reverend Ian Paisley and Prime Minister Terence O’Neill.⁴⁴⁴

The civil rights campaign in Northern Ireland began in 1963, and in a manner much quieter than its American counterpart. The pressure for reform came from two organizations that were founded to publicize catholic discrimination complaints and to lobby the British government to take a more active role in Northern Ireland’s internal affairs. These were a private organization, the Campaign for Social Justice (CSJ) in Dungannon, and the Campaign for Democracy in Ulster, a group of Labour and Liberal MPs at Westminster.

The Campaign For Social Justice in Northern Ireland consisted of middle-class professionals who disseminated discrimination statistics to the British and Irish press and to the British government. CSJ avoided a violent or religious theme within its pamphlets and press releases. The Campaign for Social Justice grew out of housing protests that a group of catholic housewives undertook in front of the Dungannon Urban Council. Although catholic and protestant councilors awarded houses within their respective districts, no new homes had been built in catholic neighborhoods since 1945 and the appearance of 140 new dwellings in Dungannon’s protestant wards aroused indignation. An ad-hoc organization to lead the protests, the Homeless Citizens’ League, developed under the leadership of Patricia McCluskey, the wife of a prominent local doctor and a co-founder of the Social Justice campaign. As a forerunner to the CSJ – but with more limited goals - the Citizens’ League enjoyed only a short-term existence.⁴⁴⁵

⁴⁴⁴ “*We Shall Overcome,*” *The History of the Struggle for Civil Rights in Northern Ireland, 1968-1978* (Belfast: Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association, 1978), 3-7.

⁴⁴⁵ Conn McCluskey, *Up Off Their Knees: A Commentary on the Civil Rights Movement in Northern Ireland* (Galway: self-published, 1989), 1-33.

Although the CSJ sustained a longer existence, the organization faced obstacles it could not overcome. An early court action against the Dungannon Council was abandoned because of a lack of funds, and Westminster rules prevented the Campaign for Democracy in Ulster from raising issues about Northern Ireland on the floor of the Commons. Most important, Harold Wilson's Labor government carried on the British political tradition that had existed since 1921: it largely ignored the situation in Ulster. Hence, CSJ's non-violent and secular strategy and the Campaign for Democracy in Ulster drew little notice from the British government or the British public. The CSJ's quiet strategy, moreover, did not satisfy a group of left-wing housing and community workers and student leaders who demanded a more radical approach, including confrontational direct-action protests. These activists noticed the effectiveness of the Selma-to-Montgomery march and other major American civil rights protests - broadcast on British television and reported in the Northern Irish and British press - and demanded a stronger civil rights movement.⁴⁴⁶

In addition, the early work of the Campaign for Social Justice did not satisfy the political aspirations of the republican movement, as the political-military coalition of Sinn Fein and the Irish Republican Army pushed a more radical agenda. Because of the failure of the IRA's border campaign, in the early 1960s republican transformed their basic strategy. Communist political activity replaced a political agenda based on partition. The republican movement also made overtures to the protestant working class, hoping to win Orange converts to a united Irish workers' republic. Republican activists formed the Wolfe Tone Society in October 1964, as discussion groups to promote republicanism and civil rights, and in Ulster the group became active in cities such as Belfast and Londonderry. Desmond Greaves of the Connolly Association

⁴⁴⁶ Bob Purdie, *Politics in the Streets: The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement in Northern Ireland* (Belfast: The Blackstaff Press, 1990), 92-116.

in London – a British-based group of Irish workers linked to the British Communist Party – along with two members of the Wolfe Tone Society, Roy Johnston and Anthony Coughlan, formulated the new republican strategy; they argued for a left-wing agenda that sought to implement a worker’s republic in Ireland and to eliminate sectarianism in Ulster. Johnston, the education officer of the Republican Army Council, and Coughlan, a lecturer in social administration at Trinity College, Dublin, asserted that the focus of republican political efforts should turn towards social activism and support for civil rights activities. In 1967, Cathal Goulding, the chief of staff of the IRA’s Army Council made the policy official when he attacked the tradition of physical-force violence at the annual republican meeting in Bodenstown. The threat of violence was not entirely eliminated from the republican agenda, but it was in those years, relegated to a secondary role. Goulding argued for a campaign of socialist-based social action groups.⁴⁴⁷

Goulding’s attempt to transform the IRA did nothing to alleviate militant fundamentalist fears of a resurgent Roman Catholicism in Northern Ireland. The militant fundamentalists perceived a conspiracy connecting Catholicism, republicanism, and communism, and the civil right movement. Militants argued that the Irish left pushed civil rights as a precursor to a

⁴⁴⁷ J. Bowyer Bell, *The IRA 1968-2000: Analysis of a Secret Army* (New York: St. Martin’s Press), 73-76; and Tim Pat Coogan, *The I.R.A.* (Niwot, Co: Roberts Rinehart Publishers, 1993), 249-258. Paisleyites had a point: during the five decades following the 1916 Easter Rising, the Irish labor movement would not promote policies that upset the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. For instance, at the Annual Conference of the Irish Labour Party (April 1939), Labour removed proposed amendments that called for a workers’ republic and attacked private property. The Catholic hierarchy disliked the proposals. Unlike the Russian revolutionaries of the early twentieth century who were atheists, many Irish leftists retained their Catholic religiosity (W.K. Anderson, *James Connolly and the Irish Left* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, Limited, 1994), 94-96).

communist revolution and an Irish socialist state, and that the Roman Catholic Church was acquiescing to the plan in an attempt to become the state church.⁴⁴⁸

Despite some small successes in Londonderry and Belfast, through the mid-1960s catholic civil rights activism in Northern Ireland was a disjointed effort between republicans and moderate catholics who employed legal methods. By late 1966, however, the mood was beginning to change. A civil rights meeting in Belfast in November heard Ciaran Mac an Aili, president of the Irish Pacifist Association, argue for a civil disobedience campaign. In January 1967, the Campaign for Social Justice helped to form the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association (NICRA) as a partnership between republicans, left-wing housing activists and communists, and a spectrum of non-violent catholic and labor organizations. NICRA sought to coordinate Northern Ireland's rapidly diversifying civil rights efforts, and accepted known members of the Irish Republican Army and non-aligned republicans who sympathized with the violent assertion of catholic political ambitions. The civil rights group met monthly and opened branches throughout Northern Ireland; any person or organization who accepted the new organization's constitution could join. The civil rights association even included several protestant groups, Unionist Stormont Senator Nelson Elder, Robin Cole of Queen's University Young Unionists (and chairman of the University's Conservative and Unionist Association), and the Ulster Liberal Party. NICRA agreed to a policy that supported the O'Neill administration and along the lines of the Campaign for Social Justice did not advocate public protests.⁴⁴⁹

⁴⁴⁸ *Protestant Telegraph*, "CRA = IRA, C.R.A. – Civil Right Association, I.R.A. – Irish Republican Army," 19 November 1968 and "Civil Rights – Then Communism," 15 May 1969.

⁴⁴⁹ Bardon, 1992, 652; and Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association, "Constitution and Rules," 1967. Senator Elder walked out of the initial meeting (29 January 1967) because NICRA denounced capital punishment for the murder of policemen. Robin Cole and the Ulster Unionist Party stayed in the civil rights association for a while, but most Liberals and many moderate Unionists joined the Alliance Party after it was formed in April 1970 (W.D. Flackes

However, the loose nature of its structure mandated that NICRA would never have a strong and domineering leadership and allowed its membership the freedom to promote competing agendas. This concept proved to be important, as some members argued that support for O'Neill should not be open-ended and gave the prime minister just one more year to implement effective reforms. The social demographics of civil rights activists also weakened NICRA's effectiveness: the movement divided along class lines, with catholic middle class members like the McCluskeys advocating a moderate movement, while catholic workers advocated a more militant approach. The majority of republicans and leftists within NICRA were from the catholic working class and between January 1967 and August 1968 - when the first civil rights march took place - they pushed for radical protests in support of housing reform. The civil rights movement altered its non-confrontational style in June 1968 when Austin Currie, the Nationalist Party MP for East Tyrone, at his party's annual conference not only argued for direct action protests, but followed through on his demands.⁴⁵⁰

Because NICRA did not initially advocate street protests, Paisley and his militant fundamentalist supporters paid little attention to the organization. This did not mean that they ignored the issue of catholic civil rights was totally ignored. Paisley and organizations such as the Evangelical Protestant Society kept a vigilant eye on the emerging civil rights movement, as well as on republican activity in Northern Ireland and the Republic – arguing that both movements worked in collusion. In March 1967, the *Protestant Telegraph* and the *Ulster*

and Sydney Elliott, *Northern Ireland: A Political Directory 1968-1988* (Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 1989), 203 and 278-279).

⁴⁵⁰ Gerry Adams, *Before the Dawn: An Autobiography* (New York: William Morrow, 1996), 75-91; Bardon, 1992, 637 and 643; Brian Dooley, *Black and Green: The Fight for Civil Rights in Northern Ireland and Black America* (London: Pluto Press, 1998), 42-47; Purdie, 4 and 82-92; and MLR Smith, *Fighting For Ireland?: The Military Strategy of the Irish Republican Movement* (London: Routledge, 1995), 81-82.

Protestant denounced as treasonous proposed marches that planned to commemorate the 1867 Fenian Rising despite a temporary ban on parades by the Home Minister, William Craig. Implementing the Special Powers Act, Craig placed a month-long proscription on all public processions and meetings, unless authorized by the Royal Ulster Constabulary; a permission difficult for nationalists and republicans to obtain. Because the ban did not prevent Junior Orangeman bands from marching during the same period, catholic MPs charged that the government was appeasing protestant extremists. Craig also outlawed the new Republican Clubs set up to circumvent a similar ban on Sinn Fein and the Irish Republican Army.⁴⁵¹

The same feeling of outrage over discrimination that Northern Ireland's catholic politicians expressed also germinated within three important groups: politically-minded students attending Queen's University, the Northern Ireland Labour Party, and moderate protestants who supported catholic civil rights demands. During the 1967 - 1968 academic year, civil rights in Northern Ireland and the United States, the war in Vietnam, the student riots in France and the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia had awoken some Ulster students to the need for political activism. On March 8, 1967, Queen's students formed a Republican Club in defiance of the government ban and two days later eighty students staged an illegal march through Belfast. Paisleyites and the police ignored these two efforts, but in mid-November a Paisley-led counter-demonstration blocked a smaller march to the Unionist Party headquarters. In response, several thousand students protested in front of Craig's house.⁴⁵²

⁴⁵¹ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Fenians 'Treason' Marches Throughout Ulster," 4 March 1967, "Why Does Ulster's Rebel Go Free? Arrest Fenian Fitt and Rout the Republican Clubs," 1 April 1967 and "Craig Must Go: No Action Against Republicans," 13 April 1968; and *Ulster Protestant*, "Fenian Rising Ban Imposed," April 1967.

⁴⁵² *Belfast Telegraph*, "Students' March: Paisley to Protest," 14 November 1967 and "Students March to Craig's Home," 15 November 1967; and Paul Arthur, *The People's Democracy 1968-1973* (Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 1974), 21-26.

Both the policies of the O'Neill administration and the militant fundamentalist effort to thwart these policies inspired calls for reform from diverse elements within the Unionist community. During its 1967 General Assembly, the Presbyterian Church in Ireland issued a statement against religious discrimination that showed an increasing willingness to address the problem, while at its annual conference in Newtownards the Northern Irish Labour Party passed a resolution calling on the British Government to investigate discrimination in Northern Ireland. The NILP strongly supported the Campaign for Democracy in Ulster and the two-day visit to Ulster by Paul Rose and Stan Orme, two important figures within CDU. In September 1966, the NILP and the Irish Congress of Trade Unions submitted a report to the Northern Ireland government calling for business votes in provincial elections and Queen's University seats to be eliminated, and for redrawing of Stormont constituencies. The receipt of the report marked the first time that a Unionist administration had agreed to consider civil rights grievances.⁴⁵³

Westminster ignored the call for reform despite CDU supporter Gerald Fitt's insistence on discussing discrimination in Northern Ireland within the British House of Commons – a crucial break with parliamentary convention.⁴⁵⁴ The British government's apathy and inaction proved to be a major mistake. As Vincent Feeney has argued, the lack of interest in Ulster's affairs prior to the summer of 1968 forced NICRA to adopt direct-action protests. Ulster politicians, however, did not ignore the new civil rights activism or Paisley's counter efforts. During Stormont debates Austin Currie, Harry Diamond, (the catholic MP from the Falls Road, Belfast), Gerry Fitt, and James O'Reilly, (the MP for Mourne), denounced previous Paisleyite actions, such as the proposed march to Divis Street in 1964 and the protest outside the Presbyterian General

⁴⁵³ *Annual Reports of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1967*; and Mulholland, 148-149.

⁴⁵⁴ Fitt, a Stormont MP, also sat in the British House of Commons from 1966-1983, representing Belfast West.

Assembly two years later, as intimidating to the government, and condemned both Paisley and the *Protestant Telegraph*. The Paisleyite newspaper had called for Fitt's arrest and a ban on the Republican Clubs.⁴⁵⁵ O'Reilly contrasted Irish Presbyterians who supported liberty in 1798 to those who pandered to extremist protestants one hundred and seventy years later: "Now in 1967 we have so-called Free Presbyterians. In my view their attitude to freedom is repugnant to the principles for which those earlier Presbyterians fought and died. We have people whose creed is a creed of hatred and whose actions are a mockery of Christianity and whose aim is the setting up of a ruthless direction of State policy and control over the forces of Government." ⁴⁵⁶

THE AMERICAN CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

In North America, militant fundamentalists took a strong stance against the American civil rights movement, which they attacked as communist-inspired and backed by liberal, apostate Protestant clergymen. During his speaking tours Paisley witnessed the protests transforming the United States and heard the militant fundamentalist condemnation of these protests. Militant fundamentalists viewed both racial integration and theological liberalism as communist efforts to eradicate "true" Biblical Protestantism. During the fifteen years between the Second World War and the 1960s. McIntire, Hargis, and the militant fundamentalist community in general focused on the threat posed by theological modernism and communism. They believed that God had ordained the United States to defend Protestantism and capitalism. While the threat of civil rights was rising on the horizon, until the early 1960s the threat appeared contained. The Supreme Court's landmark *Brown v. Boards of Education* decision in 1954, which outlawed segregated school systems, did alarm segregationists and militant fundamentalists and set in

⁴⁵⁵ Northern Ireland (1967), vol. 65, col. 1763-1764, 1811-1815 and vol. 66, col. 145-148, 156-162 and 1049; and Vincent E. Feeney, "Westminster and the Early Civil Rights Movement in Northern Ireland," *Eire-Ireland* 11 (1976): 3-13

⁴⁵⁶ Northern Ireland (1967), vol. 65, col. 1820-1821.

motion massive resistance from the American South. The inability of federal courts to implement the decision, however, delayed a strong reaction from the American right.⁴⁵⁷

The situation changed dramatically in 1960, when four African American college students sat down at the Woolworth whites-only lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina, on February 1st. Their courageous action not only inspired a wave of civil disobedience across the southern United States, but also provoked a reaction from militant fundamentalists. The civil rights and voting legislation of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations enhanced this reaction. McIntire, Hargis, and their fundamentalist associates intensified their campaign to correlate the civil rights movement with both communism and theological liberalism. Militant fundamentalists argued that segregation was not only the best social solution, but that scripture revealed it as the will of God. Many militant fundamentalists opted for an anti-clerical position, arguing that the leadership of mainstream denominations and seminaries – not the church body – were supporting civil rights as part of a liberal social gospel. There were some public statements; for instance, in 1958, the annual convention of the American Council of Christian Churches passed a resolution asserting that not only was segregation and apartheid Christian, but that inter-racial marriages were unbiblical. In 1964, the ACCC urged black Christians to denounce the leaders of the civil rights movement, arguing that the National Council of Church's support for the civil rights movement violated scripture. In these arguments militants were careful not to advocate racial superiority, but to attack the liberal social gospel. Within the fellowship of "true believers," however, segregationists openly preached a message of racial superiority.⁴⁵⁸

⁴⁵⁷ Farber, 72-74.

⁴⁵⁸ *Christian Beacon*, "Civil Disobedience and the Sit-Ins," 19 February 1961 and "The Christian Attitude Towards Race," 10 March 1966; David L. Chappell, *A Stone of Hope*:

Militant fundamentalists thought that a major part of the plan of God-less communists was to use integration, civil rights agitation, and black street violence to destroy America's protestant churches. Militants decried the social gospel as a front for communism because it advocated a

Prophetic Religion and the Death of Jim Crow (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 105-124 and "Disunity and Religious Institutions in the White South," in *Massive Resistance: Southern Opposition to the Second Reconstruction*, Clive Webb, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 136-150; and George Lewis, "White South, Red Nation: Massive Resistance and the Cold War," in Webb, 117-135. (Note: all Biblical quotes are from the King James Version) Segregationists maintained that God created diverse species and commanded that each remain pure (Genesis 1:11). "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, *and* the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed *is* in itself, upon the earth: and it was so." After the Flood, Noah's lineage divided into three racial groups: the white races of Shem and Japheth and the dark races of Ham (Genesis 9:18 – 10:32). "And the sons of Noah, that went forth of the ark, were Shem, Ham, and Japheth; and Ham *is* the father of Canaan." "These *are* the families of the sins of Noah, after their generations, in their nations: and by these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood." Ham and his descendants were to become the servant race: "Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall be unto his brethren.." (Genesis 9:24-27). "And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him. And he said, Cursed *be* Canaan, a servant of servants shall be unto his brethren. And he said, Blessed *be* the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant." The mixing of races was forbidden and purity demanded of the Israelites (Genesis 24: 3-4). "And I will make thee swear by the Lord, the God of heaven, and the God of the earth, that thou shalt not take a wife unto my son of the daughters of the Canaanites, among whom I dwell: But thou shalt go unto my kindred, and take a wife unto my son Isaac." God, moreover, separated humans by language (Genesis 11:1-9). The Hebrew prophets continued God's segregation: "...give not your daughters unto their sons neither take their daughters unto your sons...that ye may be strong (Ezra 9:12). "Now therefore give not unto their sons, neither take their daughters unto your sons, not seek their peace of their wealth forever: that ye may be strong, and eat the goods of the land, and leave it for an inheritance to your children forever," as did the Apostles and Saint Paul. New Christians, for example, were ordered not to marry non-believers (2 Corinthians 6:14-17). "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness – and what communion hath light with darkness. And what concord hath Christ with Belial or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in *them*; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you," and the Second Coming would allow all nations in the church triumphant to preserve their cultural and racial distinctiveness (Revelation 22:24). "And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the Kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it." Militant fundamentalists insisted, then, that divinely-ordered segregation was part of God's plan.

one-world, classless society, where human reformation would replace God's salvation. They particularly targeted Martin Luther King, Jr. and his civil disobedience campaign because of both King's social theology and his willingness to work with left-wing organizations.⁴⁵⁹

Logical incoherence was a hallmark of the militant argument. For example, militants argued that civil disobedience violated God's command to "be subject unto higher powers," (*Romans* 13:1),⁴⁶⁰ yet McIntire and Paisley were willing to undertake public protests against both the American and Northern Irish governments. Militants, however, asserted that scripture allowed for attacks on the "higher powers" of "apostate" governments. Any action was Christian as long as it supported the militant fundamentalist position.⁴⁶¹

Through the *Christian Beacon* and his "Twentieth Century Reformation Hour" radio broadcasts, McIntire took a strong stance against the civil rights movement, highlighting the connection between civil rights actions and clerics in the National Council of Churches. Billy James Hargis began his attack on the civil rights movement immediately following the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, an early move that critics have credited to his birth in Arkansas. Hargis' attacks on integration and civil rights resulted in a sharp rise in the income of his radio

⁴⁵⁹ *Christian Beacon*, "The Theology of Martin Luther King," 26 March 1964; and *Weekly Crusader*, "Martin Luther King Spokesman for the Enemy," 5 May 1967. Militant fundamentalists had a point: The historiography on Martin Luther King, Jr. supports his contacts with socialist and communist groups and individuals. Examples are: David J. Garrow, *The FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr.: From "Solo" to Memphis* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1981) and *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference* (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc, 1996); and Thomas F. Jackson, *From Civil Rights to Human Rights: Martin Luther King, Jr and the Struggle For Economic Justice* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007).

⁴⁶⁰ "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers: For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." (King James Version)

⁴⁶¹ *Christian Beacon*, "Civil Disobedience and the Sit-ins," 19 February 1961; *Christian Crusade*, "Guerrilla Warfare in U.S.A.," August-September 1967; and *Western Voice*, "Integration and the Negro Revolt," 12 August 1965, and "Communist Use of Negro Agitators in War Against Christianity Not New," 24 August 1967.

broadcasts after 1955. Although his income declined in the early 1960s, attacks on the Civil and Voting Rights Acts and the Supreme Court decision in 1963 to outlaw prayer and Bible reading in America's public schools brought new financial and moral support from Americans concerned over school integration, black voting power and the perceived promotion of atheism in the school system.⁴⁶² The Anti-Communist Leadership schools sponsored by the Christian Crusade made support of segregation a major topic at its seminars. Quite often speakers at the schools did not hide their racism: R. Carter Pittman, a radical Georgia lawyer, used the word 'nigger' as well as imagery that would be welcomed at Ku Klux Klan rallies. While Hargis never openly expressed such views and although he did condemn Pittman, the Georgia racist was a frequent speaker at the Anti-Communist Leadership Schools. Such are the men that the Reverend Ian Paisley fraternized and prayed with at American Bible Conferences.⁴⁶³

THE AMERICAN INFLUENCE ON THE NORTHERN IRELAND CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Although the American and Northern Ireland civil rights movements developed independently, there were important transatlantic connections. Historians, participants, and observers of the Northern Ireland civil rights movement all acknowledge the influence of its American counterpart. The Homeless Citizens' League in Dungannon in 1963 was only the first of many organizations to notice, admire and imitate the tactics of groups such as the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee and Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The forty women who picketed the Dungannon Urban District Council held

⁴⁶² Janson and Eisman, 69-91; and Jorstad, 107-111;

⁴⁶³ *Christian Beacon*, "Dr. McIntire Takes Aim at D.C. March," 29 August 1963, "The Christian Attitude Towards Race," 10 March 1966; *Gospel Witness*, "Special Centennial Event," March 2, 1967; *New York Times*, "A Segregationist Advises Rightists," 30 January 1962; *Minutes of the Twenty-Ninth General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, Christian Admiral, Cape May, NJ, October 19-25, 1965*; *Segregation and God's Word* (Decatur, GA: The Voice of Liberty, no publication date); Clabaugh, 90-91 and 99-103; and Stroman, 259-260.

placards with slogans such as “they talk about Alabama, why don’t they talk about Dungannon,” and “if our religion is against us, ship us to Little Rock.”⁴⁶⁴ When NICRA began its marches they routinely sang “We Shall Overcome,” the anthem of the American movement. The leaders of the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association admit that they copied the tactics of Americans, although some, such as Michael Farrell of the Peoples’ Democracy also credit the student uprising in Paris in 1968 as a role model. In early January 1969, Farrell was one of the organizers of the “Long March” that went from Belfast to Londonderry and which was modeled after the 1965 Selma-to-Montgomery March in Alabama.⁴⁶⁵

In his comparative study of the American and Northern Irish civil rights movements, Brian Dooley chronicled several examples of direct transatlantic contacts. In a November 1966 speech, Ciaran Mac an Aili, the Irish pacifist leader, urged republicans to emulate Martin Luther King and in the same year Eamonn McCann – a leading catholic activist in Londonderry - met Stokely Carmichael in London at the Dialectics of Liberation Conference. Fionnbarra O’Dochartaigh, another catholic, Londonderry activist read magazines that black American civil rights activists produced and published articles on the American movement in the *Irish Democrat*, the paper of the Connolly Association. Although such direct transatlantic contacts were rare, Gerry Adams, the future leader of Sinn Fein, has argued that many Irish republicans identified with American blacks.⁴⁶⁶

⁴⁶⁴ Dooley, 29-30.

⁴⁶⁵ *Belfast Telegraph*, “Dungannon Women in Housing Protest,” 14 May 1963; and Catherine B. Shannon, “From Housing Rights to Civil Rights 1963-8,” in *The Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing Volume 5: Irish Women’s Writing and Traditions* (New York: New York University Press, 2002), 379-381.

⁴⁶⁶ Adams, *Before the Dawn*, 37; Farrell, *Northern Ireland: The Orange State*, 249; and Paddy Devlin, *Straight Left: An Autobiography* (Belfast: The Blackstaff Press, 1993), 87. A good example of the articles in the *Belfast Telegraph* is: “50 Mile Freedom March on Alabama Resumes,” 22 March 1965. In *Black and Green: The Fight for Civil, Rights in Northern Ireland*

The news media made the biggest impact on Ulster, militant fundamentalists, moderates, and radicals alike. Ulstermen kept abreast of the news from America; the British and Northern Irish press extensively covered the important events of the American civil rights movement. These reports taught activists in Northern Ireland that direct action protests not only made the news, but brought government action. The publications of Northern Ireland's major Protestant denominations frequently carried articles on the American civil rights movement, and were always sympathetic to the demands of the black minority. As early as 1961, the *Irish Christian Advocate*, the organ of the Methodist Church in Ireland, included stories about the Freedom Riders and the integration of the University of Georgia.⁴⁶⁷

Coverage in the Northern Irish militant fundamentalist press, in contrast, was extremely negative. Stories on the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. exemplify the differences in coverage. For instance, both the *Church of Ireland Gazette* and the *Presbyterian Herald* supported the Martin Luther King Memorial Fund that the World Council of Churches set up for the benefit of the Delta Ministry in Mississippi and for Freedom City, a housing estate for unemployed cotton plantation workers. The *Protestant Telegraph*, in contrast, featured articles with headlines like: "Violence the Fruit of King's 'Non-Violence' Campaign."⁴⁶⁸

and Black America, Brian Dooley acknowledges the inspiration of the American movement, but asserts that Northern Ireland Catholics developed their own strategies, such as squatting in council houses and employing student marches. Very few contacts were made between American and Irish civil rights leaders and almost everything that Northern Irish activists learned about the American movement came from television and newspapers.

⁴⁶⁷ *Irish Christian Advocate*, "Inter-Racial Tension in the South," 27 January 1961 and "Freedom in Alabama," June 2, 1961.

⁴⁶⁸ *Church of Ireland Gazette*, "Ecumenical News Column," 26 April 1968; *Presbyterian Herald*, "The WCC Has Launched a Martin Luther King Memorial Fund," July/August 1968; and *Protestant Telegraph*, "Martin Luther King" by Bob Spencer, 27 April 1968 and "Violence the Fruit of King's 'Non-Violence' Campaign," 27 April 1968.

MILITANT FUNDAMENTALISM AND THE ORANGE ORDER

The extent of Paisley's rising influence and O'Neill's decline can be illustrated by looking at the new support Paisley received from members of the Orange Order. The Order included members from all segments of the protestant community, including important businessmen, clergymen, and politicians. The annual Orange marches on July 12th and 13th, which celebrate the Battle of the Boyne, are public holidays in Northern Ireland. Thus, the Orange Order holds an important influence on the political, cultural, and economic life of Ulster.⁴⁶⁹

The relationship between Paisley and the Orange Order was complicated and often hostile; Paisley's ecumenical efforts created dissension within the Orange Order. Many Orangemen agreed with Paisley's argument that working-class protestants were also entitled to civil rights. Despite advantages over working-class catholics, the protestant working class also suffered high unemployment and their housing conditions were sub-standard.⁴⁷⁰ Other Orangemen, however, resisted any outreach to the Protestant community. In addition, Paisley's attacks on Protestant apostasy further divided the Order. Paisley was the chaplain of the Apprentice Boys' Belfast and District Amalgamated Committee until the Crossgar schism. In the late 1950s, the Order

⁴⁶⁹ The founding of the Grand Orange Institution of Ireland (Orange Order) in 1795 and the Order's contribution to Irish history has been well documented (and has been touched on in Chapter Four). Although the Home Rule Crisis made the Orange Order an integral part of protestant politics in Ulster - in the twentieth century most Ulster unionist politicians and many prominent protestant businessmen have been Orangemen - the political significance of the Order is beyond the scope of this dissertation, except for the vital years between 1965 and 1968. What is important is the relationship between the Orange Order and the Reverend Ian Paisley. Free Presbyterianism and the Orange Order had a contentious relationship, but a more amiable discourse revived in 1967. However, it is important to note the similarities between Paisleyite and Orange practices. Both Paisley and Orange Order marches included Bible readings that often denounced Roman Catholicism, the Orange Order required its members to uphold the Protestant religion, and a few Orange Lodges barred non-practicing Christians from membership.

⁴⁷⁰ Geoffrey Bell, *The Protestants of Ulster* (London: Pluto Press, 1976), 15-33; and Gary McMichael, *Ulster Voice: In Search of Common Ground in Northern Ireland* (Boulder, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers, 1999), 4-5.

censored Paisley for accusing the Reverend Warren Potter, chaplain of the Mountpottinger Orange Lodge, of apostasy. Paisley was upset that Potter had been a member of the Irish Evangelical Church and the National Union of Protestants, but resigned both to return to Irish Presbyterianism. Because many Orangemen were Presbyterian, the Orange Order and the Apprentice Boys of Derry Association excluded Free Presbyterian chaplains from most Lodges after December 1951. Although Paisley denounced individual members of the Order as ecumenicalists, WCC supporters, and drunkards, he actually remained a member for another decade and retained many supporters within the organization. In 1962, however, the Orange Order refused to expel the Lord Mayor of Belfast, Robin Kinahan, after Kinahan attended a catholic funeral mass. Paisley quit the fraternal organization in protest, but continued to address the North Antrim Lodge of the Independent Loyal Orange Institution during July Twelfth celebrations. These events were little noticed by the public, but were important in widening the gap between Paisley and protestant authority.⁴⁷¹

During the mid-1960s, the relationship between the Reverend Ian Paisley and the Grand Orange Lodge of Ireland took on a new dimension. While Paisley was disliked by the Orange leadership, many Orangemen became Paisleyites. In the contentious atmosphere of Ramsey-Rome talks and the Assembly protest and with his rising fame, Paisley became a favored speaker during the July 12th celebrations. Paisley's influence could be seen throughout the Order: the Grand Lodge of Ireland issued a statement denouncing the attendance of Protestant clergymen at Catholic dedication services, declared that ecumenical Protestant clergymen were not welcome at

⁴⁷¹ *Ballymena Observer*, "Church Halls Closed to Rev. Ian Paisley," 4 May 1951; Bruce, 2007, 196-199; and Eric P. Kauffman, *The Orange Order: A Contemporary Northern Irish History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 21-48.

the upcoming July 12th parades, and attacked the World Council of Churches. Many Orangemen supported Paisley's attacks on the ecumenical movement and on O'Neill.⁴⁷²

The Orange Order's leadership, however, remained resistant to Paisleyism and tensions within the Order grew. In 1965, Sir George Clark, the Grand Master of the Loyal Orange Institution of Ireland, Clark broke with Orange tradition and made conciliatory comments towards the catholic community during his July 12th speech at Finaghy. All Orangemen did not accept Clark's viewpoint and the following year, Northern Irish dissidents and a large number of Scottish bands, made a loud pro-Paisley showing at Finaghy.⁴⁷³ Led by Clark, the Orange leadership sought to show support for O'Neill by allowing outreach to the catholic community. Two leading Orangemen, Ulster Unionist MP Phelim O'Neill (the Prime Minister's cousin) and Colonel Henry Cramsie attended a Catholic mass in Ballymoney, while Nat Minford, a vocal opponent of Paisley's and a prominent Unionist politician, appeared the opening of a Catholic school in Anderstown. These gestures to the catholic community violated the rules of the Order, and many rank-and-file Orangemen sought to discipline the violators. In June 1967, however, Phelim O'Neill and Minford were summoned before their lodge to answer the charges, an action both men considered insulting. Although neither MP was immediately forced to leave the Order, the incident showed that the influence of moderates within the order had waned. Moreover, as a result of the controversy, the Grand Lodge of Ireland amended its by-laws and ordinances, enabling the Order in the future to expel any member who attended a Catholic service or ceremony.⁴⁷⁴

⁴⁷² Kauffman, 21-48.

⁴⁷³ Kauffman, 21-48.

⁴⁷⁴ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Orangemen Want to Have MP Expelled From Order," 16 February 1967, and "Orange Order to Take Fresh Look at its Rules," 8 February 1968; and Moloney, 2008, 140-142.

The tensions within the Order exploded in violence during the July 12th celebrations of 1967. Orangemen attacked George Forrest, the Ulster Unionist Westminster MP for mid-Ulster, when he proposed a resolution in support of the Prime Minister. The level of animosity was unprecedented: Forrest was physically assaulted while speaking from the platform at Coagh. Similar pro-O'Neill declarations at Belfast Fontana, Lisburn and Tandragee were also denounced. In addition, traditional Orange resolutions supporting the Prime Minister were omitted during numerous celebrations, including the one at Enniskillen presided over by Lord Brookeborough, the ex-Prime Minister. Brookeborough expressed the concerns of many Unionists who were upset over O'Neill's firing of Harry West, the Minister of Agriculture from County Fermanagh, for corruption and for the consistent banning of protestant parades over the previous year. West, a right-wing hardliner and opponent of O'Neill, had used privileged governmental information to purchase land in county Fermanagh. Although Paisley and the Orange Order had their differences in the past, from the mid-1960s on, both were working in a loose alliance to defend Irish Protestantism.⁴⁷⁵

Paisley received a larger degree of support from the Independent Orange Order. Founded on July 11, 1903, the new organization was established in East Belfast by trade unionists who felt that the Orange Order leadership did not look out for working-class interests. The dissidents

⁴⁷⁵ *Presbyterian Herald*, "Editorial – Orange Order," July/August, 1968; *Protestant Telegraph*, "Turmoil at the Twelfth: Orangemen's No Confidence in O'Neill," 22 July 1967; Bardon, 1992, 634-636; Moloney and Pollak, 145-147; and Mulholland, 120-122.

During July 1966, 28 resolutions targeted Stormont policy towards Easter Rising celebrations and ten specifically denounced Ramsey's trip to Rome. In the summer of 1966, Paisley was invited to speak to the Orange service at Knockadona on June 12th, to the Apprentice Boys in Dromara the next day, and on July 1st to a large crowd at Castlewellan that included eight Orange bands. In addition, anti-O'Neill heckling was heard at six Orange demonstrations during the July 12th gatherings. But there was a limit to Orange Paisleyism: while the Order felt it necessary to reconfirm its commitment to the Anglican Thirty-Nine Articles of Faith and the Westminster Confession, it also denounced the violence that the Paisley protest provoked.

institutionalized a movement that opposed Unionist leadership, and which Paisley would copy. The Independent Loyal Orange Institution of Ireland supported Paisley's attack on Fisherwick Presbyterian Church in 1964 and that same year made the first open attacks on ecumenism during their July 12th celebrations.⁴⁷⁶

The Moorman controversy provides another example of Paisley's growing influence within both the Orange Order and the Independent Orange Order. In August 1966, the Church of Ireland announced that the Irish Church Association had invited Moorman to speak at St. Anne's Cathedral on the dialogue between the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church. Moorman had attended Vatican II as an observer and in 1966 accompanied Archbishop Ramsey to Rome to talk with Pope Paul VI. Dr. F. J. Mitchell, the Anglican Bishop of Down and Dromore, asked Anglican churches to refuse permission for these services. The evangelical element within the Grand Orange Institution and the Independent Orange Order supported Paisley's anti-ecumenical and anti-O'Neill stances. The Independent Orange Order replied to Mitchell that no evangelical Protestant should be denied use of a Protestant church and attacked his stance against the Reformation Services as part of the Anglican move towards unity with Rome.⁴⁷⁷

THE CRUSADE AGAINST ECUMENISM AND O'NEILL CONTINUES

The controversy over Moorman's visit aroused intense interest outside the ranks of the Orange Orders as well and further strengthened Paisley's growing influence among Ulster

⁴⁷⁶ Dominic Bryan, *Orange Parades: The Politics of Ritual, Tradition and Control* (London: Pluto Press, 2000), 52-54.

⁴⁷⁷ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Orange Order No Right to Dictate to Church of Ireland – Canon," 9 February 1967, "Independent Orangemen Attack Bishop," 11 February 1967 and "Orange Services – Bishop Speaks," 10 February 1967; *Protestant Telegraph*, "Dr. Alfred Martin Moderator of Irish Presbyterian Church Attacked Orange Institution for its Stand Against Moorman Visit," 18 February 1967; Moloney and Pollak, 145-147; and Mulholland, 117-119.

protestants. In October 1963, Moorman had told interviewers from the Roman Catholic Church that he supported a reunion of Christian churches and that “there will have to be a central head of the Church, and that head will clearly have to be the Bishop of Rome.”⁴⁷⁸ Such a statement was fuel to the Paisleyite fire. Moorman’s apparent support for the Anglo-Catholic goal of one united Christian Church under the head of the Roman pope provided further evidence of growing Roman Catholic influence in Britain.⁴⁷⁹

To Paisley and his supporters, Moorman’s visit provided a rich opportunity for public protest against the forward march of ecumenicalism in Northern Ireland. To distance himself from its more ecumenically minded English cousins, the Church of Ireland issued in a statement entitled ‘The Church of Ireland and Other Churches,’ which reconfirmed its commitment to the Thirty-Nine Articles of Faith and the Book of Common Prayer, and expressed its support for the traditional Apostolic, and Reformed Protestantism of Irish Anglican theology. Nevertheless, the Irish Bishops supported the talks between Anglicans and Rome, including the first meeting that was held in early January 1967 at Gazzoda, Italy to discuss scripture, tradition and liturgy. They also expressed support for an ecumenical meeting held in the National Stadium in Dublin, attended by Eamonn De Valera and the Apostolic Nuncio, and for the Greenhills Conference on Christian marriage held in the Presentation Convent in Drogheda, and attended by 150 Anglican,

⁴⁷⁸ Divine Word News Service, “Views of Anglican Bishop of Primacy, Deacons and Collegiality,” 21 October 1963. The Vatican-run news service issued press releases during the Second Vatican Council.

⁴⁷⁹ *Protestant Telegraph*, “Pope’s Quisling Bishop to Visit Belfast (Unprecedented Protest Planned),” 21 January 1967. Although still a minority opinion within the Anglican community, support for Anglo-Roman unity was increasing in this time period amongst the Anglican ministry and leadership. See: Adrian Hastings, 536-580 and Moloney, 2008, 139-140.

Methodist, Non-Subscribing Presbyterian, and catholic clergymen as well as the Salvation Army. The invitation to Moorman, then, appeared as yet another step toward Roman rule.⁴⁸⁰

Paisley did not initially react to Moorman's planned visit - Paisley was in jail - but as the visit approached, militant condemnation erupted. The *Protestant Telegraph* denounced the visit as an attack on the Reformation and the Revolution Settlement of 1689 and dismissed Moorman as a traitorous quisling. Paisley promised to stage a protest outside St. Anne's during Moorman's talk. The threat worked: under additional pressure from the Orange Order and after a personal request from Terence O'Neill, the Very Reverend Cuthbert I. Peacocke, the Dean of Belfast, withdrew permission for the Irish Church Association, an ecumenical organization, to use the cathedral. Moorman canceled his visit.⁴⁸¹

Once again, Paisleyism was a topic of discussion in the Northern Ireland parliament and a cause of dissension between Irish protestant churches and the Free Presbyterian Church. O'Neill was forced to deny the charge when Nationalist MP Patrick Gormley claimed that the government had pressured Peacocke to cancel Moorman's visit. In addition, Paisley's threat to protest increased tensions between fundamentalists and evangelicals on one side and ecumenists and liberal Christians on the other. The *Protestant Telegraph* proclaimed the cancellation of Moorman's visit as a "Great Victory for Ulster Protestants."⁴⁸² The leaders of the Church of Ireland and the Irish Presbyterian Church attacked the opponents of ecumenism. The *Church of*

⁴⁸⁰ *Church of Ireland Gazette*, "Bishop of Ripon to Discuss Vatican Council," 8 August 1966, "Church of Ireland Clarifies its Position in Regards to Others," 23 September 1966, "Dialogue With Roman Churches," 13 January 1967, "What is Ecumenism?" 20 January 1967, "Greenhills Conference: Theology of Marriage," 27 January 1967, and "Bishops Condemn Threats of Disturbance," 17 February 1967.

⁴⁸¹ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Unprecedented Protest Planned: Pope's Quisling Bishop to Visit Belfast," 21 January 1967; and Moloney, 2008, 139-140.

⁴⁸² *Protestant Telegraph*, "Great Victory for Ulster Protestants: Bishop's Visit Off," 4 February 1967.

Ireland Gazette denounced “forces that would deny freedom of speech in Northern Ireland,”⁴⁸³ the House of Bishops issued a statement denouncing Paisley’s planned protests, while in a sermon to St. Anne’s, Reverend Brian Harvey argued that militants had no right to determine who the cathedral invited.⁴⁸⁴

His fight against liberalism and modernism within the Irish Presbyterian Church, however, continued to concern Paisley more than the Church of England’s rapprochement with Rome. As a consequence of his 1966 arrest, Paisley led protests outside the Presbyterian General Assembly during the following two years. The Home Minister William Craig banned a threatened march to the General Assembly in 1967 but Paisley, several Free Presbyterian ministers, and a small crowd of hymn singers and placard holders picketed outside the Assembly building. They jeered dignitaries as they left the Assembly, and skirmished with the police. Paisley charged that O’Neill had made a deal with the catholic community to prevent another Paisleyite march through Cromac Square.⁴⁸⁵

The protest outside the 1968 Assembly was a repeat of the previous year with the exception that Paisley kept his plans a secret until the day before the Assembly was scheduled to begin. Paisley canceled his proposed march because he did not like the route the Royal Ulster Constabulary allowed, but he was able to publicize his concerns about the Assembly’s agenda: *The Revivalist* and the *Protestant Telegraph* denounced the plan for the Judicial Committee to review the Westminster Confession of Faith and condemned the introduction of a report on inter-

⁴⁸³ *Church of Ireland Gazette*, “Comment,” 3 February 1967.

⁴⁸⁴ *Belfast Telegraph*, “Bar on Bishop: Cathedral Permission is Withdrawn,” 30 January 1967, “Bishop Cancels Visit: Reason Given is ‘Local Opposition,’” 2 February 1967, and “‘No Pressure’ Says PM: Reply to MP About Dean’s Decision,” 2 February 1967; and *Church of Ireland Gazette*, “Bishops Condemn ‘Threats of Disturbance,’” 17 February 1967.

⁴⁸⁵ *Belfast Telegraph*, “Police Cordon as Paisley Stages Parade,” 9 January 1967 and “O’Neill’s Pact Foiled: Protest March Banned but General Assembly Picketed,” 10 June 1967.

church relations that acknowledged the Catholic Church as Christian.⁴⁸⁶ The Paisleyite press also attacked the election of John Withers of Fisherwick Presbyterian Church as Moderator of the Assembly. Paisley despised Withers for his outreach to the catholic community, for his friendly communion with catholic priests, and for his support for modernist professors, such as J.L. Haire of the Presbyterian college. As discussed in Chapter Six, in 1964 Paisley forced Withers to cancel the visit of a catholic priest who was to speak to a youth group at Fisherwick Presbyterian Church. Now his election four years later as Moderator confirmed for Paisley the apostate intentions of Irish Presbyterianism.⁴⁸⁷

Militant fundamentalists also kept a constant attack on the O'Neill administration; Paisley and his allies took the lead with a combination of street protests, articles within the militant media, and attacks from the pulpit. Paisleyites denounced O'Neill at virtually every public appearance the Prime Minister made. A thousand-man Paisleyite parade in Portadown to protest O'Neill's speech at the local Orange Hall opened 1967 - although the march was not banned, it was stopped by the Royal Ulster Constabulary. The year ended with a protest against O'Neill's December meeting with the new Irish Taoiseach, Jack Lynch.⁴⁸⁸ Paisley and supporters met Lynch outside Stormont with a barrage of snowballs and placards accusing O'Neill of selling out Irish Protestantism to the Catholic Church. In a *Protestant Telegraph* editorial entitled "O'Neill

⁴⁸⁶ *Minutes of the General Assembly and Directory of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1968* (Belfast: Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1968), 20; Bardon, 1992, 636; and John M. Barkley, *The Antichrist: A Historical Survey: A Lecture Delivered at the Public Closing of the Presbyterian College, Belfast on 26th May, 1967* (Belfast: Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1967), 16-21. The Presbyterian Church in Ireland proposed to delete from their Confession its reference to the Pope as the anti-Christ. The assertion was an important tenet of the original Westminster version.

⁴⁸⁷ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Paisley Pickets in Scene at Assembly," 6 June 1967, "Paisley Plan for Assembly Protest is Kept Secret," 3 June 1968, and "No Charges After Incident at Assembly - RUC," 4 June 1968.

⁴⁸⁸ *Protestant Telegraph*, "O'Neill Welcomes Ulster's Would-be Destroyer," 23 December 1967.

the Dictator,” Paisley laid out his charges against the Prime Minister: he was arrogant and a liar, ignored the wishes of Stormont, placed himself above the law, and used the police to further his political aims.⁴⁸⁹

Paisley also condemned the Royal Ulster Constabulary as agents of O’Neillist repression when they worked against his interests or those of the Free Presbyterian Church. In one case of note, the Reverend John Douglas, the Free Presbyterian minister of Portavogie was arrested under the Public Order Act for an open-air speech made on September 8, 1966. Paisley charged that the police lied in presenting their evidence. In September 1967, Paisley’s wife Eileen, a Belfast City Councillor, was attacked by a small crowd of Catholics. Paisley accused the Royal Ulster Constabulary of failing to protect her.⁴⁹⁰

The ecumenical policies of the O’Neill administration and its perceived threat to the constitutional position of Northern Ireland necessitated a new attack against the conversations between the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church. In August 1967, these discussions took on a new serious tone as an Anglo-Roman Catholic joint commission proposed talks with the specific intention of church reunification.⁴⁹¹

PAISLEY AND BRITISH MILITANTS

Militant fundamentalist allies in England and Scotland united with Paisley in his crusade against Anglican-Catholic unity and British apostasy. Paisley took his crusade to Scotland in March 1967, starting an ‘old-time gospel campaign’ at Hamilton to a large crowd and helping his new ally Jack Glass, a militant Baptist fundamentalist from Glasgow. In 1964, Paisley and Glass

⁴⁸⁹ *Belfast Telegraph*, “O’Neill the Dictator,” 8 October 1966, and “Councillor Paisley Stoned by R.C.’s,” 30 September 1967.

⁴⁹⁰ *Belfast Telegraph*, “Free Presbyterian Minister Charged,” 9 November 1966, and “Police Action ‘Ridiculous’ Says Craig: The Case of Rev. John Douglas,” 2 September 1967.

⁴⁹¹ *Protestant Telegraph*, “Withers – Unity With Rome Moderator,” 17 February 1968; and *The Revivalist*, “Withering Depths,” March 1968.

had protested outside the Church of Scotland Assembly in Edinburgh. In emulation of Paisley, the Glaswegian then began a long career of public protests in Scotland. In 1966, he protested against diverse unity services in Glasgow and also traveled to Rome where he interrupted the service Ramsey was taking part in at St. Peter's Cathedral. Glass was good at inciting reprisals as he was detained for three hours in Rome and on several occasions beaten up in Glasgow. He led protests against Princess Margaret's visit to the new Catholic cathedral in Liverpool in November 1967 and against the Church of Scotland moderator for supporting unity talks with the Roman Church. For his efforts, in May 1968 Paisley ordained Glass as pastor of the Zion Sovereign Grace Baptist Church in Polmadie, outside Glasgow.⁴⁹²

The Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster and the Sovereign Grace Baptists joined the British Council of Protestant Christian Churches (BCPCC), a small organization set up to counter the British Council of Churches. The BCPCC also included the Strict Baptist Group of Churches, the Latvian Lutheran Churches in Britain and the small Polish Reformed Church in Exile. Membership gave Paisley both new militant allies and a new avenue in the British Isles for high profile protests. In September 1967, Paisley, the Reverend Brian Green and Councillor Ronald Henderson of the Liverpool Protestant Party protested Anglo-Catholic unity talks with a demonstration in Trafalgar Square and a deputation to No. 10 Downing Street. The same month Paisley and Green protested outside Huntercombe Manor in Maidenhead where the Anglican-Catholic talks were taking place. The following January the BCPCC heckled Archbishop

⁴⁹² *Glasgow Herald*, "Protest Over Royal Visit to Cathedral," 27 November 1967, "Jeers at Moderator Outside Meeting," 6 April 1968, and "Protest at Next Year's Assembly, 25 May 1968; and *Protestant Telegraph*, "Pastor Glass Sets Sights on Second Reformation," 3 February 1969.

Michael Ramsey as he arrived at the catholic Westminster Cathedral in London to preach within the cathedral, the first Anglican bishop to do so.⁴⁹³

By the eve of the first civil rights marches in Northern Ireland, Paisley emerged as the most prominent proponent of militant fundamentalism in the British Isles. Paisley's notoriety was so great that in November 1967 he was invited to the Oxford Union to debate the proposition "That the Roman Catholic Church has no place in the twentieth century" with Norman St. John, a British MP and prominent Catholic layman. Although most of the students attending the debate voted for the Catholic viewpoint, Paisley was given a prestigious forum to denounce Catholic tenets. At the same time the *Belfast Telegraph* took a poll on Paisleyism, an unusual step for a non-governmental public figure. While the paper happily announced that there was an overwhelming opposition to Paisleyism throughout Northern Irish society, 30 percent of those Ulstermen surveyed told a *Telegraph* survey that they agreed with the Free Presbyterian Moderator. The poll included the catholic community, so it can be ascertained that over fifty percent of protestants backed Paisley. No militant fundamentalist in the United States or elsewhere in Great Britain could claim the same level of public support.⁴⁹⁴

⁴⁹³ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Theologians Begin 'Unity of Truth' Talks," 30 August 1967 and "Paisley Leads Church Unity Protest March," 2 September 1967; *Protestant Telegraph*, "No Popery Protest at Coventry Cathedral, by Brian Green," 5 August 1967, "Romanisers Exposed – Protest by British Council of Protestant Christian Churches," 16 September 1967; and "Traitor Shouts Greet Dr. Ramsey at Unity Service," 24 January 1968. The British Council of Churches is the British subsidiary of the WCC.

⁴⁹⁴ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Student Humour Greets Paisley's Charges," 24 November 1967, and "Paisleyism Rejected in Poll," 12 December 1967; *Protestant Telegraph*, "Belfast Telegraph Shocked by Their Own Rigged Poll: Over Half of Belfast Protestants Support Dr. Paisley," 23 December 1967, and "'Cherwell' the Oxford University Magazine Answered," 25 November 1967; and Marrinan, 141.

CHAPTER 8 PAISLEY, THE ELIJAH OF ULSTER

In August 1966, the Reverend Carl McIntire sent a telegram to Queen Elizabeth II to protest the jailing of Paisley and his associates following the Paisleyite demonstration in front of the Presbyterian General Assembly in June. McIntire argued that the convictions of Paisley, John Wylie, and Ivan Foster constituted religious persecution and that their arrests had been carried out at the request of the World Council of Christian Churches and the Irish Presbyterian Church. McIntire based his claims on the fact that it took the authorities in Northern Ireland almost a month after the General Assembly to bring charges. We can assume that McIntire's wire had little effect on the royal family (or on the British government), but the action was meant as publicity – and it succeeded. The American press reported the story and Paisley's star rose higher. On his way to Beirut for a conference of the Middle East Bible Council, McIntire stopped in Belfast and was permitted to see Paisley, Wylie and Foster. McIntire, the most avid promoter of Paisley's "martyrdom," pushed Paisley's cause to militant fundamentalist allies and within the American and the International Council of Churches. The result was that Paisley's time in jail – or more specifically, his selfless willingness to suffer for the cause – raised his stature amongst not only militant fundamentalists and secular loyalists within Northern Ireland, but also the wider community of militant fundamentalists within the British Isles and the United States.⁴⁹⁵

⁴⁹⁵ *Christian Beacon*, "A Report on Religious Persecution in Northern Ireland," 1 September 1966 (although McIntire did not specifically describe Paisley as a martyr, McIntire made it clear he thought Paisley to be a victim of governmental abuse and compared Paisley's General Assembly protest to the Apostle Paul's arrest in Jerusalem – Acts 21:27) and "McIntire Writes Queen," 1 September 1966; *Protestant Telegraph*, "World Renown Preacher Visits Belfast," 27 August 1966; and Bruce, 2007, 80-90.

The following August the bond between Paisley and McIntire drew closer after Paisley attended the Sixth Plenary Conference of the ICCA in Geneva, Switzerland. McIntire wrote to Norman Porter shortly after Paisley's trip concluded. He boasted that the Ulsterman was well received at Bob Jones University and at the Collingswood Bible Presbyterian Church and that Paisley made a strong impression within the Independent Fundamental Churches of America (IFCA) churches that he spoke to. According to McIntire, Paisley spoke emotionally with "big lungs of Elijah and the sound of the rushing of wind."⁴⁹⁶

During the Thirtieth General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church in October 1966, held at Cape May, New Jersey, the perceived persecution of the Free Presbyterians and their Moderator was made a prominent subject of discussion. The Synod passed two resolutions were passed: one to support Paisley's martyrdom, and the other to protest the United Press International's (UPI) reports on his imprisonment. The Bible Presbyterians were upset that the UPI portrayed Free Presbyterians as extremists, not evangelists of the correct gospel, and that it depicted Paisley's imprisonment not as a protest, but a staged charade.⁴⁹⁷

⁴⁹⁶ Carl McIntire to Norman Porter, April 15, 1965, McIntire Collection; and Stroman, 141-146. It is interesting that McIntire used the IFCA as an example; an early member of the American Council of Christian Churches, the Independent Fundamental Churches withdrew in 1953 over McIntire's dictatorial leadership of the American Council and McIntire's portrayal of the *Christian Beacon* as the official ACCC mouthpiece, and his criticism of the relationships some IFCA members maintained. In 1960, the IFCA had eight hundred affiliated churches; accordingly, McIntire alienated a substantial group.

⁴⁹⁷ *Minutes of the Thirtieth General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, Christian Admiral, Cape May, N.J. October 19-25*; International Council of Christian Churches, "Concerning Rev. Ian Paisley;" and Seventh Plenary Congress, Cape May, NJ 1968 (Collingswood, NJ: International Council of Christian Churches, 1968), 25-35. The UPI report on Paisley's release from prison came during the Thirtieth Bible Presbyterian Synod. It is difficult to ascertain why the Bible Presbyterian Church targeted UPI. Most American and European newspapers used either Associated Press reports (*International Herald Tribune*, "Militant Pastor Freed From Belfast Jail," 20 October 1966) or their own correspondents (*New York Times*, "Paisley Released From Belfast Jail," 20 October 1966), and few relied on reports from the United Press International.

The *Christian Beacon* printed a letter Paisley wrote to McIntire from his jail cell (as well as to the Bible Presbyterian Church and the American Council of Christian Churches) to explain the Cromac Square and General Assembly disturbances and to thank McIntire for his support. The *Christian Beacon* also expanded its coverage of the fundamentalist – ecumenical battle within the British Isles. McIntire’s paper reported on the International Christian Youth’s picketing of the British Embassy in Washington D.C., Donald Soper’s attacks against Paisley during a Methodist conference in Wolverhampton, England, and the Orange Order’s July 12th resolution against British Anglicans.⁴⁹⁸

To the militant fundamentalist press Paisley had become a modern-day prophet.⁴⁹⁹ The Irish crusader became a constant and featured subject in the *Christian Beacon*. Beginning with an article that covered Paisley’s protest trip to Rome in March 1966, McIntire’s paper chronicled the Ulsterman’s arrest, trial and imprisonment and complained about the biased press coverage of the events. McIntire wrote a long article on the persecution Paisley and Bible Protestants suffered in Northern Ireland.⁵⁰⁰

The *Christian Beacon* reprinted a copy of his letter to *Life*, protesting the magazine’s article “The Unholy War of Preacher Paisley.” McIntire charged that the *Life* story attempted to

⁴⁹⁸ *Christian Beacon*, “Associated Press Uses Double Standard in Reporting Religious News from Geneva, Northern Ireland,” 4 August 1966, “The Reasons I Chose Jails,” 4 August 1966, “Youth Picket British Embassy for Paisley,” 1 August 1966, and “Paisley Writes From Belfast Prison,” 25 August 1966.

⁴⁹⁹ For instance, within the foreword to Paisley’s *An Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans*, Bob Jones, Jr. proclaimed Paisley as a “sent” preacher in the tradition of the Old Testament prophet Jeremiah and the great reformers of the sixteenth century. By “sent” Jones meant a preacher whose ministry to save human souls was preordained by God.

⁵⁰⁰ *Christian Beacon*, “Report on Religious Persecution in Northern Ireland,” 1 September 1966; *Protestant Telegraph*, “Reverend Ian Paisley Writes From Belfast Prison to Dr. Carl McIntire,” 1 September 1966, and “American Presbyterian Church Supports Imprisoned Ministers’ Stand,” 5 November 1966; and *The Sword of the Lord*, “Bob Jones, Jr. Defends Irish Patriot,” 23 September 1966.

discredit opponents of the ecumenical movement. McIntire did have a point: the article employed innuendo to compare Paisleyism to McCarthyism and Chicago-style gangsterism, and to directly link Paisley's rhetoric with protestant violence. *Life* blamed Paisley for inciting two catholics to toss projectiles at the British monarch when she appeared in Belfast to open the Queen Elizabeth II Bridge. The article also restated the unproven charges of Paisley's complicity in the 1966 UVF murders. The article included a picture of the front of the Malvern Arms pub doctored with a picture of Paisley and the Archbishop of Canterbury transposed over it; the overt message connected Paisley to the murders. According to Hugh Moffett, the article's writer, Northern Ireland was on the brink of a catholic – protestant reconciliation until Paisley intensified his crusade in early 1966.⁵⁰¹

Reports of Paisley's 'persecution' spread throughout the media of militant fundamentalism in North America. For instance, *The Gospel Witness* printed the article "An Innocent Preacher in Prison" in its August 18, 1966 edition that charged that the widespread criticism of Paisley was intended to discredit the entire international militant fundamentalist fellowship. *The Gospel Witness* asserted that it was catholics and protestants who were opposed to Paisley's crusade who had incited violence. Furthermore, Paisley's only crimes were to be an energetic evangelist and crusader in the mold of D.L. Moody and Martin Luther, to expose apostasy and to bring Ulstermen to Jesus Christ. *The Sword of the Lord*, published by John R. Rice in Murfreesboro Tennessee, also printed a letter from Bob Jones, Jr. defending Paisley.⁵⁰²

⁵⁰¹ *Christian Beacon*, "Dr. Carl McIntire Writes Protest to Life on Paisley," 1 September 1966; and *Life*, "The Unholy War of Preacher Paisley," by Hugh Moffett, 19 August 1966.

⁵⁰² *The Gospel Witness*, "An Innocent Preacher in Prison," 18 August 1966; *Protestant Telegraph*, advertisement, 5 November 1966; and *The Sword of the Lord*, "Dr. Bob Jones, Jr. Defends Irish Patriot," 23 September 1966. *The Gospel Witness* referred to Paisley as: "A modern George Whitefield. Undoubtedly he is God's man for this hour in Northern Ireland" (March 30, 1967).

Although Paisley's relationship with Carl McIntire was still his most important friendship in the United States, the building relationship with Bob Jones University became increasingly valuable as the 1960s progressed. The imprisonment improved the growing friendship between the Free Presbyterian Church and the Bob Jones family of Greenville, South Carolina. In April 1966 Paisley had traveled to South Carolina to attend the annual Bible Conference at Bob Jones University, speaking on the direct link between the Reformation, Scottish Calvinism, and Free Presbyterian theology.⁵⁰³ Paisley was a featured, but not prominent guest. Because of his imprisonment, Paisley was granted an honorary doctorate of theology from Bob Jones University and support for evangelizing engagements in the United States.⁵⁰⁴ It is noteworthy that Paisley used one of his weekly prison letters to correspond with Bob Jones, Jr. In his letter, Paisley thanked the South Carolinian for the gifts and letters that were sent to his wife and mentioned that three students from Bob Jones University had visited him in jail. Paisley reiterated the persecution directed at him and his supporters, but was jubilant that the Northern Irish press had published a report asserting that 200,000 Ulstermen supported his crusade. Paisley also noted that his imprisonment was bringing him closer to God.⁵⁰⁵

The Twentieth-Century Reformation and Bob Jones University worked energetically to bring Paisley to the United States for new speaking tours.⁵⁰⁶ Paisley's talks and sermons impressed McIntire, who argued that the Ulsterman was God's primary voice in Ireland.

⁵⁰³ This was Paisley's second trip to the U.S. Paisley also spoke at the Bob Jones University Bible Conference in April 1965, preaching on the ministries of John Calvin and John Knox (*The Fellowship News*, "Bible Conference Notes," 15 May 1965).

⁵⁰⁴ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Bob Jones University Confers D.D. Degree on the Editor," 5 November, 1966. On 7 September 1966, the university granted the fourth honorary degree conferred in the University's forty-year history, and the only one, at the time, given in absentia to a person in jail.

⁵⁰⁵ Ian Paisley to Bob Jones, Jr., 16 August 1966, Fundamentalism Files; and Bob Jones, Jr, 1981, 145-151.

⁵⁰⁶ Carl McIntire to Norman Porter, 12 May 1967, McIntire Collection.

Immediately following Paisley's imprisonment in June 1966, McIntire and Bob Jones, Jr. began to organize a series of engagements for the following spring. Plans were laid for Paisley to visit churches that had fellowship with Bob Jones University, Baptist and Methodist churches that professed militant fundamentalism, as well as small denominations that were members of the American Council. Within most of these churches, Paisley's anti-Catholicism was not a concern, although when it did arise - as with Billy James Hargis' Christian Crusade in Tulsa Oklahoma - Paisley was reconstructed as a separatist anti-communist crusader. Hargis was enthusiastic at the prospect of Paisley's visit and did not see a problem with his Catholic supporters. According to Hargis, "most of the conservative Catholics in the United States are fully aware that the Catholic hierarchy, worldwide, is growing more and more pro-Communist. Everywhere I travel I find more and more out-spoken anti-Communist Catholics that are concerned about their own hierarchy. There is an interesting development taking place in the Roman Catholic Church itself (against its hierarchy)."⁵⁰⁷

The speaking tour began March 28, 1967 at the Collingswood Bible Presbyterian Church and moved to the annual week-long Bible Conference held at Bob Jones University. Paisley was one of the seven featured speakers, a privilege also given to Bob Jones, Jr, his son and four nationally-known militant fundamentalists. Paisley's talk, a look at "Lessons on Revival Gleaned From the Life of Elijah," was mostly theological and anti-ecumenical; Paisley correlated the apostasy of Israel with that of Irish Protestantism in the twentieth century. He also compared the Israelites' introduction of Egyptian idolatry with the interaction between evangelicals and the Roman Catholic Church. Paisley's extensive itinerary included

⁵⁰⁷ Billy James Hargis to Bob Jones, Jr., 17 November 1966, Fundamentalism Files.

engagements in the Southeast, West Coast and the Midwest, and several states in the Northeast.⁵⁰⁸

Paisley also made a number of stops in Canada, including three in the Maritime Provinces, one in Vancouver and another as the featured speaker in Toronto at the Annual Convention of the Canadian Council of Evangelical Christian Churches. The Convention was held in the Jarvis Street Baptist Church - the church that T.T. Shields pastored for most of his ministry - and included both McIntire and Bob Jones, Jr, as eminent speakers.⁵⁰⁹

Paisley was also the featured speaker at the national convention of the American Council of Christian Churches in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, where the Irish militant fundamentalist argued that the current problems facing humanity resulted from the failure to respect scripture. Each engagement was promoted to the church membership and advertised in the local press; while not unusual, these ads were reserved for prominent visitors. Unfortunately, there is no record of what Paisley preached to each separate church. Unlike today where most churches record their services, such recordings were unusual in the 1960s and congregants recorded sermons by hand. But what can be determined is that Paisley's preaching denounced the ecumenical movement in Northern Ireland and the threat the Roman Catholic Church posed to Protestantism, intermixing both topics into a premillennial message based on the book of *Daniel*. According to Paisley, ecumenism and the Anti-Christ were hastening the End Times.⁵¹⁰

⁵⁰⁸ *Christian Beacon*, "Ian Paisley to Begin Speaking Tour of U.S.," 6 April 1967; and *The Fellowship News*, 15 July 1967. The other featured speakers were: Dr. H.C. Slade of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto Canada; Evangelist Glen Schunk of Greenville, South Carolina; Dr. Robert T. Ketcham of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches; and Dr. Charles S. Poling of Phoenix, Arizona.

⁵⁰⁹ *The Gospel Witness*, Dr. Ian Paisley in Massey Hall, May 5, 8 P.M.," 30 March 1967.

⁵¹⁰ *Atlanta Constitution*, advertisement, 1 April 1967; (Harrisburg) *Patriot*, "Restudy Bible, Cleric Urges," 28 April 1967; and information provided by email from an attendee at Paisley's

Paisley's tour of the United States aroused both protest demonstrations and shows of support illustrating his rising international stature. At Philadelphia International Airport several hundred hymn-singing supporters met the Irishman, while the same night hecklers positioned themselves inside the Collingswood church. The coverage of his anti-ecumenical crusade in Ireland within publications such as *Life* and the *New York Times* had incited interest in Paisley in American cities with large Irish-American populations. McIntire charged that the protesters appeared because Philadelphia television misrepresented Paisley as the leader of a 'lunatic fringe' in Ireland, and that America's press had distorted his protest at the General Assembly in the summer of 1966 as anti-catholic. Paisley caused a controversy in Forth Worth, Texas, when the April 9th edition of St. Anne's Episcopal Church weekly bulletin contained Reverend Norman V. Hollen's lengthy attack on Paisley's career. Hollen did not like the appearance of Paisley and Captain Edgar L. Bundy at Castleberry Baptist Church. Although the controversy in Texas passed quickly, the incident illustrated Paisley's growing international stature and his prominent position within the American militant fundamentalist community.⁵¹¹

Paisley also made radio appearances, which he had not done on his previous tours. The most important example was his interview on the Heart-to-Heart Hour, broadcast from Phoenix. In the interview Paisley not only explained his view of the situation in Northern Ireland, but prophesized that modernism, the ecumenical movement, and the Irish and World Councils of Churches would hasten the Second Coming of Christ. Paisley returned to New Jersey in the fall

talk to the Inter-City Baptist Church, Allen Park, Michigan (the home of Dr. William R. Rice), 21 November 2006.

⁵¹¹ Carl McIntire to Norman Porter, 19 December 1966, McIntire Collection; Carl McIntire to Norman Porter, 12 May 1967, McIntire Collection; Bob Jones, Jr. to Billy James Hargis, 7 November 1966, Fundamentalism Files; *Minutes of the Thirty-First General Assembly of the Bible Presbyterian Church, Christian Admiral, Cape May, NJ, 1967*; and *Western Voice*, "Episcopal Rector Rectified," 20 April 1967.

of 1967 with Pastor Brian Green to begin a two-week evangelistic campaign at the Christian Admiral Conference Hall in Cape May. The crusade was broadcast back to Northern Ireland through McIntire's short-wave radio station WNIB in Red Lion, Pennsylvania.⁵¹²

THE INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP CONSOLIDATES

While Paisley sympathized with American fundamentalists over the threat that communism posed to the United States, and while McIntire and Bob Jones, Jr. sympathized with the threat posed to Ulster by the Marxist agenda of the Irish Republican Army, both camps had not been overly preoccupied with the other's domestic political and civil rights questions. The fear of communism and Romanism transformed the relationship of Paisley and American militants from a theological union into a broader political crusade.⁵¹³

According to militant fundamentalists in North America and the British Isles, both the Roman Catholic Church and communist regimes, such as the Soviet Union, were repressive dictatorships, working in unison to implement a totalitarian one-world government. Communism and Catholicism aimed to divide the world, but in order to do so they had to eradicate Protestantism, the voice of Christian liberty. In Ireland, republicanism varied the equation – Irish Republican Army terrorism bolstered the anti-protestant agenda of the Catholic Church. Until the late 1960s, the common interest between American and British militant

⁵¹² *Christian Beacon*, "Paisley to Begin on Short Wave," 4 July 1968; and Heart-to-Heart Hour, Inc., "Dr. Paisley Interviewed on the Heart-to-Heart Hour," pamphlet published in 1967. Paisley returned to McIntire's airwaves when Paisley began round-the-world broadcasts on November 3, 1968 (*Protestant Telegraph*, "Dr. Paisley to Broadcast Daily Round the World: Short Wave 'Voice of Protestantism' programme," 21 September 1968).

⁵¹³ Paisley, *The Archbishop in the Arms of the Pope of Rome!, 14-15* and *The Battle of the Reformation*.

fundamentalists was their perception that a coalition of communism and the Catholic Church threatened international Protestantism.⁵¹⁴

In 1968 these threats presented themselves in many of the important battlegrounds of the Cold War, including the wars in Vietnam and Biafra, and Rhodesia's declaration of independence. Behind these conflicts, militant fundamentalists saw a partnership between the Catholic Church and communist forces to expand communism and Catholic totalitarianism: "Romanism and communism on the surface appear to oppose each other; in reality they are both working towards the same end, which is the totalitarian control of the people."⁵¹⁵

To expand the power of the Vatican, local protestant communities had to be suppressed. Militants believed that, just as American foreign policy used local "brush wars" to fight the Cold War, the Catholic Church employed local communist revolutions to suppress protestant liberty. For instance, Paisley and his American allies argued that the regime of Ian Smith in Rhodesia was a Christian, protestant government threatened by both communist-inspired African revolutionaries and Rome-directed British imperialists; and that Rome pushed Biafran independence because the rebel leader, Lieutenant Colonel Oduniegwu Ojukwu was Catholic and a dupe of the Catholic Church. In Southeast Asia, however, the Roman Church and the Moscow/Beijing axis were on opposite sides. Vietnam was a Catholic crusade to back the Kennedy administration's appointee, Prime Minister Ngo Dinh Diem.⁵¹⁶

⁵¹⁴ *Protestant Telegraph*, "10 Reasons Why Romanism breed Communism," 16 November 1968.

⁵¹⁵ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Rome, Moscow and Ulster by Councillor R.F. Henderson," 27 September 1969.

⁵¹⁶ *Christian Beacon*, "Churchmen Clash on War in Vietnam," 8 February 1968; *Christian Crusade*, "The Pope and Vietnam," 3 February 1968; *Protestant Telegraph*, "Rome and the War in Vietnam," 2 November 1968 and "Biafra – Another Vietnam?," 19 April 1969; and *Weekly Crusader*, "NCC Leads Vietnam "Peace" Offensive," 3 February 1967.

Militant fundamentalists perceived all these conflicts as part of a loose conspiracy between the Soviet Union, the Catholic Church, and the World Council of Churches to divide the world between Moscow and Rome. The Roman Catholic Church used communist movements to eliminate the major threat to their ambitions. Militants believed that the totalitarian nature of Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy allowed communism to breed; only protestant countries, such as the U.S., the United Kingdom, and the nations of the British Commonwealth, could thwart international communism. Billy James Hargis helped promote the All-Africa Christian Crusade Congress in Salisbury, Rhodesia in January 1969, where the Rhodesian Prime Minister – the featured speaker - asserted that his countries’ racial policies were enacted to thwart atheistic communism. American militant fundamentalists articulated this viewpoint at numerous Bible conferences, including those that Paisley attended in New Jersey, South Carolina, and Canada.⁵¹⁷

As his international contacts grew, Paisley tacitly supported the segregationist and anti-communist positions of southern politicians and anti-communist laymen who were important to the militant fundamentalist crusade. The most important were Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, Governor Lester Maddox of Georgia, John Stormer, and General Edwin Walker, all of whom spoke alongside Paisley at Bible conferences. John Stormer, who made his name as the author of *None Dare Call it Treason*, a chronicle of the communist conspiracy to destroy American democracy and Protestantism, was a frequent speaker at militant churches and Bible conferences. According to Stormer, America was losing the Cold War because of the internal communist threat. Described by Erling Jorstad as the far-right bible, Stormer’s book sold seven

⁵¹⁷ *Christian Crusade*, “Text of Address by Ian Smith,” April 1969; and *Protestant Telegraph*, “Is Loyal Rhodesia Rebellious?,” 7 January 1967, “South Africa and Rhodesia: Report of a Fact-Finding Tour by Dr. Billy James Hargis of Christian Crusade, USA,” 13 April 1968, and “For the Sake of Rhodesia,” 11 May 1968.

million copies, with Free Presbyterians in Ulster, Bible Presbyterians in New Jersey and numerous other militant fundamentalist churches worldwide serving as retail outlets. Because of his notoriety, Stormer became a sought-after speaker and was active within the American and International Council of Churches. On several occasions he accompanied Hargis overseas. Stormer spoke at the ACCC conference in 1967 and at the Bob Jones Bible Conference in 1968, both places Paisley also preached. Most of Stormer's writings addressed right-wing political issues, but he also pastored several Baptist churches and was awarded honorary degrees from the Manahath School of Theology in western Pennsylvania and from Shelton College, a school in New Jersey affiliated to the Reverend Carl McIntire.⁵¹⁸

Paisley also shared platforms with General Edwin A. Walker, a valued speaker at Bible Conferences and at militant fundamentalist churches. McIntire, Hargis and Bob Jones University all strongly supported Walker. The earliest known meeting of Paisley and Walker occurred in May 1967 when both Paisley and Walker spoke at the Jarvis Street Baptist Church to the Canadian Council of Evangelical Protestant Churches. Walker became an active anti-communist crusader following his resignation from the military in 1961. A veteran of both the Second World and Korean Wars and the commander of the airborne troops that forced the integration of Little Rock Central High School in 1957, Walker found trouble while serving with the 24th Infantry Division in Augsburg, Germany in 1960. The brainwashing of American prisoners-of-war in Korea and the use of federal power in Little Rock radicalized the general into action.⁵¹⁹

In October 1960, Walker initiated the "Pro-Blue Program," which he wrote to educate soldiers about communist infiltration into American institutions. Inspired by the National

⁵¹⁸ Jorstad, 107-111.

⁵¹⁹ *The Gospel Witness*, "Special Centennial Event: Canadian Council of Evangelical Protestant Churches," 2 March 1967.

Security Council's "Cold War Directive" of 1958 that allowed officers to issue anti-communist literature to their commands, the Pro-Blue Program utilized conservative publications (including John Birch Society material), employed speakers such as Edgar C. Bundy, and advised soldiers how to vote in American elections. *The Overseas Weekly*, a liberal tabloid aimed at American soldiers, began a relentless attack on Walker's program, starting with its April 16, 1961 issue. Liberal clergymen in America and the National Council of Churches quickly joined the assault. Worried over parallels to France's Secret Army Organization – a group within the French military that used terrorist tactics to fight against Algerian independence – and the appearance of American fundamentalists and military officers at the same right-wing seminars, the Kennedy Administration retracted the Cold War Directive.⁵²⁰

The Administration ordered Defense Secretary Robert A. McNamara and the Acting Judge Advocate of the Army, Major General Robert H. McCaw to charge Walker with violation of the Hatch Act, a law that prohibited anyone in the military from influencing the votes of American soldiers during elections. Senators Thurmond and Goldwater denounced the reversal on the Senate floor as did militant fundamentalists within their newspapers and radio shows, and from their pulpits. Thurmond introduced Senate Resolution 191 calling for the Senate Armed Forces Committee to investigate the military's attack on Walker. Removed from his command, Walker resigned and became an instant celebrity on the militant fundamentalist circuit.⁵²¹

⁵²⁰ Kent and Phoebe Courtney, *The Case of General Edwin A. Walker* (New Orleans: Conservative Society of America, 1961), 30-42; and Bernard Ledwidge, *DeGaulle* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982), 244-258. Walker ran for Governor of Texas, but it appears that while he could speak well enough to address religious functions, Walker was not charismatic enough to inspire purely political audiences.

⁵²¹ Billy James Hargis, *The Muzzling of General Walker* (Tulsa: Christian Crusade Publications, 1962), 106-108; Janson and Eisman, 174-185; and Stroman, 249-256.

Walker also played a role in the controversy over the enrollment of James Meredith at the University of Mississippi (Ole Miss) in 1962. Meredith's enrollment incited thousands of Mississippi segregationists to rush to Oxford to defend the racial integrity of the university, and aroused a call to segregationists across the South. Walker was one who made haste to northern Mississippi. In Oxford, Walker not only urged rioters to attack the marshals, he publicly called for a volunteer force to oppose the federal action. Arrested for inciting insurrection against the U.S. government and assaulting federal marshals, the general was imprisoned and given psychiatric testing.⁵²²

These events elevated Walker from one of many speakers on the militant fundamentalist circuit into a celebrated martyr and a man of action. In February 1963, Walker and Billy James Hargis jointly conducted a cross-country crusade called Operation Midnight Ride, held rallies in twenty-nine cities, including Greenville South Carolina and Bob Jones University, and warned about the communist encroachment in America and the acquiescence of liberals. At each rally, Hargis made a short speech, followed by Walker who talked on various subjects, most prominently the federal "invasion" of Mississippi and the Ole Miss Riots. Thurmond and other conservative politicians appeared with Walker at Bible conferences and meetings of the Christian Crusade's Anti-Communist leadership Schools. For instance, on the Fourth of July 1968, Bob Jones Jr. gave the invocation at a dinner at the Fifth Annual New England Rally for God, Family and Country, a dinner in Boston honoring Walker.⁵²³

⁵²² *The (Jackson) Clarion Ledger*, "Governor is Backed by Walker," 28 September 1962, "General Walker is Arrested; in Hospital," 2 October 1962, and "General Walker Held for Mental Exam," 3 October 1962.

⁵²³ Billy James Hargis to Bob Jones, Jr., 1 December 1961, Fundamentalism Files; *Christian Crusade*, "Operation: Midnight Ride Rallies!," March 1963; *Protestant Telegraph*, "Invocation by Dr. Bob Jones," 10 August 1968; and Richard Dudman, *Men of the Far Right* (New York: Pyramid Books, 1962), 52-63.

Senator Thurmond and Governor Maddox were also activists on the militant fundamentalist Bible conference and church circuit, which helped shape Paisley's anti-civil rights movement in Northern Ireland. For example, Thurmond addressed the Twentieth Century Reformation Hour Freedom Rally in Cape May, New Jersey on June 14, 1968, on familiar themes: the U. S. Senate promoted federal authority over the Constitution and God's Divine Will, and the American government was not effectively fighting communism. To Thurmond, America could solve all its problems by returning to a fundamentalist and "true" Christian faith in God. Thurmond maintained a close personal friendship with McIntire and spoke at the ACCC conference on several occasions. The senior senator from South Carolina appeared at the Anti-Communist Leadership Schools of the Christian Crusade, and publicly advised Christians to support Hargis and the American Council, and to leave the apostate National Council of Churches. Support from a U.S. senator is no small matter for any religious figure, especially one with the history and stature of Thurmond.⁵²⁴

⁵²⁴ *Christian Beacon*, "Address by Senator Strom Thurmond to the 20th Century Reformation Hour Freedom Rally, Robert Lee Gardiner Memorial Auditorium, Cape May, NJ at the Christian Admiral Hotel June 14, 1968 8:00 PM," 27 June 1968; and Nadine Cohodas (*Strom Thurmond and the Politics of Southern Change* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993), 268-331. In 1948 as governor of South Carolina, Thurmond became the leading member of the Dixiecrat movement, a group of Southern delegates to the Democratic Party convention who opposed the Democratic Party's civil rights platform and who sought to thwart civil rights legislation. Thurmond ran for president in 1948, receiving over one million votes and winning four southern states, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina. The Dixiecrats, however, did not survive the election. Over the next two decades, Thurmond championed segregation in the U.S. Senate. In March 1956, the Senator drafted the Southern Manifesto that outlined southern resistance to integration, led the filibuster against the Civil Rights Bill of 1957, and voted against the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Thurmond also sent a telegram to President Kennedy after the Ole Miss riots, and like General Edwin A. Walker, Thurmond contrasted the federal "invasion" of Mississippi to inaction against communist Cuba. Thurmond strongly supported General Walker on the Senate floor, making seventeen Senate speeches, orchestrating the wiring of 17,000 telegrams to the Armed Forces Committee, and holding thirty-six days of hearings on the Walker affair.

While it is certain that Paisley and Thurmond knew each other during the 1960s, the relationship between Paisley and Lester Maddox is more intriguing. Elected governor of Georgia in 1966, Maddox made his fame two years previously when he prevented African Americans from eating at his Atlanta restaurant, chasing them into the street with hand guns and axe handles. The restaurateur was also known for his outspokenness on civil rights agitation in Atlanta. Maddox helped to found the People's Association for Selective Shopping to boycott and picket white businesses who served African-Americans. After a court order shut down his restaurant, Maddox insisted that a conspiracy of the federal government, communists, and the National Council of Churches had targeted him. Maddox adopted McIntire's tactics and picketed the White House, protesting President Lyndon Baines Johnson's refusal to meet with him.⁵²⁵

Maddox was another politician with strong fundamentalist beliefs: he stated "God put me where I am today,"⁵²⁶ after receiving the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in 1966; held prayer sessions in the Governor's Office; and argued that America's economic, social, and moral troubles could be solved with a fundamentalist Christian revival. To Maddox, America suffered from spiritual poverty: "Such a revival would restore states' rights, property rights, free enterprise and liberty - which were part of our spiritual heritage."⁵²⁷ God and the Bible would win over communists, atheism, and defend private enterprise, capitalism and private property. Maddox appeared at numerous churches throughout the country where he supported Christian involvement in politics and compared the defense of capitalism with the will of God:

"Nowhere in the Bible do I find the teaching that when a person is elected governor he is supposed to stop serving Christ. When the enemies of God, of America and

⁵²⁵ Bruce Galphin, *The Riddle of Lester Maddox* (Atlanta: Camelot Publishing, 1968), 1-65.

⁵²⁶ Galphin, 8.

⁵²⁷ Galphin, 197.

of freedom fill the streets with their calls for the abolishment of private property, for government takeover of the private free enterprise system and for an end to constitutional government, then the hard-working, law-abiding Christian patriots of this country must take their stand for what they know is right.”⁵²⁸

Maddox attended Bible conferences and militant fundamentalist events where, like Thurmond, he publicly opposed liberal church theology and clerics. For instance, in April 1969, Maddox issued a public statement opposing the Consultation on Church Unity meeting, held in Atlanta. Six months later, he took part in the ACCC-led “Bible-Believers March” in Trenton, New Jersey held to support the war in Vietnam.⁵²⁹ Maddox went on the Twentieth Century Reformation Hour broadcast to explain his decision:

The goal of Dr. McIntire, the goal of Lester Maddox, and the goal of Christian patriots in this country is one and the same. We are publicly and unashamedly letting the nation and the world know that we do believe in the living God and that we are loyal to our country. There are those in our midst today who would seek the solution through asking us to place our faith in the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Governor, the President, or expanded social programs. We’ve tried all these but still have a nation grasping and seeking the answer. That answer is Christ and in the living God... We seek victory, not surrender, over Communism.⁵³⁰

Paisley was impressed with Maddox, a politician with militant fundamentalist beliefs. In the *Protestant Telegraph*, Paisley reprinted the full text of a speech the Governor made to the Christian Crusade convention in Tulsa Oklahoma in August 1967. The Free Presbyterian paper proudly proclaimed it was the first in the British Isles to do so. In his speech, Maddox asserted that his administration was only outwardly Christian and that his election as Governor of Georgia

⁵²⁸ “A Message From the Governor,” text of remarks prepared for delivery by Governor Lester Maddox at the Calvary Baptist Church, Rittman, Ohio, Sunday, November 9, 1969, 10:30 AM, Lester Maddox Collection, Russell Library for Political Research and Studies, the University of Georgia.

⁵²⁹ *Atlanta Journal*, “U.S. Needs Revival, Maddox Says,” 25 September 1967; *Christian Beacon*, “Maddox Joins Ranks of Opponents of Church Union,” 3 April 1969 and “Governor Lester Maddox to Join Trenton March,” 16 October 1969; Jorstad, 94-98; and Lester Garfield Maddox, *Speaking Out: The Autobiography of Lester Garfield Maddox* (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1975), 167-178.

⁵³⁰ *Christian Beacon*, “Governor Maddox Explains His Position,” 23 October 1969.

was part of a backlash from conservative Americans against atheistic government, the implementation of the Great Society, and integration. By devoting a large proportion of his bi-monthly eight-page paper to Maddox's speech, Paisley signaled his whole-hearted endorsement of Maddox's position.⁵³¹

Attacks from civil rights activists on the fundamentalist position intensified both the militant anti-civil rights campaign in America and Paisley's determination to become the Northern Irish counterpart. The best example is the campaign that militant fundamentalists undertook against Martin Luther King, Jr. Militants despised King not only for his popularity and effectiveness, but for his connections with left-wing activist groups, his social theology, his attacks on Christian fundamentalism, and his alleged communism. Even after King's assassination, they attacked the civil rights leader as the purveyor of lawlessness, not the proponent of racial justice. The *Protestant Telegraph* described King's ministry:

He laid great emphasis upon the brotherhood of man rather than the Kingship of Christ. He chose liberal theology rather than fundamentalism. He chose ecumenism rather than separation, he chose pacifism, looking to Ghandi (sic) as his guru, and to the Pope as his friend, but his pacifism could not adequately be transmitted to his followers. The people that he led have now taken to riot, looting and murder. The smouldering racial tensions have once again been rekindled. The communist agitators have whipped up grief and emotion into xenophobia and uncontrollable rioting; and America is on the brink of civil war. There can be no integration or equality of the races, no peaceful coexistence, no international harmony, until and when nations and men submit to Christ – the Prince of Peace.⁵³²

Militant fundamentalists charged that King's ministry did not "save" souls, but promised a man-made kingdom of heaven on earth. They insisted that King's legacy was not the elimination of racial barriers but rather the violence that followed his death.⁵³³

⁵³¹ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Governor Maddox of Georgia, U.S.A. Speaks His Mind," 30 September 1967.

⁵³² *Protestant Telegraph*, "Martin Luther King," 13 April 1968.

In the spring of 1968, as the American South implemented integration, Paisley paid close attention to the events in the United States. During March and April Paisley witnessed first-hand the traumatic transition in the South during a twenty three-city speaking tour that included Natchez, Mississippi; Decatur and Huntsville, Alabama; Augusta, Georgia; and several cities in northern Florida. The most influential event of the trip took place on April 4, 1968, however, during the annual Bible conference held at Bob Jones University. In the midst of the conference James Earl Ray assassinated Martin Luther King, Jr. in Memphis, Tennessee. Although the conference had begun with a general call for Christian revival and a promise that the Second Coming of Jesus Christ was at hand, the upbeat mood changed dramatically on April 4th. That evening, news of Martin Luther King's death and reports that intense racial riots had broken out in forty-six American cities reached the university, as did the image of the machine guns placed on the steps of the U.S. Capitol Building. Paisley spoke on the morning of April 6th, and although he avoided mentioning King's assassination and its violent aftermath, it is clear from his conference speech that he considered Irish and American Protestantism to be facing similar threats of apostasy and paganism:

“The heart of both systems (referring to the NCC/WCC and to Babylonian paganism) is idolatry; that is materialistic worship with the denial of the spirituality of God. Both are satanic attempts to build a way to God, and as such constitute anti-Christianity, the religion of anti-Christ. Both these systems have the seed of religious intolerance...”⁵³⁴

Dr. Archer Weniger, a California preacher and ardent anti-communist, followed Paisley to the platform. Weniger addressed the rioting. He blamed the turmoil in America on ecumenical

⁵³³ *Christian Beacon*, “The Theology of Martin Luther King,” 26 March 1964, *The Sword of the Lord*, “Martin Luther King is Dead,” 26 April 1968, and “Who is Behind the Murder of Martin Luther King?,” 24 May 1968; *The Weekly Crusader*, “Martin Luther King a Spokesman for the Enemy,” 5 May 1967; and *Western Voice*, “King and the Communist Front,” 2 September 1965.

⁵³⁴ *The Greenville News*, “Paisley Blasts Church Councils in BJU Talk,” 7 April 1968.

apostasy, immorality, and the communist-led radicalization of the American civil rights movement. To Weniger, all these elements were part of an interconnected conspiracy, a message that Paisley and other fundamentalists readily approved.⁵³⁵ John Stormer, who also spoke at the conference, expanded on Weniger's message. He charged that King promoted racial discord and racial rioting and helped communists take advantage of America's social problems. Stormer contrasted 1968 America with the America of the 1930s, when a majority of Christian churches practiced sound Biblical theology and the government took action against social disorder. During his talk, Stormer quoted from Matthew 5:13⁵³⁶ and argued: "...the nation that forgets God shall be turned into Hell...America is sick."⁵³⁷ While Paisley patiently listened to the comments of his American militant fundamentalist allies, he began to feel a sense of urgency; civil rights in Northern Ireland had to be squashed.

⁵³⁵ *The Fellowship News*, "Bible Conference Notes," 27 April 1968.

⁵³⁶ Matthew 5:13: "Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt has lost his saviour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men." (KJV)

⁵³⁷ *The Fellowship News*, "Outline of John Stormer speech," 25 May 1968. Exact quotations from the Bob Jones Bible Conference are impossible to obtain as the University-published *Fellowship News* employs paraphrased reports from observers.

CHAPTER 9 CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE IN ULSTER

When Paisley returned to Northern Ireland, his rhetoric against the Northern Civil Rights Association dramatically increased: attacks on civil rights took prominence over those against O'Neillism. Moreover, his tactics changed in a very important way. Before the summer of 1968, Paisley had never physically prevented an opponent from protesting or from attending any church service, meeting, or conference. His counter-demonstrations and marches were designed to have the Royal Ulster Constabulary and the Stormont government accomplish this task. But in August 1968, when catholic protestors hit the streets of Ulster, Paisley decided personally to stop the Civil Rights Association from marching. Aware of the reputation that American civil rights marches had won and with an understanding of the threat that a radicalized movement presented, Paisley could not allow the catholics in Northern Ireland to emulate the African Americans of the American South. He knew that federal legislation had effectively bolstered civil rights in the United States, and accordingly he hoped to prevent the success of the American civil rights movement from being repeated in Ulster.

Paisley has never publicly stated that the events of the American civil rights movement overtly influenced his reaction to the Northern Ireland civil rights movement. There is little doubt, however, that after several years of fellowship with segregationists and anti-civil right American militant fundamentalists, after being a witness to the changes that the American civil rights movement inflicted on American society, and after his relationship strengthened with Bob Jones University (a university that would not allow inter-racial dating or women to wear modern clothes) the situation in America had a profound impact on the Reverend Paisley. Four months after the assassination of King and after witnessing the resulting violence, Paisley felt a sense of

urgency in resisting the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association when catholic activists decided to hit the streets of Ulster. It is not a coincidence that the strongest and most vocal opponent of NICRA was the man who had seen first-hand what a strong civil rights movement supported by a sympathetic press could accomplish. In August 1968, the defense of Bible Protestantism in Ireland meant the defeat of the catholic civil rights movement.⁵³⁸

When the summer of 1968 began, Northern Ireland's political and communal relationships could have proceeded in either of two directions. On one hand, the Ulster Unionist Party could have immediately implemented reforms acceptable to the catholic community or set a realistic timetable for their future appearance. Such a move would have encouraged the civil rights movement to work through the parliamentary process and to shun street protests. Unfortunately, the Stormont government chose a second course: the O'Neill administration decided to maintain the status quo and only promised limited reforms. Because the second scenario prevailed, radical elements within the civil rights movement pressed for direct action, while moderates within the civil rights movement agreed to back a limited campaign of civil rights marches and local protests. Catholic politicians understood that the new direction of the civil rights movement

⁵³⁸ Paisley's close relationship with Bob Jones University also brought him into the American civil rights debate. New regulations under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare made the students at segregated schools, such as Bob Jones, ineligible for federally-backed student loans. In 1965, Bob Jones University argued that the law was Satanic and socialist and would lead to federal interference in the curriculum. The university administration refused to comply with the Act. Because the university claimed that one-third of its students used the federal program in 1964, the university organized its own 'Freedom Loan Fund' to help the needs of the student body. The University also denounced the civil rights movement and black preachers, arguing that they dispensed political propaganda, not Christian tenets (*The Fellowship News*, "From the President of Bob Jones University," 9 October 1965). Amongst a cross-section of American Christianity, Bob Jones University became a pariah, but militant fundamentalists supported its stance. Given his yearly trips to the Greenville, South Carolina campus in the late 1960s, Paisley must have been aware of the university's racial policy, which he never denounced in the *Protestant Telegraph*.

would arouse a reaction from protestant extremists, and the leadership of the Nationalist Party refused to endorse direct action protests - except when they were unavoidable – which enabled radicals to influence the direction of the campaign. The emergence of catholics marching on Northern Ireland’s streets proved too much for Paisley and his followers, and between June 1968 and August 1969 Northern Ireland witnessed an escalating battle between Paisleyites and the catholic civil rights movement.⁵³⁹

The direct conflict between Paisley and the civil rights movement began in June 1968 when housing activists in Caledon made the fateful decision to begin direct-action protests. Over the previous year, the Republican Club in County Tyrone (an illegal organization) had encouraged catholic families to squat in the new housing built in Caledon’s protestant ward. Each time, however, the RUC evicted the squatters. Austin Currie, the Nationalist MP for East Tyrone, brought the matter up during a Stormont debate, and after receiving little support from the government, he personally joined one of the squatting families. The house Currie chose to squat was assigned to a single, nineteen year old protestant secretary, who had been selected over catholic families on the housing list for ten years.⁵⁴⁰

The overt act of discrimination and Currie’s resulting arrest reminded catholics how little the O’Neill administration had changed Northern Ireland. Many catholics concluded that more drastic action would be required. After a small NICRA protest in Dungannon on June 22nd, Currie asked both NICRA and the Campaign for Social Justice to support a larger protest to march to go from Coalisland to Dungannon. Both organizations reluctantly agreed to support Currie’s plan, and on August 24th Currie and the NICRA assembled four thousand marchers in

⁵³⁹ *Disturbances in Northern Ireland: Report of the Cameron Commission Appointed by the Governor of Northern Ireland (Cameron Report)* (Belfast: HMSO, 1969).

⁵⁴⁰ Purdie, 135-137.

Coalisland to begin the five-mile walk to Dungannon. Despite the marchers' peaceful demeanor, the RUC re-directed their route to avoid a counter-demonstration the Ulster Protestant Volunteers orchestrated.⁵⁴¹

Paisley saw that the Coalisland march signaled a new radicalism within NICRA and argued that Irish republicanism and the Catholic Church were the true culprits. The *Protestant Telegraph* noted that the march took place on the 396th anniversary of the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacre of Huguenots in France and asserted that the march was not for civil rights, but an assault on Irish Protestantism.⁵⁴² To many in Ulster, the claim was absurd, but not to Free Presbyterians and Paisley's militant fundamentalist supporters. To press his point, Paisley organized a march of 200 members of the Ulster Protestant Volunteers in Maghera in early September, the city chosen because Kevin Agnew, a local solicitor and member of NICRA's executive committee, had called for more civil disobedience in the area.⁵⁴³

After the Coalisland-Dungannon march, civil rights activism in Northern Ireland focused around Londonderry, a city important to the protestant cultural identity in Northern Ireland.⁵⁴⁴ Because of the city's catholic majority, retaining protestant control over the city required blatant gerrymandering and extensive housing and employment discrimination. Catholics constituted 70 percent of the city's population but controlled only eight of twenty council seats and suffered

⁵⁴¹ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Right Group Protest at Caledon," 19 June 1968, "Currie Squats in House," 20 June 1968, and "Dungannon March Just the Beginning," 26 August 1968; Northern Ireland (1968), vol. 64, col. 1091; Max Hastings, *Barricades in Belfast: The Fight for Civil Rights in Northern Ireland* (New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1970), 43-45; Moloney, 2008, 149-150; Moloney and Pollak, 153-160; and Niall O'Dochartaigh, *From Civil Rights to Armalites: Derry and the Birth of the Irish Troubles* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1977), 12-26.

⁵⁴² *Protestant Telegraph*, "Fitt, Currie, and the I.R.A.," 7 September 1968.

⁵⁴³ Moloney, 2008, 150; and Purdie, 135.

⁵⁴⁴ Londonderry is protestant Ulster's Kosovo, the site of an important battle – the siege of Derry in 1689 – as well as a city numerically dominated by a cultural and religious enemy (Ian McBride, *The Siege of Derry in Ulster Protestant Mythology* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997), 9-15).

two and one half times the rate of protestant unemployment. In addition, Londonderry's division of the Royal Ulster Constabulary owned Northern Ireland's strongest reputation for hostility towards catholics.⁵⁴⁵

The city also contained some of Northern Ireland's most radical civil rights activism. Eamonn McCann, who formed the Derry Hosing Action Committee (DHAC) in partnership with local Republican Clubs, organized Northern Ireland's most dynamic housing unrest. At the end of August 1968, the DHAC asked the Northern Ireland Civil Right Association to take part in a civil rights march in Londonderry set for October 5th. Because of the tension within the city, NICRA initially denied McCann's request, and only radical and republican groups agreed to participate. NICRA, however, wanted to retain a moderate influence in Londonderry and after an internal debate reluctantly agreed to support the march. When protestant organizations in Londonderry also complained, William Craig, the Home Affairs Minister, banned the demonstration. Because of the ban, the entire spectrum of civil rights groups in Northern Ireland agreed to participate and what would have been a protest of several hundred radicals turned into a march of 2,000, including three British Labour MPs and several Nationalist MPs from Stormont.⁵⁴⁶

The choice of Waterside Station as a staging point was made to reinforce the parade's non-sectarian appearance. The parade route, however, added another challenge to the government. Because the station sits within a protestant neighborhood, and because the march proceeded into

⁵⁴⁵ O'Dochartaigh, 19-25.

⁵⁴⁶ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Nationalists to Shelve Civil Disobedience, Currie Proposal Lost," 24 June 1968, and "Paisley's Maghera Parade Goes Without Incident," 9 September 1968; *Protestant Telegraph*, "Fitt, Currie, and the I.R.A.: Provocation by Rebel Mob," 7 September 1968; Campaign for Social Justice, "One Man One Vote," (pamphlet published in 1965) and "The Plain Truth" (pamphlet published in 1969); Max Hastings, 50-52; and Eamonn McCann, *War and an Irish Town* (London: Pluto Press, 1993), 69.

the city center, the route seemingly was designed to make the Royal Ulster Constabulary overreact. On cue the RUC stopped the marchers with water cannon and a baton charge as they neared the city walls. Both the BBC and Ulster television broadcast the police violence; this publicity further increased support for civil rights within the catholic community and demands from the British government for O'Neill to act. The evening of the march, catholic and protestant gangs in Londonderry began several days of street fighting, which convinced Paisley that the marchers intended to instigate violence.⁵⁴⁷

Many within Northern Ireland's protestant community now concluded that the RUC needed help to maintain law and order on the streets of Ulster; more protestant extremists joined Paisley's counter-demonstrations. Encouraged by Paisley, protestants demanded tougher action toward civil rights marches. The tactics of Paisley and protestant extremists made it impossible for O'Neill to implement meaningful reforms. To make matters worse, after October 5th an increasing percentage of the catholic community accepted radical civil rights protests as a necessity, while the Nationalist Party withdrew as the Official Opposition at Stormont. To the catholic community, O'Neill was using the dual threat of catholic civil disorder and Paisleyite reactions as an excuse to block reforms.⁵⁴⁸

During the last two months of 1968, a series of civil rights protests in Londonderry, Belfast and Armagh met a growing reaction from Paisleyites. A new ad hoc organization in Londonderry, the Derry Citizens' Action Committee (DCAC), organized the largest civil rights protests. John Hume, a leading moderate politician, and Ivan Cooper, a liberal protestant, directed the DCAC towards a moderate direction, widening the moderate-radical split within the

⁵⁴⁷ McCann, 37-40. Prior to October 5, 1968, no catholic parade or procession had been allowed inside Londonderry's city walls. Thus, the town was dubbed the "maiden city" by protestants: its walls had never been violated. The reference also alludes to the siege of Derry.

⁵⁴⁸ Coogan, 1995, 179-190.

civil rights movement and alienating radicals such as Eamonn McCann. When Hume and the DCAC organized a second march on November 2nd, retracing the route used one month earlier, their protest incited the Loyal Citizens of Ulster to instigate a larger Paisleyite counter-march. A third civil rights march planned for November 16th brought threats of a second Paisley counter-demonstration in Londonderry and forced William Craig to ban for one month further marches within the city. Catholics from across Northern Ireland responded angrily and 15,000 took part in an illegal demonstration. However, the moderate leadership of Hume and a cautious attitude from the Royal Ulster Constabulary prevented violence.⁵⁴⁹

The success of these civil rights marches and the size of the turnout on November 16th inspired catholic dock and factory workers into mount a series of small processions that took place within Londonderry's walls. The sight of these marchers increased the protestant desire to stop further civil rights protests. To Paisley and many protestants, the apparent impotence of the O'Neill administration against the civil rights movement and Stormont policies invited intervention from the British government. Paisley's counter-demonstrations took on the aspects of a revival and combined political speeches with religious sermons of his own and other fundamentalist preachers. The use of religious oratory was important to inspire violent defiance from both protestants who claimed to have a relationship with God and from secular working-class extremists. Secularized workers respected Paisley and believed that following a man of God vindicated their radicalism.⁵⁵⁰

On the night of November 30, 1968, 2,000 Paisleyites assembled in Armagh, sang hymns and waited for a planned civil rights march to proceed. Paisley's aggressive intentions were clearly announced in fliers that the Ulster Protestant Volunteers posted: 'Ulster's Defenders. A

⁵⁴⁹ Boulton, 71-88; and O'Dochartaigh, 19-25.

⁵⁵⁰ Moloney and Pollak, 153-160.

friendly warning. Board up your windows. Remove all women and children from the city on Saturday, 30th November. O'Neill must go.'⁵⁵¹ Despite the efforts of the RUC to search Paisley supporters before they entered Armagh, many Paisleyites produced weapons. Consequently, the civil rights march had to be diverted around the city center where Paisley assembled his followers. Although Paisley and an aide, Ronald Bunting,⁵⁵² were subsequently arrested for disturbing the peace and many observers felt that the RUC had acted fairly towards the marchers, the diversion of the march appeared to Catholics as a concession to Paisleyism.⁵⁵³

The escalating tension in Northern Ireland alarmed both Irish church leaders and the British government. The Catholic and Anglican primates issued a joint appeal for peace, a rare display of Catholic-Anglican unity, although not surprising to militant fundamentalists who had long suspected both hierarchies of ecumenical aims. As the intensity of civil rights marches increased, the British government paid more attention to the affairs of Northern Ireland and took a new, aggressive stance in its intercourse with O'Neill. Over the previous four decades the UUP had manipulated contacts between Northern Irish and British officials, and Unionist-British discussions focused on financial matters. Westminster now started to re-evaluate its policy towards Northern Ireland and insisted that O'Neill begin instituting reforms. Wilson threatened to reconsider Britain's financial and political relationship with Northern Ireland if Catholic

⁵⁵¹ O'Dochartaigh, 42-43.

⁵⁵² Ronald Bunting, a former British Army officer and one-time socialist supporter of Gerald Fitt, founded the Loyal Citizens of Ulster. After being "saved" by Paisley's evangelism, Bunting formed small Paisleyite groups that often counter-demonstrated against civil rights marches. For instance, the Loyal Citizens of Ulster were active in Armagh in November 1968 and against the Long March in January 1969.

⁵⁵³ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Wilson Wants Urgent Derry Report," 6 October 1968, "2 Derry Rallies: Civil Rights Demonstrators Face Opposition," 18 October 1968, "We'll Not Change Route Marchers Tell Craig," 14 November 1968, and "8,000 Marchers Halted Near Paisley Crowd," 30 November 1968; *Protestant Telegraph*, "10,000 Loyalists Demonstrate at Londonderry," 11 November 1968; and Michael Farrell, *Civil Rights Twenty Years On: A Personal View* (Dingle: Brandon Book Publishers, Limited, 1988), 54-74.

demands were ignored or if the right-wing of the UUP replaced O'Neill. Wilson's response tightened the difficult position in which O'Neill was placed. Too much reform risked a backlash from Paisley and the UUP's right-wing, while limited reforms could not placate a majority of the catholic community and would escalate civil rights activities.⁵⁵⁴

On November 22, 1968 the British government forced O'Neill to announce a series of reform measures: the reorganization of the Londonderry Corporation as a Development Commission that would include catholic members; the establishment of a fair housing program that would take control of the waiting list for new houses from the Lord Mayor; the appointment of an Ombudsman to investigate complaints against the Northern Ireland government; and the elimination of the company vote in Stormont elections. Many catholics thought that the reforms were inadequate and insincere and that the O'Neill government would avoid implementing them. The reforms did not satisfy the civil rights demand for "one man one vote" in local council elections, nor did they eliminate the Special Powers Act or promise new housing. Nevertheless, the civil rights movement had gained in two months more rights for catholics than the Nationalist Party and the IRA had achieved in forty-seven years. Radicals within the civil rights movement believed further pressure on the O'Neill government could bring additional concessions.⁵⁵⁵

The new initiatives enraged Paisley and his followers. Because Paisley considered all civil rights organizations to be fronts for republican activities and the Catholic Church, placating these groups constituted treason against Irish Protestantism. Paisley argued:

⁵⁵⁴ Max Hastings, 52-66; McCann, 96-103; O'Dochartaigh, 19-23; Purdie, 139-144; and Barry White, *John Hume: Statesman of the Troubles* (Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 1984), 40-51.

⁵⁵⁵ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Wilson Blackmails Ulster," 16 November 1968; Tony Benn, *Office Without Power: Diaries 1968-1972, Vol.2* (London: Hutchinson, 1987), 101; Richard Crossman, *The Diaries of a Cabinet Minister. Vol. III: Secretary of State for Social Services* (London: Hamish Hamilton and Jonathan Cape, 1972), 478; Eric Gallagher and Stanley Worrall, *Christians in Ulster, 1968-1980* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 42-45; and Max Hastings, 58-75.

None of us need be a qualified psychiatrist to conclude that the present spate of unrest in Ulster, under its convenient label of Civil Rights...is in reality a united Roman Catholic protest – not against our Unionist Government – but rather and indisputably against centuries of oppression and repression by the Roman Catholic hierarchy and its Italian dictators in the Vatican...civil rights marchers are...in actual fact screaming against the many centuries of injustice meted out to them by their Vatican dictators.⁵⁵⁶

The escalating confrontations between Paisley and catholic radicals increased the pressure on O'Neill. After Paisleyites violently disrupted a civil rights meeting in Dungannon, O'Neill went on television to address the increasing violence. O'Neill's 'Crossroads' speech on December 5, 1968 promised a new commitment towards implementing reforms that were acceptable to the catholic community. O'Neill asked the civil rights movement for a moratorium on marches and the protestant community to support his government's policies. But NICRA, DCAC, and a majority of civil rights activists announced only a temporary halt to all marches. The O'Neill government made two other important moves: the Attorney General adjourned all summonses for all outstanding civil rights offenses until the following May - including those given Paisley and Bunting - and O'Neill fired William Craig in an attempt to thwart right-wing dissension within the Ulster Unionist Party. Craig now aligned himself with the Paisleyites, while Paisley temporarily confined his activities to church matters.⁵⁵⁷

O'Neill's efforts at reconciliation soon foundered as a new student-based group from Queen's University, People's Democracy, decided to wreck the truce. The confrontations between Paisley and civil rights marchers over the previous four months, and the RUC's reactions in Dungannon and Londonderry aroused a coalition of radical, leftist, and moderate student groups into organizing their own movement. After ten students picketed Craig's house on October 6, 1968, and Craig publicly insulted the group, a meeting was called at the Students'

⁵⁵⁶ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Civil Rights – then Communism," 17 May 1969.

⁵⁵⁷ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Missiles Thrown as Rival Factions Clash in Dungannon," 5 December 1968; and O'Neill, 1972, 145-149.

Union to plan a protest march. Three days later, 3,000 students marched from the university to Belfast City Hall, but were diverted around Shaftsbury Square to avoid a large gathering of Paisleyites. At an impromptu meeting that evening, Queen's University students formed the Peoples' Democracy to press for the same civil rights demands as NICRA. What made the group different were its anarchic structure and its independence from the civil rights movement. Peoples' Democracy was open to all students, faculty and alumni of any British university and each member had an equal say in the group's decisions and organization. A small group of radicals, however, manipulated the decisions of the organization and made sure that the group was less spontaneous and democratic than it proclaimed. Several charismatic and well-known political activists directed the course of the organization, the most important being Eamonn McCann of Londonderry, Michael Farrell, a lecturer with an extensive background in radical activities, and Bernadette Devlin, the future Westminster MP. Farrell was also a leader of the Young Socialist Alliance, a group that violently confronted the police during civil rights marches and along with McCann was a member of the Irish Workers' Group, which aimed to unite Ireland into a socialist worker's republic.⁵⁵⁸

Farrell, McCann, and Devlin wanted to implement a socialist revolution, and they believed that only a radical movement could change Northern Irish society. All three viewed NICRA as a middle-class attempt to maintain the basic class structure. The best way to accomplish their goal was to provoke the O'Neill government into overreacting to civil rights protests, to incite Paisley into violent counter-demonstrations, and to provoke intervention from the British government. Farrell did not support the moratorium on civil rights marches and feared that the November

⁵⁵⁸ *Belfast Telegraph*, "1,000 Stage Sit-Down: Chanting Students 'Squat' in Street After Route Switch," 9 October 1968, Peoples' Democracy, *Why PD?* (No publication information), and "A People's Democracy: A Discussion on Strategy," *New Left Review* 55 (1969): 31-33; and Arthur, 29-39.

reforms might actually satisfy much of the catholic community. Accordingly, on January 1st he along with two hundred radical supporters began the ‘Long March,’ a four-day protest that walked from Belfast to Londonderry. The route chosen passed through a mostly protestant-dominated region and was designed to provoke a violent reaction from Paisley and his followers and to force the O’Neill government to protect catholic civil rights marchers. From the moment the marchers set out from Belfast City Hall they met a constant barrage of protestant harassment. The RUC was forced to re-route the Long March several times to avoid hostile counter-demonstrators. Paisley did not personally join the protesters but assigned Ronald Bunting, his Loyal Citizens of Ulster, and the Ulster Protestant Volunteers to lead the protestant extremists. On the evening of January 3rd, Paisley and Bunting held a prayer meeting at the Guildhall in Londonderry, calling on his audience to attack the marchers and to defend Protestantism.⁵⁵⁹

When the marchers arrived the following morning at Burntollet Bridge a few miles outside Londonderry, 300 protestant extremists attacked them with clubs, sticks, and paving stones, while their police escort refused to intervene. Later that afternoon, the marchers were again attacked as they entered Londonderry, setting off several days of rioting within the city’s catholic neighborhoods. Catholics had expected the Long March to meet some resistance but they did not anticipate the indifference the police exhibited at Burntollet Bridge. During previous civil rights marches the Royal Ulster Constabulary had re-routed marches to secure the safety of marchers, but this time the police appeared to direct marchers into a trap. Reports that the new Minister of Home Affairs, Captain William Long, had met with Paisley and Bunting on January 2nd led to accusations of government collusion in the incident. While no direct complicity has ever been proven, it appeared to catholics that the O’Neill government had become more interested in

⁵⁵⁹ Farrell, 1976, 242-245; Max Hastings, 83-88; and McCann, 214.

placating Paisley and protestant extremists than in pushing reforms and considering civil rights complaints. It did not help to alleviate tensions when the *Protestant Telegraph* triumphantly applauded the attack at Burntollet Bridge and predicted a new awakening in the protestant community against the civil rights movement.⁵⁶⁰

On January 5, 1969 Terence O'Neill went on television again. This time, however, O'Neill accused the civil rights movement of promoting anarchy, while only mildly criticizing Paisley, Bunting and the UPV: "I think we must also have an urgent look at the Public Order Act itself to see whether we ought to ask Parliament for further powers to control these elements which are seeking to hold the entire community to ransom. Enough is enough. We have heard sufficient for now about civil rights, let us hear a little about civic responsibility."⁵⁶¹ O'Neill's speech lost what moderate catholic support he still retained and ended most dialogue between the government and the civil rights movement. The events of December and January convinced most protestants that catholics were over-emphasizing civil rights demands and that catholics were actually interested in political power. Many protestants who had supported O'Neill and flaunted "I Back O'Neill" buttons after the Crossroads speech now embraced protestant radicals and Paisley. A majority of protestants discounted O'Neill's assurances and the promises of the British government that civil rights reforms would not come at the expense of the protestant community.⁵⁶²

As a result of escalating violence, O'Neill proposed the *Public Order (Amendment) Bill* to supplement the Special Powers Act. The Amendment banned all protests and counter-protests

⁵⁶⁰ *Belfast Telegraph*, "75 Taken to Hospital in Day of Ambushes," 4 January 1968; *Protestant Telegraph*, "'Civil Rights March' Smokescreen for Outlawed Republican Clubs," 11 January 1969; Egan Bowes and Vincent McCormick, *Burntollet* (London: LSR Publishers, 1969); and Bernadette Devlin, *The Price of My Soul* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969), 126.

⁵⁶¹ Moloney and Pollak 167.

⁵⁶² Purdie, 210-218.

and made it harder to obtain police permission to hold marches. Although the Bill met stiff resistance and did not become law until February 1970, it stifled Paisley whose claim to support legal government authority meant he had to back down from new counter-demonstrations. O'Neill introduced the Public Order Bill to deter growing opposition within the Ulster Unionist Party. Not only were protestants from outside the UUP, such as Paisley, demanding that O'Neill resign, a growing movement within the Party publicly advocated O'Neill's removal. Many protestants believed that O'Neill's government could not maintain law and order.⁵⁶³

In late January 1969, the right-wing Unionist attack on O'Neill intensified when twelve backbenchers met at a hotel in Portadown to formulate a strategy to oust the Prime Minister. In response, O'Neill decided to call a general election to demonstrate his popular support. Paisley decided to run against O'Neill in what was the militant fundamentalist's first election campaign. Paisley lost the election, but drew enough votes to embarrass O'Neill, while the UUP split, with twenty-nine pro-O'Neill Unionists winning seats and ten anti-O'Neill candidates victorious. It was the first split in the party's history. In addition, the Nationalist Party's loss of three seats to civil rights activists, including John Hume, illustrated the waning of its influence within the catholic community. O'Neill was re-elected as Leader of the Ulster Unionist Party, but the erosion of support for his policies was obvious. O'Neill and the UUP suffered another significant election in April when the death of George Forrest, the Unionist Westminster MP for mid-Ulster, prompted a by-election. To assure the defeat of a protestant candidate, republicans, the Nationalist Party and Peoples' Democracy agreed to support Bernadette Devlin to represent

⁵⁶³ J. Bowyer Bell, *The Irish Troubles: A Generation of Violence 1967-1992* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 88-92.

all catholic parties. Devlin won on a non-sectarian, radical socialist platform that attacked both the Unionist's discriminatory policies and Paisley's religious viewpoints.⁵⁶⁴

The Stormont and mid-Ulster by-elections were not the only new troubles facing O'Neill. Between March 30 and April 24, 1969, the Ulster Volunteer Force orchestrated a series of bombings that damaged electrical and water facilities throughout Northern Ireland. Both the government and Paisley blamed the IRA and initially the RUC could not provide evidence of UVF complicity. The *Protestant Telegraph* asserted that the civil rights campaign had begun its second phase: the bombings signaled the start of a new round of republican violence that aimed to topple the Northern Ireland government. Despite the Royal Ulster Constabulary's claims to the contrary, catholics suspected that protestant extremists had committed the bombings. Later in the year the Northern Irish authorities did arrest members of the UVF for the attacks, but by then it was too late to placate the catholic community.⁵⁶⁵

After determining that his policies had split the Ulster Unionist party, O'Neill resigned as Prime Minister on April 28, 1969. Unionist moderates retained enough power, however, to elect Major James Chichester-Clark as the new party leader over Brian Faulkner, the choice of the Unionist right-wing. Throughout the summer of 1969, Chichester-Clark continued the basic O'Neill policies, and did not win the confidence of either the catholic community or Paisley and protestant extremists. To all three, the new Prime Minister appeared indecisive, inarticulate and awkward. Catholics did not believe that Chichester-Clark could deter Paisley or the Unionist

⁵⁶⁴ Arthur, 56-58; Farrell, 1976, 253-354; Harbinson, 43-46; Terence O'Neill, *Ulster at the Crossroads* (London: Faber and Faber, 1969), 172.

⁵⁶⁵ *Protestant Telegraph*, "IRA Plots Unfolds: The Second Phase: Civil Disobedience," 22 March 1969.

right wing, while Paisley and protestant extremists were dissatisfied when the Prime Minister continued O'Neill's policies.⁵⁶⁶

From the end of the Long March until the start of the marching season in the summer of 1969, both the Northern Ireland civil rights movement and Paisley continued their campaigns. Most of the civil rights actions were either small Peoples' Democracy protests or larger protests led by radicals, not by members of the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association. These included the 4000-person demonstration in Londonderry on March 28th that again covered the ground between Waterside train station and the Diamond in the center of the city, and the march in Omagh in mid-April that counter-demonstrators confronted. NICRA had backed off from supporting demonstrations, but frustrated by the lack of reforms, the organization announced on June 2nd that it would start marching again in six weeks.

The tensions within the province were augmented by both the street violence and sectarian intimidation that was beginning to occur on a regular basis in Belfast and Londonderry between catholics and the Royal Ulster Constabulary, and by the appearance of neighborhood vigilante committees in catholic and protestant neighborhoods. The Shankill Defence Association, founded by John McKeague, a former Free Presbyterian and member of Paisley's Ravenhill congregation, was one notorious protestant group that used intimidation and threats of fire-bombing to 'convince' catholics to leave predominately protestant areas.⁵⁶⁷

Protestant marching, however, was the final straw that ushered in a new and deadly era in the history of Northern Ireland – and in Paisley's career. In 1969, the July 12th Orange Order parades proceeded with sporadic violence in Belfast, although the RUC established an uneasy

⁵⁶⁶ Brian Faulkner, *Memoirs of a Statesman*, John Houston, ed. (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978), 56.

⁵⁶⁷ Moloney, 2008, 165-188.

truce. Serious sectarian fighting broke out near the Shankill Road after catholics attacked a Junior Orangeman parade that passed in front of the Unity Flats housing estate. The Shankill Defence Association counterattacked but a massive RUC presence stopped the protestant onslaught. Nevertheless, residents of Unity Flats accused the police of aiding the protestant extremists.

Stormont expected trouble to be repeated during the annual August 12th Apprentice Boys parade in Londonderry. Robert Porter, the new Minister of Home Affairs, began discussions with the British government for the use of the British Army if serious violence did occur and several British Army units were dispatched to bases in Northern Ireland as a precaution. Porter refused to ban the Apprentice Boys march and the parade proceeded without incident until fighting broke out between catholic and protestant youths that afternoon. The tensions created during the previous ten months of civil rights marches and protests proved too much and the sporadic street fighting escalated into two nights of vicious rioting. On the third day of rioting, the Northern Ireland government concluded that it had lost control of law and order, and at 4:15 p.m. on August 14, 1969, troops of the Prince of Wales' Own Regiment were deployed on the streets of Londonderry.⁵⁶⁸

THE SECOND JAILING

Throughout the spring and summer of 1969, Paisley's voice was somewhat muted because of the pending court case that resulted from his counter-demonstration in Armagh the previous November. Although Paisley and Bunting first appeared in court on January 27, 1969 and were convicted of unlawful assembly and sentenced to ninety-day imprisonment, both were released on appeal and not jailed until the end of March. At that time, the appeal was heard by a judge

⁵⁶⁸ Bardon, 1992, 672-679; and Coogan, 1995, 60-81.

who happened to be catholic: the original sentence doubled. Both Paisley and Bunting were released early, however, after Chichester-Clark announced an amnesty for all civil rights offenses that took place after October 5, 1968.⁵⁶⁹

Paisley's second jailing further elevated his status within the international community of militant fundamentalists, and Paisley's ordeal became standard reading in newspapers such as the *Christian Beacon* and *Western Voice*.⁵⁷⁰ Because of his second imprisonment, Paisley could not attend the annual Bob Jones Bible Conference, although Brian Green, who spoke in Paisley's place, fully detailed Paisley's martyrdom and the "Spiritual Conditions in Great Britain Today." Green argued that the civil rights movement in Northern Ireland and the Catholic Church were the culprits behind Paisley's legal trouble. As the marching season in Ulster in the summer of 1969 began, Paisley was the most revered defender of Bible Protestantism within the international militant fundamentalist fellowship.⁵⁷¹

In early July 1968, Paisley and associates in the British Council of Protestant Christian Churches – once again including Brian Green and Jack Glass - picketed the World Council of Churches assembly in Uppsala, Sweden. Paisley and Free Presbyterian ministers including the Reverend John Wylie and Ivan Foster, joined the BCPC and John Walsh of America to protest the imprisonment of protestant clerics in Cameroon and the presence in Uppsala of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Billy Graham, and Catholic observers. Militant fundamentalists had been championing the case of the Presbyterians in Cameroon; militants claimed the group was imprisoned for their refusal to join the country's state-ordained ecumenical church. Militants

⁵⁶⁹ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Paisley in Court Row at Armagh," 27 January 1969, "Paisley Out Again: Leaves Jail After Signing Bail Bond," 30 January 1969, "Paisley, Bunting Appeal Sentences," 25 March 1969; and Moloney and Pollak, 167-171.

⁵⁷⁰ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Ian Paisley – Ecumenical Prisoner by Dr. Carl McIntire," 19 April 1969.

⁵⁷¹ *Fellowship News*, "Bible Conference Notes," 24 May 1969.

attacked the new WCC resolutions against the Vietnam and Biafran Wars, and new “avant-garde” theological conceptions, such as “touch-and-feel” prayer sessions where participants prayed as well as expressed physical affection. Militant fundamentalists equated these “new” practices as recycled pagan orgies. Paisley, Wylie and Foster held placards announcing their martyrdom two years before and confronted delegates from the Irish Presbyterian Church and the Irish Methodist Eric Gallagher at the entrance of the assembly.⁵⁷²

The following January, Paisley led another British Council of Protestant Christian Churches protest in London against Cardinal John Heenan, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, who spoke at St. Paul’s Anglican Cathedral as part of a week of prayer for Christian unity. Heenan was the first catholic archbishop to preach in a British Protestant church for 400 years. Although Paisley, Green and several associates were able to enter the churchyard, several hundred opponents trapped them and for two hours shouted abuse, such as “Paisley go home,” and “Fascist.” London policemen had to protect the militant fundamentalists.⁵⁷³

As the episode reveals, Paisley’s public stature incited a stronger response from his critics throughout the British Isles; Paisleyites had never before inspired pre-planned counter-protests. In early December, Lord Donald Soper attacked Paisley in the British House of Lords as a “man with a loud voice and his doctorate is self-inflicted. He is purely dogmatic and has no scholarship. He is a rabble-rouser, he has a raucous approach and a dogmatic gesture.”⁵⁷⁴ Eric Gallagher, who publicly supported the aims of NICRA and condemned extremist actions such as

⁵⁷² *Protestant Telegraph*, “W.C.C. Uppsala Sweden: A Report from Scotland by Rev. Jack Glass,” 27 July 1968 and “What Really Happened at the W.C.C. at Uppsala,” 24 August 1968; and *The Revivalist*, “Free Presbyterians Protest at W.C.C. Assembly,” July/August, 1968.

⁵⁷³ *Belfast Telegraph*, “Paisley Caught up in Police Net at St. Paul’s,” 23 January 1969.

⁵⁷⁴ *Belfast Telegraph*, “Paisley Hits Back at Soper,” 4 December 1968.

Burntollet Bridge, expressed the feelings of many moderate protestants, arguing that Protestant churches in Ireland should have been denouncing Paisley in a stronger tone.⁵⁷⁵

Other Irish protestants, however, were taking a neutral position, opposing both civil rights activism and Paisleyism. While not supporting Paisley's methods, these moderates argued that Irish protestants had legitimate grievances. The *Church of Ireland Gazette* urged Irish protestants to support civil rights in the North, but printed an editorial proclaiming that protestants in the Republic of Ireland also needed civil rights and attacking the anti-protestant policies of Irish Catholicism. The *Gazette* pointed out that protestants in southern Ireland could not get divorces or buy contraceptives, and that the *Ne Temere* decree was a major obstacle to ecumenism between protestant and catholic churches.⁵⁷⁶

Paisley received new important and visible support from his militant fundamentalist allies. Throughout the period leading up to the British Army deployment, Paisley kept not only his campaign against apostasy and ecumenicalism within the Irish churches, but his fellowship with militant fundamentalists in the British Isles and North America as well. In February 1969, Bob Jones, Jr. appeared with Paisley in a series of meetings in Ulster to support Paisley's anti-civil rights and anti-ecumenical crusades, but also tacitly to support his political campaign. Bob Jones III appeared at the Tandragee Free Presbyterian Church and the Ulster Hall.⁵⁷⁷ After his jailing March 1969, the American Council of Christian Churches passed a resolution commending Paisley as a "great Protestant leader" and denouncing the Northern Irish civil rights movement for inciting violence. The Bob Jones Bible Conference sent a telegram to President Richard M.

⁵⁷⁵ Dennis Cooke, 2005, 152-153.

⁵⁷⁶ *Church of Ireland Gazette*, "Civil Rights for Protestants," 20 April 1969. The *Ne Temere* decree required that the children born out of mixed Catholic – Protestant marriages be raised Catholic.

⁵⁷⁷ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Bob Jones III to Visit Ulster," 14 June 1969; and *The Glasgow Herald*, "Ian Paisley Shares Platform with His U.S. Mentor," 17 February 1969.

Nixon condemning Paisley's second incarceration as an assault on Bible Protestantism. McIntire also added direct support, with guest editorials in the *Protestant Telegraph* and telegrams to the Queen of England that denounced Paisley's treatment.⁵⁷⁸

In early June 1969, Paisley led six Free Presbyterian ministers in a protest against the appearance of Dr. John Carson, the new moderator of the Irish Presbyterian Church, at the Trinity Presbyterian Church in Bangor, and planned a visit to Geneva with sixteen ministers to protest Pope Paul VI's visit to the headquarters of the World Council of Churches. Geneva was the home of John Calvin and the choice of venue for the Pope's visit galled militant fundamentalists. In spite of a ban by the Swiss authorities – who cited a supposed (but false) death threat against the Pontiff from Glass – Paisley and his entourage left for Geneva. Paisley and five others were detained at the airport, but the others were able to stage a protest outside the World Council building.⁵⁷⁹

Following the protests, Paisley returned to Belfast to prepare for the upcoming July 12th celebrations and to prepare for the new wave of NICRA marches. Whether Paisley was prepared for the outbreak of sectarian fighting is speculative. But he had spent two decades warning Ulster protestants and militant fundamentalists throughout the world that apostasy and the Roman Catholic Church threatened Ulster Protestantism. To many Irish protestants, Paisley's dire predictions appeared to be becoming true.

⁵⁷⁸ *Christian Beacon*, "Paisley Arrested, Sentenced to Prison," 6 February 1969, "Ian Paisley – Ecumenical Prisoner," 10 April 1969, and "Paisley Released From Prison," 8 May 1969; *Protestant Telegraph*, "IRA Plot Unfolds: The Second Phase of Civil Disobedience," 22 March 1969; *The Fellowship News*, "Bible Conference Notes," 24 May 1969; and *Western Voice*, "11,000 March in Support of Paisley," 13 March 1969 and "A.C.C.C. Commends Paisley," 29 May 1969.

⁵⁷⁹ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Churches Awake to World Problems of To-Day," 22 July 1968, "Paisley Plans to Defy Swiss Ban," June 2, 1969, and "Paisley Protest in Bangor," 9 June 1969; and *Protestant Telegraph*, "Great Protest Inside Geneva: An Eyewitness Account," 28 May 1969.

CHAPTER 10 THE SECOND COMING: PAISLEY IN THE AGE OF AMILLENNIAL POLITICS

This final chapter briefly explores Paisley's career in politics and his transformation from a premillennialist fundamentalist crusader into an amillennial politician. During Paisley's early career as a crusading anti-modernist and anti-ecumenical militant fundamentalist, he showed a basic interest in politics. He primarily focused on constitutional issues, such as defending the Union between Northern Ireland and Great Britain, and local controversies, such as education grants to Catholic schools and state-mandated sabbatarianism. Politically Paisley took a populist stance in opposition to the policies of the ruling Ulster Unionist Party. Politics for Paisley in these early years was a means to an end: political action could be used to arouse a new religious revival within Ulster and to thwart the aspirations of Irish Catholicism.⁵⁸⁰

Reflecting on his propensity for independent Unionism, during an interview in 1996 Paisley reminisced over his propensity for independent Unionism, and stated that he developed an early dislike for the official Unionist party. He asserted that the UUP did not act in the best interests of the protestant working class, and he argued that the Party was unnecessarily antagonistic to the Nationalist Party and the catholic community. During his career as a crusading militant fundamentalist, Paisley attacked the Ulster Unionist Party as consistently as he did catholic politicians and political issues. This animosity towards "Big House" Unionism continued through his service in the Northern Ireland, British, and European parliaments. As a Northern Irish and British MP, Paisley protected the social and economic needs of his entire constituency, both catholic and protestant. As a European MP, Paisley worked to protect the

⁵⁸⁰ *Third Way*, "Mr Protestant, Nelson Gonzalez talks to the Rev Ian Paisley MP MEP," 19, (November 1996), 13-17. 'Big House' Unionism is a derisive term working class protestants use to refer to the Unionist Party leadership, who are mostly middle and upper class.

interests of the entire Northern Ireland community. It is conceivable that a fundamentalist protestant who grew up in a social position outside the protestant ascendancy would feel some compassion for the well-being of the catholic as well as protestant community, as long as Northern Ireland remained securely within the United Kingdom and as long as protestant dominance within Northern Ireland remained unchallenged.⁵⁸¹

PAISLEY'S FIRST POLITICAL FORAY

Paisley came from a sub-section of Ulster Unionism that supported independent political action against the protestant ascendancy. These Unionists, primarily working class, followed a tradition that began in the late nineteenth century and continued through the Home Rule Crisis and the establishment of the Northern Ireland statelet. The alternatives to the Ulster Unionist Party became more numerous and aggressive in the period between the partition of Ireland and the 1940s. Populists supported movements independent of the Ulster Unionist Party; for instance, the Protestant Action Society was formed to help protestants buy property and to thwart catholics from doing the same. In addition, the Ulster Protestant Defence and Propaganda Society fought to ensure that the Protestant religion would be taught within the new Northern Ireland public school systems, while the Ulster Protestant League was set up to defend protestant jobs. Independent and populist Unionists won parliamentary seats in the late 1940s with the election of Tommy Henderson and J.W. Nixon in Belfast, candidacies that both the largely secular urban working class and pious protestants supported. Working class and evangelical protestants were concerned over the Ulster Unionist leadership; the working class accused

⁵⁸¹ *Third Way*, "Mr. Protestant," 13-17. While this might seem contradictory in light of Paisley's opposition to civil right actions, such as the Coalisland-to-Dungannon march in August 1968, Paisley had no problem allowing catholics to rent public homes or to receive any other government-provided privileges as long as protestant power in Northern Ireland was not threatened. Civil rights marches were a challenge to protestant control of the province.

Unionists of engaging in class politics, while evangelicals asserted that the party expressed little evangelical fervor. The UUP employed anti-catholic rhetoric and economic discrimination against the catholic community to maintain the economic division between the protestant and catholic working classes, but showed little interest in improving Ulster's economy or in revivalism and evangelical efforts.⁵⁸²

Paisley's first foray into Unionist politics came in January 1949 as the campaign agent for UUP candidate Tommy Cole, during Cole's run for the Stormont ward of Belfast, Docks. By all accounts, Paisley argued a sectarian and anti-socialist message. The area was not only divided between working-class protestants and catholics, it had previously elected candidates of the Northern Ireland Labour Party. This was part of a larger trend in Belfast politics, which saw five socialists, including two from the NILP, elected in Belfast after the Second World War. But during the 1949 election, the UUP made the border the primary political issue. Paisley attacked the anti-partition stance of the NILP candidate and orchestrated a campaign that promoted "Protestantism," ensuring Cole's victory. Because the area experienced consistent sectarian trouble in the past and because of Paisley's campaign efforts, the campaign was the most violent in the constituency since 1921.⁵⁸³

In spite of Cole's victory, the process affected Paisley negatively; he concluded that he should concentrate on his ministry. In January 1949, an event which Paisley considered an epiphany diverted his attention from politics and back towards religious matters. During an extended prayer meeting with members of the Ravenhill Mission, Paisley claimed to have encountered the Holy Ghost, who asked Paisley to inspire a revival amongst Ulster's true Christians – those who professed Calvinism and took a fundamentalist view of the Bible – and to

⁵⁸² Bardon, 1992, 588-591; and Moloney and Pollak, 28-29.

⁵⁸³ Bruce, 1989, 64-68; and Moloney and Pollak, 29-33.

forego politics. Paisley's spiritual epiphany shaped his career during the 1950s and early 1960s: he primarily evangelized and when he did involve himself in political issues, he worked indirectly with organizations such as the National Union of Protestants and Ulster Protestant Action, and in a manner that used political action to promote religious concerns.⁵⁸⁴

THE NATIONAL UNION OF PROTESTANTS

During the late 1940s, Paisley expanded his ministry with a muted interest in politics. He helped to establish the Ulster branch of the National Union of Protestants (NUP) and became the organization's treasurer. It was partially through his uncle, the Reverend W. St. Clair Taylor who was the General Secretary of the organization in London that Paisley involved himself with the NUP, and partially through the relationships Paisley developed in Ulster. The most important was Norman Porter, a man with whom Paisley attended evangelical meetings.⁵⁸⁵

Organizations like the National Union of Protestants widened the scope of both Paisley's religious activities and his political connections. As the NUP's Northern Ireland treasurer and secretary, respectively, Paisley and Porter used the group as a platform for political activism that benefitted evangelical Christians. The NUP sought to maintain protestant unemployment and to thwart Catholic evangelizing and ecumenical efforts. It also sought to uphold the traditional Protestant character of public life in Northern Ireland. Alarmed by the growing secularization of British society and the loosening of public morals, Paisley and the NUP opposed the liberalization of laws governing alcohol consumption and sales on the Sabbath. Because the Northern Ireland parliament and local councils held the right to legislate on local issues such as education, local voting rights, and alcohol sales, these institutions were subject to constant NUP pressure. For instance, in May 1948 Paisley spoke at a NUP meeting denouncing the attempt to

⁵⁸⁴ Moloney and Pollak, 35-37.

⁵⁸⁵ Moloney, 2008, 19-24.

open the Belfast Museum and Art Gallery on Sundays. Two years later Paisley and the NUP petitioned the Belfast Corporation, the city's administrative body, to ban alcohol ads on city-owned buses, while in 1958, Paisley and Porter opposed the *Intoxicating Liquor and Licencing Bill (Northern Ireland)*, which permitted new alcohol licenses and increased sales in hotels.⁵⁸⁶

Following the Second World War, Northern Ireland maintained a semi-puritanical society that limited the number of bars and the hours they could operate. The opening of public buildings, conveniences, and parks were outlawed on Sundays. While evangelical protestants - essentially from rural and small town areas, but with a sizable urban base - rallied behind the law, the system faced local pressure. The catholic community did not share their concept of the Sabbath - catholics routinely petitioned for permits to stage football matches and to open bars on Sundays - and the urban, protestant working class was less inclined to attend church and more likely to visit pubs or public events on Sunday.⁵⁸⁷

To Paisley and the NUP, Catholic evangelization was as serious a threat as was public morality. A protest was made to the Ministers of Health and Local Government, claiming that catholic employees of local hospitals were preventing protestants from evangelizing within state-run hospitals. Paisley joined NUP street protests, such as demonstrations against the mission that Redemptorist priests held in Belfast to convert non-Catholics. In October 1950 and in April of the following year, Norman Porter and Paisley appeared at NUP rallies in Pomeroy, County Tyrone, a contentious and divided town with an active republican sector. During these rallies, a converted Australian Catholic named Monica Farrell explained the evils of Catholicism to the

⁵⁸⁶ *Belfast Telegraph*, "National Union of Protestants Organise Petition Creed and Hospitals," 20 January 1950; and *Intoxicating Liquor and Licencing Bill (Northern Ireland)* (Belfast: HMSO, 1958).

⁵⁸⁷ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Drinking Blamed on Television," 19 May 1960; *Ulster Protestant*, "I.F.A. and the Sunday Matches," July 1958, "Protestantism in Bangor: Is it Declining?," April, 1959 and "Limavady and the Lord's Day," February 1960; and Moloney, 2008, 19-24.

local protestant community. While Paisley shunned elected office, Porter propelled his leadership in the National Union of Protestants into a Stormont seat. In October 1953, Porter ran as the independent Unionist for the Clifton ward of north Belfast, and won on a Loyalist, anti-catholic, and anti-‘Big House’ platform.⁵⁸⁸

Paisley’s adherence to militant fundamentalism, however, upset his coalition with Porter and the National Union of Protestants. As has been shown in Chapter Four, during the early 1950s Paisley began attacking Porter and fellow Irish fundamentalists, such as the Irish Evangelical Church, for their relationships with Irish and British protestants who were not militants. Accordingly, Paisley’s cooperation with the NUP lasted barely five years. In 1952, Paisley resigned from the National Union of Protestants after a controversy involving the Reverend Eric Borland of Bangor, a vice president of the organization and a Presbyterian minister. Borland argued that Paisley threatened to create trouble for any NUP minister whose theology differed from strict militant fundamentalism, and due to Paisley’s willingness to attack fellow evangelical clergymen led the NUP to vote him off its Ulster executive. But because he retained support from the main office in England, Paisley was able to regain the organizational name for use in Ulster.⁵⁸⁹

Despite their theological differences, Porter and Paisley temporarily joined forces again in 1956 to form Ulster Protestant Action (UPA). Purportedly founded at a meeting in the headquarters of the Ulster Unionist Party, the original organizers of UPA included a wide range of militant Loyalists from Belfast, notably Desmond Boal, a secular barrister and member of the UUP, and Billy Spence, whose brother would help to resurrect the Ulster Volunteer Force ten

⁵⁸⁸ Moloney, 2008, 19-45; and Moloney and Pollak, 42-51.

⁵⁸⁹ Moloney and Pollak, 33-51. In the spring of 1954, London forced Porter to split a £400 endowment left to the NUP with Paisley. Afterwards, Porter and his supporters resigned from the group and formed the Evangelical Protestant Society.

years later. Ulster Protestant Action was founded to defend Belfast against the expected Irish Republican Army attacks, but when the IRA threat was contained to the Northern Ireland border, the UPA concentrated on social and economic issues. For instance, one UPA branch worked to prevent catholics from obtaining public housing in north Belfast. The organization supported protestant employment and pressed for unrestricted marching by protestants, as many Orange parades in the 1950s were banned or re-routed to avoid catholic neighborhoods. The *Public Order Act (Northern Ireland)*, passed in 1951, required forty-eight hours notice to the Royal Ulster Constabulary in order to obtain a parade permit. The Act allowed the police to suppress marches deemed a threat to public order.⁵⁹⁰

His relationships with Ulster Protestant Action and the National Union of Protestants and his willingness to confront Unionist authority, earned Paisley a reputation as an independent, a populist, and a demagogue. In March 1958, Ulster Protestant Action became involved in local political campaigns, in one instance helping Albert Duff – who ran a gospel mission in loyalist Sandy Row in south Belfast - to run for Brian Maginess' Stormont seat. Maginess, the Minister of Education and the husband of a catholic, was attacked for policies the Ulster Unionist Party introduced at Stormont. Two instances were state finance for Catholic schools and the withdrawal of the Family Allowances Bill, a plan that would have penalized larger and mostly catholic families. Paisley also supported Duff, Charlie McCullough and Free Presbyterian minister John Wylie in city council elections the following May. Paisley became Duff's election manager after declining an offer to run for the office himself.⁵⁹¹ Maginess won the Stormont election with the help of Prime Minister Brookeborough, while Duff and the two others were elected to the Belfast Corporation. All three ran as Protestant Unionists, a loose political

⁵⁹⁰ Moloney, 2008, 73-80.

⁵⁹¹ Moloney, 2008, 92-99.

organization Paisley helped to establish. In 1960, Ulster Protestant Action put its support behind Desmond Boal to win election to Stormont, representing the Loyalist Shankill Road ward in west Belfast. But the success of UPA political activities was inconsistent: in the March 1958 Stormont election, Norman Porter lost his seat.⁵⁹²

In the May 1961 Belfast Corporation elections, the UPA ran five candidates, two of whom won - Albert Duff and James McCarroll, a Free Presbyterian layman. But once again, Paisley's tactics, including directing the UPA to accuse rivals of employing Catholics, caused dissension. Paisley quit Ulster Protestant Action several years later, although he continued to work with the group. For instance, during the 1964 British General Election, Paisley and the UPA supported James Kilfedder and helped foment the Divis Street riots. The NUP controversy and his membership in Ulster Protestant Action made an important early impact on Paisley's political and evangelical outlook. Paisley was convinced that attacking enemies could bring political advantages and help maintain militant fundamentalism.⁵⁹³

Many Free Presbyterians, however, did not approve of their moderator's political activism. The NUP and UPA became useful fronts to distance Paisley the emerging politician, from his dual roles as a pastor and the Moderator of the Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster.⁵⁹⁴ Moreover, the Ulster Protestant Action inspired Paisley to form new political organizations that eventually led to the formation of a formal political party. The Ulster Constitution Defence Committee and the Ulster Protestant Volunteers, two organizations which were vital to Paisley's campaign against O'Neill and the Northern Ireland civil rights movement, played important roles in Paisley's politicalization. Both expanded Paisley's support base beyond the boundaries of the

⁵⁹² *Belfast Telegraph*, "National Union of Protestants," 24 January 1952; Macquigg, 176-177; Moloney, 2008, 80-84; and Smyth, 6-9.

⁵⁹³ Moloney and Pollak, 98-102.

⁵⁹⁴ Moloney, 2008, 92-99.

militant fundamentalist community; many of these street activists were interested in maintaining protestant political power and economic rights for the working class, not in protesting against the ecumenical movement or Christian modernism.⁵⁹⁵

Paisley proclaimed his political ambitions when he formally organized the Protestant Unionist Party (PUP). In the March 1966 British General Election Paisley campaigned against O'Neill's supporters within the Ulster Unionist Party, standing as a 'Protestant Unionist'. Previously, Protestant Unionist was an informal moniker employed since the city council and Stormont elections in 1958. The PUP was in essence Paisleyism as a political action group and a coalition between the Reverend Ian Paisley and the solicitor Desmond Boal, Paisley's new political ally. The PUP platform combined economic populism, anti-O'Neillism, and evangelicalism: the party opposed the appeasement of the Catholic Church, the civil rights movement and the Irish Republican Army, called for the defense of the Union, and demanded new housing, local voting reform, and a program to ease unemployment. During the first days of the PUP, Paisley hinted at higher political ambitions: in an Ulster Hall rally in July 1966, Paisley announced: "with the help of God and the Protestants of Ulster," he would one day run for and be elected to Stormont.⁵⁹⁶

Four Paisleyite candidates stood for election in Belfast in 1966 in opposition to the Ulster Unionist Party. All four lost, but in west Belfast their candidacy insured the defeat of the Unionist James Kilfedder, who lost to Gerry Fitt of the small Republican Labour Party. This was the same Unionist candidate Paisley had supported two years earlier and over whom serious

⁵⁹⁵ Moloney and Pollak, 122-128.

⁵⁹⁶ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Paisley Says He'll be MP at Stormont," 20 July 1966.

rioting had occurred on Divis Street. Despite their complicity in the election, Paisleyites denounced Fitt's success as another victory for O'Neillism.⁵⁹⁷

The PUP experienced a few early successes, such as Eileen Paisley's election to the Belfast city council in May 1967 and the election of two councillors in Lisburn. In the February 1969 Stormont elections, called by O'Neill as a mandate on his policies, the PUP fielded six candidates. Paisley himself ran against O'Neill. Although none of the PUP candidates were elected, Paisley's showing was strong enough to embarrass the Prime Minister.⁵⁹⁸

After the election, the Ulster Unionist Party voted to back O'Neill, but the Ulster Volunteer Force bombing campaign in Ulster, the election of Bernadette Devlin as the Westminster MP for Mid-Ulster in a by-election, and continuing civil rights activism led to O'Neill's resignation on April 28, 1969 as Prime Minister.⁵⁹⁹ Paisley viewed O'Neill's departure as an act of God, yet Paisley, his militant fundamentalist allies, and PUP supporters initially backed the new

⁵⁹⁷ Moloney, 2008, 122-125; and Moloney and Pollak, 129-131. Paisley and the Protestant Unionist Party helped to defeat Kilfedder by making it known that the Unionist had attended Fine Gael meetings as a student at Trinity College Dublin. Fine Gael is a major political party in the Republic of Ireland.

⁵⁹⁸ Moloney, 2008, 148-149. Paisley won approximately 39% of the vote; Terence O'Neill took 47%, while Michael Farrell of People's Democracy received the other 14%. The populist economic policy of the Protestant Unionist Party was laid out in the *Protestant Telegraph* (22 February 1969): "Complete parity with the United Kingdom, both in services and taxation; Reorganisation of local government with reform of its taxation system to ensure that every elector obtains his full democratic rights and equitable financial treatment; Crash programme on housing, with particular reference to the improvement of existing houses and twilight zones and the speed-up of slum clearances and redevelopment; Reduction of the rate of employment to at least one third of its present level, that is to the United Kingdom limit or below, by the gearing of the whole Government machinery to this end; Full employment must be the final goal of government; Improvement of household incomes by 25 percent to bring them to the United Kingdom standard by the immediate introduction of modern management techniques and production methods; Raising of education, health, and welfare standards to the levels reached in the progressive regions of Great Britain; and a new deal in agriculture with a firm future for the small farmer ensured." For the next thirty-five years, the PUP and the Democratic Unionist Party followed a similar platform.

⁵⁹⁹ O'Neill, however, kept his Stormont seat.

administration of Major Chichester-Clark, who tried to continue O'Neill's policies. The outbreak of sectarian-street fighting in August 1969 and the deployment of the British Army to the streets of Northern Ireland caused Paisleyites to reverse course. Ever since November 1968 when the British government forced O'Neill to implement a reform program, many within Northern Ireland's protestant community viewed British policy as appeasement of the civil rights movement and the Republic of Ireland. It seemed to Loyalists and supporters of the Union that the actions of the British government were facilitating the resurgence of the Irish Republican Army and that the British were considering abandoning Northern Ireland to the southern republic. Paisley and the PUP articulated these concerns.⁶⁰⁰

In October 1969, the British Government released the *Hunt Report*, which blamed Unionist policies for Northern Ireland's outbreak of sectarian violence.⁶⁰¹ The Report called for the disbanding of the Ulster Special Constabulary, the disarming of the Royal Ulster Constabulary, the appointment of Sir Arthur Young, the London Police Commissioner, as Northern Ireland's chief constable, and the formation of an Ulster Defence Regiment as a unit of the British Army. After implementing these reforms, London took over control of security. To Northern Irish protestants British security policies seemed ineffective and too conciliatory towards the catholic community. They particularly abhorred the existence of 'no-go' areas in catholic neighborhoods, where the Army and police would not enter.⁶⁰² In response, Loyalists fought street battles with the Army during the first year of the British deployment. Yet the British Army alienated the

⁶⁰⁰ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Requiem for O'Neill," 3 May 1969; and Moloney, 2008, 81-192.

⁶⁰¹ *Report of the Advisory Committee on Police in Northern Ireland (Hunt Report)* (Belfast: HMSO, 1969).

⁶⁰² The British Army allowed 'no-go' areas – catholic neighborhoods where the Army and the Royal Ulster Constabulary would not enter and where catholics (mainly through the IRA) policed themselves. These areas became safe havens from where the Irish Republican Army could plan attacks on security forces and organize a bombing campaign.

catholic community as well. Slowly the IRA bombing campaign intensified and when the internment of republicans was badly implemented, the Irish Republican Army resurrected itself as a potent terrorist organization. After the 'Bloody Sunday' shootings in Londonderry, during which the Parachute Regiment killed thirteen unarmed marchers, British government policy foundered. During the "Troubles," no policy could simultaneously satisfy catholic and protestant interests.⁶⁰³

THE FIRST YEAR OF "TROUBLE"

During the months following the British Army deployment, militant fundamentalists in the United States showed renewed interest Paisley's crusade. It was imperative to this Christian fellowship to defend law and order in Ulster and to protect Bible Protestantism. To militants, Northern Ireland had become an important battlefield in the struggle between the Roman Catholic Church and militant fundamentalism. In addition, the appearance of Westminster MP Bernadette Devlin in the United States on an extensive speaking tour to press the case of the catholic community and the Northern Ireland civil rights movement made support for Paisley a vital exercise. Devlin, a Trotskyite but the darling of Irish-Americans, was given a warm reception and the key to the city in major cities such as New York, Philadelphia, Los Angeles and San Francisco. A two-man 'Truth Squad' consisting of an Ulster Unionist and a British House of Commons MP followed Devlin to the United States, holding news conferences and television appearances to refute Devlin's assertions about the situation in Northern Ireland. Two weeks later, Paisley himself came to North America and retraced Devlin's route, and refuted to the American press her claims of discrimination in Ulster.⁶⁰⁴

⁶⁰³ Bardon, 1992, 672-703.

⁶⁰⁴ *Christian Beacon*, "Paisley to Come to U.S.; Bernadette Faces Opposition," 4 September 1969, *New York Times*, "Ulster 'Truth Squad' Pursues Miss Devlin to U.S.," 30 August 1969;

McIntire and Paisley presented the militant fundamentalist position. Paisley received more press than he did during his previous tours of the United States, as well as extensive coverage in Northern Ireland. In New York, Paisley and McIntire were refused an audience by Mayor John Lindsay, despite the mayor's previous meeting with Devlin. In Los Angeles, Paisley argued at the Los Angeles Press Club that the Catholic Church was virtually communist. In Philadelphia, McIntire made sure that hymn-singing supporters met Paisley at the Philadelphia International Airport and that he received a warm welcome at the Bible Presbyterian Church in Collingswood, New Jersey. But Paisley's most important stop was in Greenville, South Carolina where on September 12th he made a speech to the student body of Bob Jones University, a message that talked about the developing "trouble" in Ulster. Paisley denounced catholic attacks on protestants, but not protestant violence towards the catholic community.⁶⁰⁵

The deployment of the British Army was an important development in Paisley's metamorphosis from a premillennial preacher into an amillennial politician. The Army's presence on the streets of Ulster gave the British government the responsibility for security and law and order, but the continued existence of the Northern Ireland parliament gave Unionists legislative power over civic affairs. This dual control proved unworkable and helped the Irish Republican Army to expand its support within the catholic community. In many ways it became inevitable that IRA violence would escalate and that the Northern Ireland parliament would be

Philadelphia Inquirer, "Rev. Paisley Arrives in Phila. To Counter Miss Devlin's Drive," 7 September 1969, and "Rev. Paisley Hailed at 2 Churches, is Rebuffed by Germantown Rector," 8 September 1969; and *The Western Voice*, "Ireland Becomes 'Test Case' for World Domination by Rome," 4 September 1969. In fall 1969, the 20th Century Reformation Hour also published an eight page pamphlet "Report on Ulster."

⁶⁰⁵ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Bias Against Protestants, Says Paisley," 10 September 1969, and "RC Church Nearer to Communism – Paisley," 11 September 1969; *Christian Beacon*, "Hymn-Singers, McIntire Welcome Rev. Paisley to Phila.," 11 September 1969; and Ian R. K. Paisley, *Northern Ireland: Message Delivered at Bob Jones University, September 12, 1969*, 5-22.

suspended in 1972 and direct rule from London imposed. As Westminster sought a political solution involving Ulster nationalists and Dublin, Unionists moved into a position of opposition to the British government.⁶⁰⁶

With British troops on the streets of Ulster and the British government seeking to thwart the growing violence with a political solution, moderates within the UUP could not simultaneously satisfy the British and fulfill the demands of the Loyalist and fundamentalist communities. The UUP's failure created a political opening for new leadership that could articulate the demands of the protestant working class and evangelical communities. At the same time, Ulster's secular warfare elevated Paisley into an even higher position within militant fundamentalism. In Northern Ireland, militant fundamentalists had fought a long rhetorical battle against civil rights, communism, ecumenism and the Catholic Church. Now Northern Ireland became a physical battleground.⁶⁰⁷

In a show of support for Paisley and Irish Protestantism, in early October 1969 McIntire and Bob Jones, Jr. returned to Belfast to open the new Martyrs Memorial Free Presbyterian Church. After visiting Belfast and viewing the damages from the riots of the previous month, McIntire held a press conference in the United States to announce that Irish Christian Relief (ICR) would raise money for Northern Irish protestants affected by the violence. McIntire used his Twentieth Century Reformation radio program to run a five-hour marathon that raised \$5,000 for ICR. The militant fundamentalism media in America made the situation in Northern Ireland a prime topic. John R. Rice, editor of *The Sword of the Lord*, documented McIntire's trip to Belfast, expressed amazement that a substantial revival was taking place despite the violence,

⁶⁰⁶ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Surrender by Installments – Faulkner Policy of Appeasement," 3 July, 1971 and "Action – Now?" 4 September, 1971.

⁶⁰⁷ Bardon, 1992, 665-669; Boulton, 1973, 104-111; Faulkner 50-51; and Moloney and Pollak, 192.

and urged that American protestants to pray for Northern Ireland. Such support from prominent American militants bolstered Paisley's international stature. Now in control of the largest congregation in the British Isles, Paisley turned his attention to the security situation in Northern Ireland.⁶⁰⁸

THE SECOND COMING: PAISLEY AND DEMOCRATIC UNIONIST POLITICS

The ineffectiveness of British government policy and the escalation of republican violence accelerated Paisley's move into politics. Paisley's second jailing, the opening of the Martyrs Memorial Free Presbyterian Church, and his increased stature within the international fellowship of militant fundamentalists, furthered Paisley's prestige with both church-going and secular Ulster protestants and eased his transition into politics. From the 1970s on, Paisley's crusade slowly but steadily transformed from one against ecumenicalism and the civil rights movement into a political campaign. In early February 1970, the PUP fought two by-elections for Belfast city council seats, winning both against UUP candidates.⁶⁰⁹ The culmination of Paisley's foray into politics came during the Stormont by-election in April 1970, when Paisley won the

⁶⁰⁸ *Christian Beacon*, "ICR Launches Campaign to Help Afflicted Protestants in Ulster," 4 September 1969, and "ICR Receiving Funds for Ulster Protestants," 11 September 1969; and *Sword of the Lord*, "Dr. Bob Jones in Ireland Revival," 14 November 1969.

In a significant episode in February 1970, the Reverends Jack Glass and Brian Green and thirteen Free Presbyterian ministers were arrested in London, during a British Council of Protestant Churches protest against the Queen Elizabeth II's audience with a French cardinal. They handed out a petition on behalf of Paisley – but the Reverend himself did not attend because he was preoccupied with the election for two vacant city council seats in Belfast. Moreover, a third coast-to-coast preaching tour of the United States – to visit nineteen states and Canada – was canceled due to Paisley's electoral campaign two months later. Clearly, Paisley was beginning to focus on political matters (*Belfast Telegraph*, "Paisleyites at London R. C. March," 26 January 1970; and *Protestant Telegraph*, "Third Coast-To-Coast Tour of U.S.A.," 6 December 1969).

⁶⁰⁹ *Belfast Telegraph*, *Belfast Telegraph*, "Paisley Party to Fight 2 Seats," 19 January 1970, "Protestant Unionists Triumph In Woodvale," 5 February 1970; and *Protestant Telegraph*, "Protestant Unionists Win in Woodvale," 21 February 1970. The Protestant Unionist Party contested and won the two seats from the Woodvale ward of Belfast.

Bannside seat Terence O'Neill had vacated; the former prime minister had become a British Peer. Although Paisley won only 43 percent of the vote, he outpolled Dr. Bolton Minford, the Ulster Unionist candidate, and Pat McHugh of the Northern Ireland Labour Party.⁶¹⁰ The voters ignored Minford's plea: "A Protestant Unionist government has nothing to offer the people, but fist shaking and words of hate. By voting for that party a Unionist is abandoning reason for a future of fear and uncertainty, and is turning his or her back on fifty years of solid achievement by the Unionist Party."⁶¹¹ Instead, many protestant voters accepted Paisley's plea that Ulster needed deliverance. The April 1970 Stormont election gave the PUP two victories (Reverend William Beattie also won in South Antrim) and confirmed Paisley's new vocation as a politician.⁶¹²

Paisley's victory accelerated the process that turned him from a premillennial crusader against Irish Protestant apostasy and catholic civil rights into an "amillennial politician." Militant fundamentalists in the premillennial tradition regarded the conflict in Northern Ireland as quite possibly the skirmish that would lead to the upcoming Battle of Armageddon. But how and when Jesus would return to rule God's Kingdom on Earth became less important to Paisley than defending the Union between Northern Ireland and Great Britain – and hence Ulster Protestantism – through the political process. Instead of crusading against apostasy in expectation of the Second Coming – a premillennial proposition that demanded the salvation of souls rather than political action – Paisley began working for political solutions, a tactic more in

⁶¹⁰ *Belfast Telegraph*, "Double Paisleyite Victory Stunning Blow to Unionists," 17 April 1970.

⁶¹¹ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Paisley's Only Seeking Publicity Voters Told: Bannside Would be Left to Rot," 11 April 1970.

⁶¹² *Belfast Telegraph*, "Paisleyites at London R.C. March," 26 January 1970 and "Double Paisleyite Victory Stunning Blow for Unionists," 17 April 1970; and *Protestant Telegraph*, "Ulster Needs Deliverance," 13 June 1970.

line with the amillennialist emphasis on temporal reforms. No longer did Paisleyism constitute a crusade against apostasy and ecumenicalism; it became instead a political movement working to prevent a British withdrawal from Northern Ireland. It is one thing to protest against government actions, but another to be an elected participant within the political process. Although as an MP Paisley continued in opposition to the Ulster Unionist Party, as a sitting member of Parliament he was required to offer workable solutions. Paisley's election to the British House of Commons in June 1970 made him part of the national government, enhancing Paisley's political dilemma.⁶¹³

Paisley's victory splintered the Ulster Unionist Party into Paisleyites, official Unionists, and the Alliance Party, a new coalition of moderate Unionists and Catholics. The fragmentation of the UUP became official in September 1971 when Paisley and Desmond Boal turned the PUP into the new Ulster Democratic Unionist Party (better known as the DUP). The new party was set up to articulate the political demands of evangelicals and the secular working class; the party name was changed to differentiate it from Protestant Unionism and to widen its base away from Free Presbyterianism.⁶¹⁴

Clifford Smyth argues that Paisley and Boal intended to form an organization more secular than Protestant Unionism so that it would receive more coverage from the mainstream media. But such a platform proved difficult at first: many Free Presbyterians joined the Party and the decisions of the Free Presbyterian presbytery could impact party policy. For instance, in June 1973 a church decision allowed the Reverends James McClelland, William McCrea, and Ivan Foster to run for the Northern Ireland Assembly, expanding denominational influence over the DUP. Previously only Paisley and Reverend William Beattie had been endorsed by the

⁶¹³ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Protestant Unionists in the Battle," 22 February 1969.

⁶¹⁴ Moloney, 2008, 200-203; Mulholland, 179-192; and Walker, 190-197.

presbytery. Smyth further asserts that the religious commitment of Free Presbyterian activists made them zealous proponents of Democratic Unionism, and encouraged strong financial contributions from them. During the 1970s Paisley would not allow DUP policies to violate the doctrine of the Free Presbyterian Church.⁶¹⁵

Paisley's "political fundamentalism" took on the appearance of fundamentalist revivalism. Paisley asserted that Britain and Northern Ireland were in an economic slump and facing Irish Republican Army violence because the British had turned from God – Britain was nearing judgment.⁶¹⁶ Paisley promptly embarked on a religious-political crusade. The Democratic Unionist Party followed two tracks, one political and the other populist and based on Christian ethics. A four-headed political policy was pursued: to maintain the union with Great Britain, to denounce Unionist rule in Ulster as treasonous and incompetent, to reject any consideration of unification of the Republic of Ireland, and to defeat the IRA. The DUP social and economic platform sought to improve the economic lives of the working and middle classes, to thwart the liberalization of Ulster society, and to defend Irish Protestantism.

The DUP proved popular to Free Presbyterians, as well as secular Loyalists. As an alternative to Ulster Unionism, Paisley and the Democratic Unionist Party showed a willingness to promote contentious and unpopular policies. In September 1971, Paisley and the DUP came out against internment because the policy could be used against protestants as well as catholics. After the suspension of the Northern Ireland parliament in March 1972, Paisley and the DUP began a strong offensive against the UUP and the British government, as well as the surging Irish Republican Army military campaign. When it became known that William Whitelaw, the first

⁶¹⁵ Clifford Smyth, "The DUP as a Politico-Religious Organisation," *Irish Political Studies* I, 1986, 33-43.

⁶¹⁶ Ian R.K. Paisley, *God's Ultimatum to the Nation* (no publication information).

Northern Ireland Secretary, had secretly negotiated with the IRA in early 1972, members of the DUP felt vindicated: it was conceivable that the British government would abandon them to the Republic of Ireland.⁶¹⁷

Initially, the DUP backed direct rule and integration as the best way to maintain the Union, and argued that a weakened Stormont could not maintain the political alliance with Great Britain. When this stance proved unpopular, the DUP developed a platform calling for devolution, with the largest party to be the head of government. In contrast, the Ulster Unionist Party wanted the restoration of Stormont. But when this policy appeared unrealistic, the UUP reversed course and advocated integration with Great Britain as the best way to protect Ulster Unionist control of Northern Ireland.⁶¹⁸

The rise of the Democratic Unionist Party coincided with the formation of Loyalist paramilitary organizations. Protestant paramilitarism was a response to the increased IRA terrorist activity and to direct rule imposed from London; a protestant terrorist campaign began because Loyalists did not think British policies could defeat republican violence. The same month that the DUP was formed saw the founding of the Ulster Defence Association (UDA), an organization that Paisley occasionally, but cautiously worked with, but also a group whose

⁶¹⁷ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Internment: Dr. Paisley's Comments," 4 September 1971, "Whitelaw – Political Pope," 21 April 1972 and "Whitelaw's Plan – Blueprint for United Ireland," 4 November 1972; and Ian R. K. Paisley, *Union With Great Britain, Speech by Reverend Ian R.K. Paisley MP (Leader of the Opposition) Delivered in the Northern Ireland House of Commons on Wednesday 22 March 1972* (no publication information) and *No to a United Ireland, Speech by Reverend Dr. Ian R.K. Paisley MP Delivered in the Northern Ireland House of Commons on Tuesday, 8th February 1972* (no publication information).

⁶¹⁸ Oliver Gibson, *We Are Not Divided* (Omagh: Omagh Democratic Unionist Association, 1972); Kauffman, 83-87; and Walker, 212-221.

violence Paisley consistently denounced. The UDA asserted a mutual reluctance and would not allow clergymen to join its ranks.⁶¹⁹

On July 21, 1972 the IRA exploded twenty bombs in Belfast within sixty-five minutes, forcing the British Army to invade the catholic “no-go” areas to restore police control. British security measures appeared to be a failure. With the mounting violence and Northern Ireland under direct rule, it was vital for the British government to find a political solution in Ulster. But protestant and catholic positions appeared irreconcilable. The Unionist parties wanted an internal solution with majority rule and without Dublin’s participation, while nationalists looked to a settlement that included the Republic of Ireland. At the first intra-party talks, held in England at Darlington in September 1972, only the Northern Ireland Labour Party, the Ulster Unionist Party and Alliance took part. The DUP was not invited, and the newly formed Social Democratic and Labour Party (SDLP), a catholic party that advocated unification through the political process and pushed socialist policies, refused to attend while internment continued.⁶²⁰

From this point forward, British government policy focused on five objectives: to defeat the Irish Republican Army; to form a Northern Ireland Assembly; to involve all political parties that denounced violence; to assure protestants that the Union would continue as long as a majority in the province wanted it; and to involve the Republic of Ireland in the political process. The first solution proposed was three-part devolution: Northern Ireland would have an assembly elected by proportional representation, an executive containing protestants and catholics, and a Council of Ireland representing the British, Northern Irish and Republic of Ireland governments. The

⁶¹⁹ Flackes and Elliott, 138-141.

⁶²⁰ Thomas Hennessey, *The Northern Ireland Peace Process: Ending the Troubles?* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 6-18.

Council would involve itself in cross-border matters, such as tourism.⁶²¹ Over the next three decades, the British government consistently pushed variations on this scheme, while the Democratic Unionist Party constantly rejected all such proposals, especially involvement of the Republic all-party talks and a rapprochement with Sinn Fein.⁶²² The Ulster Unionist Party took a pragmatic stance, however, and was more willing to negotiate. Brian Faulkner, the new leader of the UUP accepted power sharing, and argued that preserving the Union required compromising with moderate nationalists, such as the Social Democratic and Labour Party.⁶²³

The British government passed the *Northern Ireland Constitution Act (1973)*, which transferred the veto over unification from the Northern Ireland parliament to the province's electorate; voters were given the same veto over unification that Stormont owned since 1921.⁶²⁴ In the first Assembly elections, held June 28, 1973, a coalition of the DUP, dissident Unionists, William Craig's newly-formed Vanguard Unionist Progressive Party (VUPP), and protestant paramilitaries won twenty-six of 78 seats. The Ulster Unionist Party won only twenty-four seats and the Social Democratic and Labour Party nineteen. The Democratic Unionist Party took part in the election, although the DUP asserted it would not form an assembly. The DUP further argued that the election was a concession to the Irish Republican Army, and should only have

⁶²¹ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Total Integration," 22 April 1972 and "Outline of Some Proposals of the Ulster Democratic Unionist Party for the Consideration of Her Majesty's Government," 4 November 1972; and Hennessey, 6-10.

⁶²² *Ulster Democratic Unionist Party Election Manifesto* (Belfast: Ulster Democratic Unionist Party, 1973).

⁶²³ *Protestant Telegraph*, "D.U.P. Will Fight Irish Dimension and Power-Sharing in Prior's Plan," April 1982; Bew, Gibbon and Patterson, 145-191; and Hennessey, 10-18.

⁶²⁴ *Northern Ireland Constitution Act (1973)* (London: HMSO, 1973); and Hennessey, 10-18.

taken place after the IRA was defeated. An executive was nevertheless formed without the DUP, with Brian Faulkner as chief executive and Gerry Fitt of the SDLP as his deputy.⁶²⁵

To implement British government proposals, a conference was held in December 1973 and again the Democratic Unionist Party was not invited. Out of the conference came the Sunningdale Agreement, which called for a Council of Ireland and a new power-sharing executive under Faulkner. The executive sought to bring the Ulster Unionist, Social Democratic and Labour, and Alliance Parties into a coalition government. The British government demanded a power-sharing government be formed - that included constitutional Catholics (the SDLP) – as a condition for restoring a devolved parliament in Northern Ireland.⁶²⁶

In response, Loyalist paramilitaries formed a United Ulster Army Council and joined with dissident Ulster Unionists and with the Democratic Unionist Parties to reject the Agreement. When the first Council of Ireland met at Stormont, Paisley and DUP deputies protested inside the building, only to be physically removed. The Agreement suffered a major blow when Taoiseach Liam Cosgrave, under local pressure, denied that Sunningdale required the Republic to give up its claim to Northern Ireland. The Ulster Unionist Party officially turned against Sunningdale. In the February 1974 British General Election, the DUP, the UUP and Vanguard united into the

⁶²⁵ *Protestant Telegraph*, “Vote for the Loyalist Coalition,” 6 July 1973 and “Why I Chose to Serve,” 18 August 1973; Flackes and Elliott, 167; and Hennessey, 10-18. The VUPP, also known as the Vanguard Movement, began as an outlet for Unionists and Loyalists who wanted more violent efforts than the UUP and DUP would publicly condone. But many right-wing Unionists, such as the Reverend Martyn Smith and James Molyneaux, would not join Vanguard because of Craig’s pro-independence stance and his association with paramilitary groups. While the VUPP did not gain wide electoral popularity, it did cause some UUP branches around Belfast to temporarily close. At times, however, the UUP and the DUP would work with Craig and Vanguard when a unified Unionist political front was deemed necessary to thwart British policy - for instance during the 1974 British General Election and the Ulster Worker’s Strike.

⁶²⁶ *Protestant Telegraph*, “Pitt-Faulkner Regime Forced on Ulster at the End of a Bayonet,” 8 February 1974.

United Ulster Unionist Council to oppose Sunningdale, winning eleven of the twelve Westminster seats.⁶²⁷

Frozen out of the Sunningdale Agreement, Paisley and the Democratic Unionists united with conservative Ulster Unionists and the right-wing Vanguard movement to support the Ulster Workers' Council Strike, which had begun in mid-June 1974. The strike aimed to shut down all public services, as well as private business, and force the British government to abandon Sunningdale. Paisley and Vanguard initially opposed the strike, and as the strike started Paisley quickly departed for Canada on a speaking tour. When it became obvious that the strike would be successful, both the DUP and Vanguard reversed course and publicly backed the Loyalists. For fifteen days, protestant paramilitaries manned roadblocks and intimidated workers and businessmen into participating in the strike, severely restricting the delivery of electricity, gasoline, fresh food and piped water. Although the British Army refused to intervene, Prime Minister Harold Wilson went on British television and called the strikers undemocratic rebels and "spongers" on the British treasury. Wilson's comments infuriated a wide section of the protestant community and ensured the strike's success.⁶²⁸

The strike and the British government's weak response not only wrecked Sunningdale, it also effectively ended protestant paramilitary political power and helped to drive these groups into a stronger military campaign and into criminal gangsterism: if the paramilitaries could not be politicians, they would be gunmen. While many working-class protestants looked to the UDA and the Ulster Volunteer Force as a defense against Irish Republican Army violence, they were wary of voting for and giving power to men of violence. In the long run, the political impotency

⁶²⁷ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Loyalist Results," 9 March 1974 and "United Ulster Unionist Council," 11 May 1974; and Walker, 212-221.

⁶²⁸ Moloney, 2008, 255-266.

of Loyalist paramilitaries helped the DUP. Loyalists who disagreed with Paisley's theological crusade nevertheless now saw the Democratic Unionist Party as the only legitimate alternative to the UUP. After the Ulster Workers' Council Strike, the DUP began to receive more votes from the secular working and middle classes and from evangelicals outside the Free Presbyterian Church.⁶²⁹

The Vanguard Party began to fall apart in May 1975, when Craig proposed the idea of an emergency coalition with the Social Democratic and Labour Party. Vanguard argued that the British government planned to withdraw from Northern Ireland and only a compromise with moderate nationalism would thwart the Irish Republican Army. Vanguard's fall from grace left the DUP as the only radical unionist party outside of the small paramilitary parties.⁶³⁰ The argument proved unpopular; moreover, many Unionists were wary of Vanguard due to its pro-independence stance and its association with paramilitarism. The demise of the Vanguard coalition took place four years later when Peter Robinson, the deputy leader of the DUP, won William Craig's east Belfast seat. Over the next decade, Unionist political support divided between the Ulster Unionist Party, the DUP, the Alliance Party, and a small electorate who still voted for protestant paramilitary groups. The need for Unionist political solidarity and its position as the second largest protestant party restricted the political fortunes of the Democratic Unionist Party: the DUP cooperated with the UUP and agreed not to contest elections where a split protestant vote would ensure a Sinn Fein or SDLP victory.⁶³¹

Support for the DUP rose and fell, depending on the security situation, and on Paisley's ability to offer viable alternatives to British policy and paramilitary violence. For instance, when

⁶²⁹ Moloney, 2008, 266-281.

⁶³⁰ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Craig and the SDLP: the Facts About the Voluntary Coalition," 15 November 1975.

⁶³¹ Hennessey, 10-18 and Walker 212-221.

Paisley organized a second Loyalist strike in 1977 to demand more security measures, the action failed because paramilitaries would not support it and because the British government acted quickly to defeat the strike.⁶³² At least 1200 new British soldiers were deployed to Ulster. Although the strike failed, the DUP doubled its number of councillors and won control of Ballymena – its first council – during local elections one week later. During the short campaign, the DUP effectively attacked the UUP for not supporting the second worker strike. But in the 1979 British General Election, the DUP won only 10 percent of the vote, although it is fair to note that the DUP did not contest all seats. Several months later, however, Paisley was elected to the European Parliament.⁶³³

In 1981, Paisley launched the short-lived “Third Force,” a group of armed Paisleyites formed to aid the Royal Ulster Constabulary, the British Army, and paramilitary groups against the IRA.⁶³⁴ For a short period, Third Force rallies drew substantial crowds, especially in November 1981 after the murder of Unionist MP Reverend Robert Bradford. In Ballymena, Paisley displayed 500 armed men to journalists, but support dwindled in the following year. Third Force activities also had limited political value. Graham Walker argues that the ‘Third Force’ and its paramilitary persona temporarily restricted the growth of the DUP at the provincial

⁶³² *Protestant Telegraph*, “The Halting of the Strike,” 4 June 1977.

⁶³³ *Protestant Telegraph*, “Great Victories,” July 1979; Bew, Gibbon and Patterson, 1995, 192-226; and Walker 225-228. Paisley sat in the European Parliament until 2004, despite his belief that the European Economic Community (and subsequently the European Union) was one of the ten horns of the beast, as revealed in Revelation. To Paisley, the EEC was founded by the Treaty of Rome, a majority of the countries comprising the Community were catholic, and the organization backed the reunification of Ireland. Although Paisley and the Democratic Unionist Party opposed Britain’s entry into the Common Market, Paisley felt that Irish Protestantism needed a voice in Strasbourg.

⁶³⁴ *Protestant Telegraph*, “Third Force Recruiting Begins,” 6 September 1974. The “Third Force” had also been proposed in the mid-1970s.

and national levels. But in the 1982 Northern Ireland Assembly elections and the 1983 British General Election, DUP vote once again increased.⁶³⁵

During this period, Sinn Fein also enjoyed new electoral support, a result of the blanket protests that republican prisoners began in 1976 and the series of hunger strikes that brought republicans substantial catholic sympathy. The most important protester, Bobby Sands, died during the strike. The fortunate timing of a by-election enabled Sands to be elected to the British House of Commons. Because of this political success, the IRA and Sinn Fein began their “ballot box and Armalites” strategy: the republican movement would participate in the political process, while continuing with its terrorist campaign. When Gerry Adams took Gerry Fitt’s West Belfast seat during the June 1983 British General Election and Sinn Fein won 43 percent of the catholic vote, the policy appeared successful. The success of Sinn Fein forced the SDLP to radicalize its platform. For instance, after the 1982 election for the Northern Ireland Assembly, the SDLP refused to take its seats.⁶³⁶

The increased vote for Sinn Fein also forced a closer relationship between the British government and Dublin. After summit in Dublin, on December 1980, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher began a new attempt to implement power-sharing in Northern Ireland and to find a role for the Republic of Ireland. The rapprochement culminated in the Anglo-Irish Agreement, signed November 15, 1985 in Hillsborough Castle. The new agreement did not differ from the Council of Ireland in structure, but substantially, the Republic of Ireland was given a consultative

⁶³⁵ *Protestant Telegraph*, “Ulster’s Day of Action,” 21 November 1981; Kauffman, 99-105; and Walker, 228-233.

⁶³⁶ Liam Clarke, *Broadening the Battlefield: the H-Blocks and the Rise of Sinn Fein* (Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1987), 221-227; and Hennessey, 19-27.

role in Northern Ireland affairs and the Republic acknowledged the constitutional position of Northern Ireland as a part of Great Britain.⁶³⁷

The secrecy behind the Anglo-Irish Agreement dialogue and Margaret Thatcher's sudden acknowledgment that the Republic must be included in a Northern Irish settlement shocked all Unionist parties. The Democratic and Ulster Unionist parties once again united to denounce the Anglo-Irish Agreement. On November 23, 1985 Paisley and the UUP leader, James Molyneaux, appeared on the same platform in Belfast in front of 100,000 protestants, and together held a meeting with Thatcher at Number 10 Downing Street. All Unionists resigned their Westminster seats in protest, and the Democratic Ulster Party and the UUP supported a protestant civil disobedience campaign that shunned contact with British government officials, withheld rates, and disrupted the business of Unionist-controlled councils.⁶³⁸

The refusal of the two main Unionist parties to take part in cross-community political agreements and the reluctance of the British government to call a referendum on the Anglo-Irish Agreement furthered the political impasse. Simultaneously, Loyalist violence rose after 1986. Many Protestants believed that the Agreement was only offered to the catholic community because of the Irish Republican Army campaign and argued that protestants must apply the same pressure on the British government. Once again Paisley employed the specter of paramilitarism. In 1986, Paisley and the DUP leadership supported Ulster Resistance, an organization with similar objectives to the Third Force. At the same time, members of both parties joined the Ulster Clubs set up by the United Ulster Loyalist Front, a paramilitary front group that threatened to take up arms against the British government. On November 10, 1986, Paisley and two DUP

⁶³⁷ *Protestant Telegraph*, "D.U.P. Will Fight Irish Dimension and Power-Sharing in Prior's Plan," April 1982.

⁶³⁸ Bew, Gibbon and Patterson, 192-232; Bruce, 2007, 210-219; Hennessey, 19-27; and Kauffman, 118-123.

leaders, Peter Robinson and Belfast mayor Sammy Wilson appeared on the same platform with Alan Wright, the chairman of the Ulster Clubs, to attack the Anglo-Irish Agreement. But the increased paramilitary violence and Paisleyite political rhetoric did not help the DUP; between 1986 and the April 1992 Northern Ireland elections, the DUP vote fell.⁶³⁹

The new threat of protestant paramilitary violence created an atmosphere where the British government abandoned the Anglo-Irish Agreement. But the Unionists were not running the show: British government policy became more flexible towards the SDLP, the republican movement, and the Republic of Ireland. In November 1990, a back-channel dialogue between the British government and the IRA began, while open discussions with Unionists, Nationalists and the Dublin government continued. On March 26, 1991, the Brooke Initiative - named after Peter Brooke, the Northern Ireland Secretary - argued for a multi-strand approach to all-party discussions. In the first strand, Northern Ireland's protestant and catholic parties would conduct direct talks, followed by those between Stormont and Dublin, and finally between Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland. In the final strand, Unionists would be considered part of the British team. The Brooke Initiative was important: it set a precedent for future talks, sparked the first direct discussions between Unionists and Nationalists since 1973, and marked the first time the British government made public overtures to the republican movement.⁶⁴⁰

In the early 1990s, electoral support for the DUP stagnated and frustration within the DUP towards the party's inflexible policies became more evident. The DUP's opposition to the UUP and British policies appeared ineffective. The loss of votes in April 1992, and the

⁶³⁹ Fergal Cochrane, *Unionist Politics and the Politics of Unionism Since the Anglo-Irish Agreement* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1997), 133-139; and Hennessey, 38-48.

⁶⁴⁰ Bloomfield, *Political Dialogue*, 2-8, 40-55 and 66-200; and Hennessey, 54-88. Thomas Hennessey, however, argues that the Anglo-Irish Agreement forced Unionists to begin a dialogue with the SDLP.

ineffectiveness of the Democratic Unionist boycott of Westminster and the Northern Ireland Office created dissatisfaction with Paisley's leadership: since all party decisions had Paisley's backing, he was personally rewarded or blamed for the successes and failures of the party. To regain lost electoral support, in April 1992 the DUP joined with the UUP in the talks Peter Mayhew, the new Northern Ireland Secretary, organized between the SDLP, the Unionists, the British government, and ministers from the Republic of Ireland. The discussions led to another proposed assembly, to be elected by proportional representation based on the number of seats each party won, and for an executive appointed by the Northern Ireland Secretary of State. Unionist ranks split, as the DUP once again took a harder stance towards Dublin. The DUP did not want any involvement by the Republic of Ireland, while the UUP was willing to accept Dublin's involvement in committees that the Assembly established. The DUP temporarily boycotted the talks set for Dublin Castle in September 1992, and then followed an obstructive policy when the party returned to the negotiating table.⁶⁴¹

Within the DUP, a fundamentalist – secular split developed over the direction of party policies: both the DUP's political and moral agendas. The Free Presbyterians within the DUP were opposed to participation in the Mayhew talks, while the secularists saw the pragmatism in negotiations. Deputy Party Leader Peter Robinson temporarily resigned, upset over the party's anti-talk position and frustrated over Paisley's insistence on combining religion and politics. But the fundamentalist influence was only temporary and illusionary. Fergal Cochrane asserts that during the 1980s, the DUP increasingly secularized as it attracted more urban and professional voters, and as Robinson led the turn away from Free Presbyterian politics. For example,

⁶⁴¹ *Protestant Telegraph*, "Paisley Warns: Shutters Come Down if Conference Restarts," November 1992; Bloomfield, *Political Dialogue*, 55-112; Cochrane, 273-282; and Hennessey, 54-66. During the opening of the Mayhew talks, Paisley went to Greenville, South Carolina for the annual Bob Jones Bible Conference.

Robinson convinced Paisley to rename the *Protestant Telegraph* the *Voice of Ulster*, to make the newspaper appear more secular. In addition, DUP-run councils accepted Sunday openings and pushed local option on alcohol consumption and sales, while more moderate DUP activists would attend political functions where alcohol was consumed and where catholics and apostate protestants attended. These were accommodations the secular wing of the DUP made to political necessity that Free Presbyterians did not like. Previously, the party could only raise revenues at fundraisers which did not serve alcohol, use games of chance, or allow secular music or musicians from liberal and charismatic churches. Paisley, as Party Leader, supported the aspirations of both wings of the DUP and sought to hold the party together.⁶⁴²

The Brooke and Mayhew talks led to the Downing Street Declaration. Announced on December 15, 1993, the Declaration continued the basic policy that the British government pursued since 1973. But for the first time the Republic of Ireland confirmed the right of the people of Northern Ireland alone to determine Northern Ireland's future, and Sinn Fein and protestant paramilitaries were brought into the political process. Following the Downing Street Declaration, the IRA and most protestant paramilitaries declared ceasefires; both protestant and catholic paramilitary groups decided to join the peace process.⁶⁴³

⁶⁴² Bruce, 2007, 47-266; Kauffman, *The Orange Order*, 118-123; and Neil Southern, "The Democratic Unionist Party and the Politics of Religious Fundamentalism" (Ph.D. diss., Queen's University, Belfast, September 2000), 189-225.

⁶⁴³ Bew, Gibbon and Patterson, 228, David Bloomfield, *Developing Dialogue in Northern Ireland: The Mayhew Talks, 1992* (Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave, 2001), 113-139; and Hennessey, 88-99. The Downing Street Declaration stated: "The situation in Northern Ireland should never be changed by violence or the threat of violence; any political settlement must depend on consent freely given in the absence of force or intimidation; there can be no talks between the two governments and those who use, threaten, or support political violence; there can be no secret agreements or understandings between government and organisations supporting violence 'as a price for its cessation'; those claiming a serious interest in advancing peace in Ireland should renounce for good the use or support for violence; if and when a renunciation of violence has been made and sufficiently demonstrated, 'new doors could open' and both governments would

The DUP continued its defiance towards the British government. Paisley protested against the Declaration with a demonstration outside the Prime Minister's office. During a meeting at 10 Downing Street, Paisley upset British Prime Minister John Major to such a degree that he had Paisley removed. The DUP leader refused to believe that the British government had not made a secret deal with the Irish Republican Army. The DUP displayed its open defiance of British authority in a more threatening manner shortly afterwards. Both Paisley and Unionist MP David Trimble - the future leader of the Ulster Unionist Party and Nobel Peace Prize winner - shared a platform at Drumcree in July 1995 to denounce the restrictions on Orange marches. The Drumcree standoff began when catholic residents on the Garvaghy Road near Portadown petitioned to have the local Orange parade banned, and the RUC prevented the march from taking place. For the next decade, the parade became a major flashpoint between Loyalists and the British government. At one point Billy Wright, the leader of the Loyalist Volunteer Force (an offshoot of the UVF that did not participate in the cease-fire) threatened to destroy police barricades with construction equipment. The Drumcree standoff continued in 1996 and threatened to end the new all-party negotiations chaired by George Mitchell, the former governor and senator from Maine. Called to Drumcree to ease tensions, both Paisley and Trimble made speeches demanding that the Orange bands be allowed to march and both politicians joined hands when the parade was allowed to proceed. Paisley called the march "a great victory for Northern Ireland Protestantism."⁶⁴⁴

wish to respond 'imaginatively' to the new situation which would then arise."

⁶⁴⁴ Bardon, 1992, 692-818; Bruce, "Fundamentalism and Political Violence: The Case of Paisley and Ulster Evangelicals," *Religion* 31 (2001), 387-405; Dominic Bryan, "Drumcree: Marching Towards Peace in Northern Ireland," 94-110 in *Peace at Last: The Impact of the Good Friday Agreement on Northern Ireland?*, Jorg Neuheiser and Steffan Wolff, eds. (New York: Berghahn Books, 2002); Cochrane, 317-351; George J. Mitchell, *Making Peace* (New York:

Out of the Downing Street Resolution came a new round of all-party talks, which began in June 1996. From these talks developed the “Mitchell Principles,” a template for future paramilitary participation in Northern Irish political talks. The Principles included total and verified disarmament, the ending of punishment killings and beatings, and the acceptance of a peaceful political process. Parties that had not accepted the Mitchell Principles - the Progressive Unionist Party and the Ulster Democratic Party (two protestant paramilitary parties) and Sinn Fein - were not invited. In his book on the negotiations, *Making Peace*, George Mitchell argues that the DUP worked aggressively to disrupt the talks and even boycotted the discussions during which Mitchell was appointed chairman. The absence of the DUP made the Ulster Unionist Party the sole agent for Unionism. The Belfast Agreement, announced on Good Friday 1998, restated the basic principles of the Downing Street Declaration. In addition, the British government repealed the *Government of Ireland Act (1920)*; the Act of Union became once again the constitutional basis for the political existence of the Northern Ireland state. Direct rule from Westminster was to end as soon as a Northern Ireland Assembly was elected, three consultative councils that included Dublin, Scotland, and Wales established, and a referendum scheduled for both Northern Ireland and the Republic. For the Belfast Agreement to be implemented, a majority of Northern Irish voters had to vote for its implementation, and a majority in the Republic had to agree to change the Republic’s constitution.⁶⁴⁵

A majority of Northern Ireland’s protestants opposed the Belfast Agreement and the UUP were penalized with a declining vote. In the Assembly elections of May 1998, the Ulster

Alfred A. Knopf, 1999), 46-70; and Chris Ryder and Vincent Kearney, *Drumcree: The Orange Order’s Last Stand* (London: Methuen Publishing, Limited, 2001), 67 and 111-116.

⁶⁴⁵ Hennessey, 173-187; Mitchell, 46-70; Stefan Wolff, “Introduction: From Sunningdale to Belfast, 1973-98,” 1-24 and Peter Shirlow, “Sinn Fein: Beyond and Within Containment,” 60-75 in Neuheiser and Wolff. The electorate of the Republic of Ireland had to agree to drop the Republic’s constitutional claim to Northern Ireland.

Unionist Party won just over 21 percent of the vote, the party's worst showing in any election since the establishment of Northern Ireland; the UUP still managed to win 28 seats to the DUP's twenty. However, when David Trimble – the radical Unionist of Drumcree, but now the more moderate head of the Ulster Unionist Party – agreed to form a Northern Ireland Executive that included Sinn Fein before the IRA agreed to disarm, UUP domination of protestant votes was doomed. Paisley and the DUP adamantly insisted that they would never act as had Trimble and the UUP. Over the next five years, DUP votes steadily increased and during the November 2003 elections for the Northern Ireland Assembly the DUP became the largest Unionist party. The Democratic Unionist Party advanced with the electorate because its platform best articulated protestant fears. Protestants were worried that the Belfast Agreement meant unification, and many believed that the refusal of the Irish Republican Army to destroy its weaponry made talks with Sinn Fein treasonous. The Belfast Agreement, however, created a turning point in Northern Irish politics: in order for Unionists to continue to participate in Northern Ireland's political talks, all parties – including the DUP – would have to negotiate with Dublin.⁶⁴⁶

THE SECOND COMING: PAISLEY AND MILITANT FUNDAMENTALISM

Following his election to the Northern Ireland, European and British parliaments, the Reverend Paisley continued to use Christian themes in his political speeches and to employ militant disruptive tactics in religious and political settings. Christian rhetoric helped Free Presbyterians to support Paisley's political fundamentalism. Paisley was concerned that Great Britain's secularization and changing public morality had brought God's judgment in the form of the IRA campaign. Paisley compared himself to Amos, the prophet who warned Israel: "prepare

⁶⁴⁶ Hennessey, 188-220; Kauffman, 226-227; and Walker 257-262.

to meet thy God.”⁶⁴⁷ Paisley and the DUP consistently combined fundamentalist and political rhetoric. For instance, in 1981, the Free Presbyterian Church and the Democratic Unionists led an attack on the European Court of Human Rights; the Court had sanctioned Britain for not extending homosexual rights to Northern Ireland. The DUP published an advertisement in the November 18, 1985 issue of the *New Letter* attacking the Anglo-Irish Agreement:

‘FOR GOD AND ULSTER’
DR IAN PAISLEY M.P., AS AN ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE, CALLS
ON ALL BIBLE BELIEVING PROTESTANTS TO SET ASIDE NEXT
LORD’S DAY 24th NOVEMBER 1985, AS A SPECIAL DAY OF PRAYER
FOR OUR BELOVED PROVINCE. A BASE BETRAYAL HAS TAKEN PLACE.
THE RIGHT OF THE MAJORITY TO HAVE ANY SAY IN THE DUBLIN/
LONDON JOINT RULE OF OUR PROVINCE HAS BEEN DENIED AND THE
USE OF THE BALLOT BOX STOPPED. WE MUST TURN NOW TO THE GOD
OF OUR FATHERS. THE WORD OF GOD PROMISES THAT WHEN WE ARE AT
OUR WIT’S END AND CRY UNTO THE LORD IN OUR TROUBLE, HE WILL
BRING US OUT OF OUR DISTRESSES (SEE PSALM 107:27-28.) LET US, NEXT
LORD’S DAY AT OUR BEDSIDES, WITH OUR FAMILIES, IN OUR CHURCHES
AND IN OUR HALLS, FERVENTLY, SIMPLY AND SINCERELY, CALL ON
GOD. ‘FOR WITHOUT FAITH IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO PLEASE HIM: FOR HE
THAT COMETH TO GOD MUST BELIEVE THAT HE IS, AND THAT HE IS A
REWARDER OF THEM THAT DILIGENTLY SEEK HIM. (HEBREWS 11:6)⁶⁴⁸

In December 1986, Paisley interrupted Thatcher’s speech in the European Parliament, objecting to her rapprochement with catholic Ireland and Britain’s new diplomatic relations with the Vatican. He was ejected. In October 1988, Paisley vehemently protested the visit of the Pope to the Strasbourg assembly, during which he had his microphone turned off. Paisley, his church, and his party also attacked purely religious matters. Free Presbyterians picketed a gay

⁶⁴⁷ Ian R.K. Paisley, *God’s Ultimatum to the Nation*.

⁶⁴⁸ *News Letter*, advertisement, November 18, 1985; and Ian R. K. Paisley, *God’s Ultimatum to the Nation*.

festival in Londonderry in 1995 and the showing of “Jesus Christ Superstar” at Belfast Grand Opera House in 1999.⁶⁴⁹

Paisley maintained his strong relationship with American militant fundamentalists, and continued to make trips to the United States. But because of his political workload and the deteriorating relationships between Carl McIntire, Billy James Hargis and the militant fundamentalist community, Paisley limited his visits to the annual Bible conference at Bob Jones University and the meetings of the newly-formed World Congress of Fundamentalists.⁶⁵⁰

Paisley’s visits were interrupted in 1971 and 1972, however, when the U.S. State Department denied him a visa, citing his inflammatory speeches and sermons. The ban, which added to Paisley’s reputation amongst supporters as a Christian martyr, forced him to confine his visits to Canada and to push his message through intermediaries such as his wife.⁶⁵¹

Paisley and Bob Jones, Jr. disassociated themselves from Carl McIntire and the International Council of Christian Churches and in 1976 organized their own alternative, the World Congress of Fundamentalists. The new organization carried on the militant fundamentalist campaign against modernism, ecumenism, new evangelicals, and communism. In Edinburgh, Paisley found little objection from the attendees when he addressed the first

⁶⁴⁹ Bruce, 2007, 163-166.

⁶⁵⁰ Bible Conference Speakers, Archives Research Center, Bob Jones University.

⁶⁵¹ *New York Times*, “U.S. is Said to be Reviewing Issuance of a Visa to Paisley,” 15 December 1981; *Philadelphia Inquirer*, “Paisley, Banned From U.S., Travels to Canada,” 16 January 1982; Bardon, 1992, 763-8; and Ronald Cooke, *Ian Paisley” Protestant Protagonist Par Excellence* (Hollidaysburg, PA: Manahath Press, 1984). The U.S. State Department revoked Paisley’s visa for a second time on December 21, 1981, citing Paisley’s role in the formation of the “Third Force.” In the mid-1980s, Paisley used the political connections he had established in the 1960s and travelled to Washington, DC to meet with Senators Strom Thurmond and Jesse Helms. Accompanied by Dr. Rod Bell of Virginia Beach, Paisley met with the Senators to discuss the political situation in Northern Ireland (Rod Bell, Sr. *The Mantle of the Mountain Man* Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1999, pp. 177-191, in Paisley, 1999; and email statement provided 8 January 2008).

Congress about the need for fundamentalists to involve themselves in political matters. Paisley argued that it was God who chose which men would lead the Lord's battle, implying he was picked by God.⁶⁵² In this manner, militants could thwart the secularization of society and the modernization of Christian theology. Paisley easily won approval from his North American and British associates for his new politico-religious crusade. As fundamentalist involvement in American politics escalated, Bob Jones University had no trouble supporting Paisley's increasing participation in Northern Irish politics.⁶⁵³

In contrast to Paisley's ability to mix politics and militant fundamentalism, from 1966 on the careers of Carl McIntire and Billy James Hargis declined because of their political activity, internal dissension within their ministries, and conflict with fellow militant fundamentalists. A

⁶⁵² Ian R.K. Paisley, "The Faith, Fire and Fight of a Fundamentalist," in *Word of Their Testimony: Sermons Delivered at the World Congress of Fundamentalists, Edinburgh, Scotland June 15-22, 1976* (Greenville, SC: BJU Press, 1976), 1-16.

⁶⁵³ Ian R. K. Paisley, *The Fundamentalist and His State* (Greenville SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1976); and Oran Smith, *The Rise of Baptist Republicanism* (New York: New York University Press, 1997), 113-124. Beginning with the 1964 Goldwater presidential campaign, the faculty, staff, and alumni of Bob Jones University made their own excursions into Republican politics. In 1976, a caucus of South Carolina Republicans associated with Bob Jones University took control of the Greenville Republican Party in order to back the presidential aspirations of Ronald Reagan. After a successful effort, Bob Jones University became an important part of Republican state politics. From the late 1970s, conservative Republicans in South Carolina have pandered to the Bob Jones vote. It must be noted, however, that political involvement was not official university policy, only a tacit approval.

Bob Jones University also took an interest in Northern Ireland politics. In a letter to Representative Joseph J. DioGuardi (R-NY), dated 18 August 1988, Bob Jones III denounced the Congressman's "One Ireland Resolution." The Resolution aimed to raise money in order to press the British government into ending the partition of Ireland. Jones wrote: "Your blatant pro-Catholic bigotry makes me sick. Your pious protestations that your interest in a United Ireland is simply a matter of concern for the poor and the oppressed is a blatant mockery. You are a puppet on the Pope's string. The majority in Northern Ireland live in their little country because they want to be free of that Catholic Church tyranny which enslaves the south of Ireland. Why do you seek to deny that right? If the Catholics of Northern Ireland don't like what is there, they can move to the South. If not, they can remain where they are as a minority. The majority in Northern Ireland want nothing to do with the Pope. What business is it of yours, as an elected official in the U.S. Congress, to meddle in their affairs and raise money to overthrow the government?" (Robert Muldrow Cooper Library, Special Collections, Clemson University).

major difficulty was the U.S. government's restrictions on their radio ministries and financial capabilities, and the waning interest in the threat that communism and the civil rights movement posed to Christians in America. Fighting the American government did not provide the long-term political benefits for McIntire and Hargis that opposing the British government earned for the Reverend Paisley.

After Kennedy's election in November 1960, McIntire came out aggressively against the election of a catholic president, whose willingness to negotiate with the Soviet Union made his administration's anti-communist credentials suspect. Militant fundamentalists opposed Kennedy's cautious support for civil rights and social welfare, disliked his appointment of moderate and liberal cabinet members, and despised his handling of the Bay of Pigs and the Cuban Missile crises. But immediately after Kennedy's election, McIntire wrote to Norman Porter expressing a fear that the Kennedy administration would start a campaign to shut down McIntire's radio programs.⁶⁵⁴ The political activism of militant fundamentalism inspired a federal counterattack. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) also investigated the tax exempt status of militant fundamentalist organizations and the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) placed restrictions on radio broadcasts, the militant fundamentalist's primary mouthpiece and source of revenue. In January 1962, the Bible Presbyterian Church lost its tax-exempt status for its political activities; donations, which were no longer tax deductible, began to decline.⁶⁵⁵

Billy James Hargis and the Christian Crusade went through their own battle with the IRS after Hargis' attacks on the American government intensified in the mid-1960s. On the air,

⁶⁵⁴ Carl McIntire to Norman Porter, 14 November 1960, McIntire Collection.

⁶⁵⁵ *Christian Beacon*, "Kennedy Administration Cracks Down on Fundamental Churches: Income Tax Used to Harass Churches That Leave NC," 19 September 1962 and "ACCC Launches Campaign to Abolish Federal Income Tax: Authorities Provide Evidence of Abuse and Discrimination Against Independent Bible-believing Churches," November 8, 1962.

Hargis charged that communists had infiltrated American domestic and foreign policy, and denounced liberal policies such as the progressive income tax and the Great Society. On September 22, 1966 the Internal Revenue Service revoked the tax-exempt status of Christian Echoes Ministry, Inc.⁶⁵⁶

In 1964, the Johnson Administration began to enforce the Federal Communication Commission's 'Fairness Doctrine,' the policy which required broadcasters to offer free rebuttal time to those they attacked on the air. If a station failed to do so, it would lose its license. The FCC investigated the Christian Crusade and McIntire's radio ministries. After a two-year court battle ended in October 1966, the Christian Crusade lost its tax-exempt status. In 1967, the FCC held hearings on the renewal of the radio license of McIntire's Pennsylvania station WXUR, after numerous groups, including the Anti-Defamation League, the American Baptist Convention and the Pennsylvania Labor Federation, opposed the militant fundamentalist programming. When the U.S. Supreme Court in 1973 finally heard the cases of both WXUR and the Christian Crusade, the Court upheld both the Federal Communications Commission and the Internal Revenue Service. WXUR was forced off the air. The loss of FCC licenses and denial of tax-exempt status meant not only the loss of important outlets to espouse the militant fundamentalist viewpoints, but the loss of vital financial income.⁶⁵⁷

⁶⁵⁶ Billy James Hargis to Bob Jones, Jr., 25 October 1966, Fundamentalism Files; and *New York Times* "Right-Wing Group Loses Tax Status," 17 November 1964, "Tax Status is Lost by Hargis Crusade," October 22, 1966, and "Free Rebuttals on Radio Upheld," 14 June 1967. The Internal Revenue Service specifically cited the Christian Crusade's support for the Becker Amendment, an initiative to amend the Constitution to allow prayer and Bible reading in public schools.

⁶⁵⁷ *New York Times*, "Station Accused of Rightist Stand," 15 October 1967, "Fairness Rules for Reply to Radio or TV Attack Upheld by Supreme Court," 10 June 1969; *The (Philadelphia) Evening Bulletin*, "Liberty Bell Rings, WXUR Leaves Air," 6 July 1973; Clabaugh, 91-93; Gasper, 21-39; and Morris, 259-314.

McIntire's political and financial problems were aggravated by problems with other militant fundamentalists. On October 31, 1969 the ACCC passed a resolution condemning McIntire's leadership and his attacks on several Council leaders – McIntire argued they were “soft on liberalism.” Dissidents in the American Council assailed McIntire's political views, and his racial and civil rights biases. McIntire's opponents also did not like his excessive administrative expenses and questioned the transfer of an ACCC relief fund to the International Council of Christian Churches. The American Council dropped McIntire from the organization's executive committee, and in November 1970, the Bible Presbyterian Church and several allies were expelled from the ACCC.⁶⁵⁸

McIntire retreated into his role as the leader of the International Council, and for a while maintained a good relationship with both Bob Jones University and Paisley; during the 1970 Bible Conference in Greenville, South Carolina, the University awarded McIntire one of the first two Bob Jones University Memorial Awards.⁶⁵⁹ Strains in the relationship between McIntire and Paisley began to appear, however: for instance, the *Christian Beacon* did not mention Paisley's electoral victory in April 1970.⁶⁶⁰ The relationship became problematic by the mid-1970s when

⁶⁵⁸ *Christian Beacon*, “Church Council Drops McIntire,” 6 November 1969; *New York Times*, “McIntire Splits With Church Group He Founded, Charges ‘Softness.’” 1 November 1969; *The (Philadelphia) Evening Bulletin*, “Dr. McIntire Denies Misusing Council Funds,” 15 April 1971; American Council of Christian Churches news release, November 1970; and Morris, 212-213. The other groups voted out of the American Council were: the United Christian Church, the Methodist Protestant Church, the South Carolina Baptist Fellowship, and the Independent Baptist Bible Mission.

⁶⁵⁹ The award - “For the Defense of the Scripture” - posthumously honored Bob Jones, Senior. On October 3, 1971, Paisley became the fifth recipient of the honorarium in a ceremony at Martyrs Memorial Free Presbyterian Church. Bob Jones, Jr. cited Paisley's book, *Christian Foundations*, as the basis for the award (*Protestant Telegraph*, “Dr. Paisley Honoured by Bob Jones University,” 16 October 1971).

⁶⁶⁰ McIntire did not approve of clergymen becoming politicians. Another source of contention between Paisley and McIntire was McIntire's adherence to premillennialism and

Bob Jones, Jr. and Paisley resigned from the International Council of Churches and founded the World Congress of Fundamentalists. Although McIntire was invited into the new council, he declined the offer because he knew that he would have no real leadership role. Instead, McIntire began to attack the new Congress and its form of militant fundamentalism. A seemingly broken man, McIntire denounced the new militant fundamentalist group and its founders, proclaiming: “You do not have any right to call yours a world congress – I am the man who has world congresses.”⁶⁶¹

The relationship between Billy James Hargis and his militant fundamentalist allies also ran into problems. As early as 1964, militant fundamentalists felt uncomfortable with Hargis’ new theological positions and associates. Hargis approved of “new Evangelicals,” such as Pat Boone – new Evangelists were suspect for their Arminianism and charismatic services - and hired the Jesuit anti-communist crusader Father Daniel Lyons as editor-in-chief of the *Christian Crusade Weekly*. One decade later, Hargis faced charges of hetero- and homo- sexual improprieties with five students and was forced to resign as president of both the American Christian College and the Christian Crusade. His ministry effectively ended. Hargis refused to accept his fall from militant fundamentalist grace, and in October 1975 he announced his intention to revive the

disdain for post- and a- millennialism (*Minutes of the Thirtieth General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church*, “The Millennial Road”).

⁶⁶¹ *California Accent* (newsletter of the American Council of Christian Churches in California), “Letter from David A. Noebel, President American Christian College, to Dr. W.O.H. Garman, 22 April 1975”, November/December 1975, Fundamentalism Files; *Christian Beacon*, “Church Council Unit Drops McIntire,” 6 November 1969, and “Tax Exemption and the Churches Statement by Dr. Carl McIntire, 26 April 1973; *New York Times*, “Church Council Scores Founder: American Group Condemns McIntire on Relief Unit,” 31 October 1969; *The Baptist Bulletin*, “And This I Separation?” March 1976; *The Fellowship News*, BJU Convocation,” 20 June 1970; *The Revivalist*, “The World Congress of Fundamentalists”, August 1976; Ian Paisley to Carl McIntire, 20 August 1977, McIntire Collection; Bob Jones, Jr. to Ian Paisley, 11 August 1978, Fundamentalism Files; Bob Jones, Jr., 1981, 179-194; Morris, 189-231; and Ian R. K. Paisley, “The Faith, the Fire and Fight of a Fundamentalist.”

Christian Crusade to its previous glory. Despite a vigorous effort that continued until his death in 1997, Hargis could never restore his ministry to more than a fraction of what it had once been.⁶⁶²

THE SECOND COMING: PAISLEY THE AMILLENNIAL POLITICIAN

After 1998, the Democratic Unionist Party increased its vote at the expense of the UUP by denouncing the Belfast Agreement and declaring that, if elected to power, it would renegotiate the Agreement. In addition, three UUP politicians, including Jeffrey Donaldson, became Democratic Unionists.⁶⁶³ From 2001 through 2007 the DUP vote increased at every election due to the popularity of its platform. On the one hand, the Democratic Unionist Party continued to support economic populism and the protestant-identity of the local police forces (which working-class Loyalists liked).⁶⁶⁴ On the other, the DUP pursued a political policy that restricted the Republic of Ireland to a consultative position in Northern Ireland's affairs and which, more importantly, would admit Sinn Fein to political talks only after the IRA disarmed and denounced terrorism.⁶⁶⁵

⁶⁶² *Baptists Today*, "Right Wing Legacy of Hargis and McIntire Remembered by Prominent Pastor in Texas, by Don Wilkey," 20 November 1967; *Christian Crusade Weekly*, "Statement from Bill James Hargis," 12 October 1975, and "Concerning American Christian College and the Summit by Billy James Hargis," 21 March 1976; *New York Times*, "Billy James Hargis, 79, Pastor and Anticommunist Crusader, Dies," 29 November 2004; *Oakland Tribune*, "Evangelist Accused," 10 January 1976; and *Time*, "The Sins of Billy James Hargis," 16 February 1976.

⁶⁶³ Donaldson was the Westminster MP for Lagan Valley and a member of the UUP negotiating team for the Belfast Agreement.

⁶⁶⁴ For instance, the DUP opposed increased charges for water usage in Northern Ireland. In September 1999, the Ulster Unionist Party backed the renaming of the Royal Ulster Constabulary to the Police Services of Northern Ireland and a recruitment drive to enlist more catholic officers (a move to placate catholics and the British government), while the Democratic Unionist Party was hostile to the changes (Moloney, 2008, 356-359).

⁶⁶⁵ *DUP Manifesto 2005* (Belfast: Democratic Unionist Party, 2005); and *Getting It Right* (Belfast: Democratic Unionist Party, 2007).

However, the Democratic Unionist Party began a subtle shift in its position toward Sinn Fein. During the November 2003 Northern Ireland Assembly elections, the DUP argued that they were the only Unionist party that could renegotiate the Belfast Agreement and contain the ambition of Sinn Fein. Although the Democratic Unionist Party argued that they would not talk with Sinn Fein, in February 2004 DUP members attended a meeting at Stormont to review the progress of the Belfast Agreement, despite the attendance of Sinn Fein. Moreover, the 2004 DUP manifesto, 'Devolution Now' hinted at the possibility of sharing power with Sinn Fein.⁶⁶⁶

While attending the December 2004 Leeds Conference to renegotiate the Belfast Agreement, the DUP made a significant shift in its platform. The DUP understood that Britain's price to reestablish a Northern Ireland parliament was a power-sharing agreement, and one that would include republicans if the Irish Republican Army decommissioned its arms. The DUP notified the British government that it would consider entering a devolved government that included Sinn Fein. But republican criminal activity delayed such a decision for the DUP: IRA men robbed the Northern Bank five days before Christmas, and murdered Robert McCartney, a catholic, in a Belfast bar-fight in early January 2005. This violence allowed the DUP to rescind its decision. During the 2005 British General Election, the DUP again insisted that it would never share power with Sinn Fein.⁶⁶⁷

At the St. Andrews talks in October 2006, however, Paisley and the DUP indicated they were ready to work with Sinn Fein. After the conference, Paisley stated: "Today we stand at a crossroads. We stand at a place where there is a road to democracy and there is a road to anarchy. I trust that we will see in the coming days the vast majority of people taking the road to

⁶⁶⁶ Moloney, 2008, 392-461.

⁶⁶⁷ Moloney, 2008, 412-441.

democracy.”⁶⁶⁸ This statement was reminiscent of Terence O’Neill’s Crossroads speech, which Paisley ridiculed nearly thirty-seven years before. In May 2007 the DUP agreed to form a government with Sinn Fein. But opposition within the party was strong: during party meetings DUP leadership was attacked and Paisley heckled, forcing the DUP to cancel its Annual Conference for the first time. Many DUP activists and supporters, however, did not believe that DUP policy would change, no matter what sort of speeches Paisley made; in the May 7, 2007 Northern Ireland Assembly Election, the DUP won 36 seats to the UUP’s 18.⁶⁶⁹

Throughout the history of the Democratic Unionist Party, the party has had to balance its core supporters of Free Presbyterians - who made up the bulk of the party in 1971 – and members and voters who either attended other protestant churches or who wanted a more secular party. The internal relationship between these two groups not only defined the personality and the politics of the party, but its relationship to the protestant electorate in Northern Ireland. The interconnection illustrates what the soul of the party had been for three decades: a compromise between Paisley’s loyalist, amillennial politics and his premillennial Christianity. What made the balance possible was the personality and leadership of the Reverend Ian Paisley. In the beginning, the DUP platform and persona conformed to Free Presbyterianism.⁶⁷⁰ But as the party grew in voting strength and Paisley’s politics alienated Free Presbyterians, the long-time supporters of Paisley’s anti-ecumenical and anti-modernist campaigns generally muted their opposition in reverence to their party leader and church moderator. But dissidents appeared. The most notable was the Reverend Ivan Foster, who in the mid-1990s began, within his magazine *The Burning Bush*, to express concerns over DUP politics. Foster’s attacks intensified

⁶⁶⁸ Moloney, 2008, 461-465.

⁶⁶⁹ Moloney, 2008, 499-511.

⁶⁷⁰ *Protestant Telegraph*, “A Short History of the D.U.P.,” by David Calvert, 9 September 1981; and Smyth, 1986, 33-43.

after the Leeds Conference in December 2004. After January 2005, the Free Presbyterian Church itself attacked the DUP reversal, saying it was contrary to scripture.⁶⁷¹

The matter came to a head in September 2007 when Paisley was forced to step down as the Free Presbyterian Moderator the following January. To the Free Presbyterian Church, there was a limit to the cooperation between premillennial Christianity and amillennial politics. For Paisley, the action appeared painful. In a May 2007 *Revivalist* editorial, Paisley denounced his critics and called himself “God’s Anointed.” Eileen Paisley referred to her husband as a modern-day Moses and attacked Ivan Foster and other dissidents.⁶⁷²

The reasons for the rise of Ian Paisley as a prominent politician in Northern Ireland and the fall of McIntire and Hargis were similar; all three men had strong personalities that could attract or alienate opponents and supporters alike. In addition, all three had antagonistic relationships with their respective national governments and with their fellow fundamentalists. But as a member of the Northern Irish and British governments, only Paisley had the political acumen and stature to influence national affairs and to withstand government pressure; as a prominent militant fundamentalist “prophet,” only Paisley maintained the support of his denomination.

Paisley’s transformation to an amillennial politician was complete when he was appointed as the First Minister of the Northern Ireland government in May 2007. The Paisleys were also accepted into the British establishment: Ian Paisley was invited into the British Privy Council while his wife Eileen was nominated to the House of Lords. What is even more indicative of Paisley’s willingness to build up his political career at the expense of his ministry is the status of the Free Presbyterian Church in the twenty-first century. While the Reverend Ian Paisley’s

⁶⁷¹ *The Burning Bush*, “Whither Free Presbyterian?” July 2007. Ivan Foster left the DUP in 1989.

⁶⁷² *The Burning Bush*, “Presbytery Statement of Rededication Following the Election of a New Moderator,” February 2008; and Moloney, 2008, 499-511.

political fortunes skyrocketed, Free Presbyterianism stagnated. From 1971 through 1991, Free Presbyterian Church membership grew from approximately 7300 to a little over 12,300; in 2001 membership dropped slightly to 12,000.⁶⁷³

That many Free Presbyterians were frustrated with Paisley's politics is illustrated in the decline in attendance at Martyrs Memorial Free Presbyterian Church. In October 1969, Paisley attracted 1800 worshippers every week; barely one hundred attend the church in 2008. The premillennial crusader of the late 1960s would never have allowed politics to interfere with his primary religious mission; the return of Jesus Christ was expected any day and saving souls preempted earthly politics. In contrast, the amillennial politician of the twenty-first century could not allow evangelical work to interfere with the political process. It is ironic that the militant fundamentalist and evangelical Reverend Ian Paisley of 1947, along with the anti-apostasy and anti-civil rights crusader of 1967 and the populist Democratic Unionist politician of 1987, would all have violently opposed the First Minister Paisley of 2007.⁶⁷⁴ While the transformation of Paisley has simultaneously fascinated and bewildered observers of Northern Ireland, it has dismayed his past supporters. Ivan Foster, a long-time participant in Paisleyite demonstrations, the Democratic Unionist Party, and the Free Presbyterian Church, best articulated the intense feelings of betrayal and disappointment that long-term supporters felt after the DUP announced its agreement with Sinn Fein in May 2007:

None who loved Ian Paisley would have wished him to end his political life with the godfathers of IRA murder and terror firmly entrenched in the joint leadership of Northern Ireland... That is not what Ian Paisley entered politics to achieve and it is not what his early supporters expected. He leaves in power the very forces he rallied the Protestant people of Ulster to oppose, even unto the death. The memories of the man that I would wish to retain and cherish are those of his days as a mighty

⁶⁷³ Bruce, 2007, 273.

⁶⁷⁴ email statement from Ivan Foster, 19 March 2008; and Moloney, 2008, 225-227 and 435-441.

preacher when it was my privilege to sit under his ministry in gospel missions in tents and halls from one end of Northern Ireland to the other. Those were the days of conversions, of God's people separating from the apostasy of the ecumenical churches and an exposing of the Romeward trend.⁶⁷⁵

There has been much speculation why the Reverend Ian Paisley, after years of political and theological opposition to power sharing with republican and nationalist parties, chose to make a political about-face and enter into government with Sinn Fein. It is possible that some day Paisley will explain his decision. Until then, observers can only speculate. Ed Moloney presents a wide range of possibilities: Moloney attributes the reversal to either a long-term plan (derived in the 1950s); to egotism and power; to a desire to join the Unionist and British establishment; and to the influence of Eileen Paisley who has been in favor of such a move. These proposals make good copy but trivialize Paisley's long career as both a political and Christian crusader.⁶⁷⁶ In contrast, Patrick Mitchel comes closer to the truth when he hints that Paisley's political shift has theological underpinnings. Mitchel contends that as Paisley became more political, he relinquished his separatist, pessimistic premillennialism; Paisley changed his theology as he adapted his politics. Perhaps the key to the shift lies in Ian Paisley's personal sense of destiny: while his belief that he had been anointed as "God's man" for the salvation of Ulster stayed constant; his understanding of what "salvation" meant changed significantly.⁶⁷⁷

While the reasons behind Paisley's decision to accommodate Irish republicanism remain opaque, the consequences are more clear. Paisley gained politically from the move: he became First Minister, his wife entered the House of Lords, and many opponents applaud his willingness to compromise. Paisley also, however, lost his standing in the Free Presbyterian Church of

⁶⁷⁵ *The Burning Bush*, "A Statement From Rev Ivan Foster on the Stepping Down of Dr. Ian Paisley as First Minister and Leader of the DUP," 4 March 2008.

⁶⁷⁶ Moloney, 2008, 513-516.

⁶⁷⁷ Mitchel, 2005, 222-223.

Ulster and alienated many long-term supporters in Northern Ireland, as Ivan Foster testifies. Free Presbyterians in North America, who are now a separate presbytery, reacted more favorably to Paisley's decision. While the Free Presbyterian Church of North America had no official position on the power-sharing agreement, those who understood its significance took a more practical stance and backed Paisley.⁶⁷⁸ One such supporter argued:

I support his action. I believe he (probably to his own surprise) accomplished what no other power-sharing politician had done: he was able to have the IRA repudiate its armed campaign, Sinn Fein declare its support for the Ulster police service and court system and commit itself to the democratic process. Since Sinn Fein had gained substantial electoral support and had met the apparently unfulfillable standards set by the DUP, and since what the British government was about to do would have been disastrous for Ulster (abandon power-sharing), I believe that Dr. Paisley made a wise and right choice.⁶⁷⁹

Paisley's decision to share power culminates his dual career of earthly politician and godly theologian. Like numerous political dissidents in Irish history – including Irishmen such as Eamonn DeValera and Michael Collins – Paisley accepted power when offered it. And like them, he accommodated past principles for pragmatic politics. As a Christian minister, Paisley had to compromise his Protestant beliefs. While it is practical as an oppositional politician to be a premillennial preacher, the head of a government must focus on the fundamentally amillennial task of building a better society in the here and now.

⁶⁷⁸ *Canadian Revivalist*, "The Northern Ireland Situation," January/February 2007. In North America, Free Presbyterianism is a growing denomination with 14 American and ten Canadian congregations.

⁶⁷⁹ email from confidential source within the Free Presbyterian Church of North America, June 2008.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES

Collections

Archive Research Center. Bob Jones University

Fundamentalism Files. Bob Jones University.

Lester Maddox Collection. Russell Library for Political Research and Studies. The University of Georgia.

McIntire Collection. Special Collections. Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries.

Murdrow Cooper Library. Special Collections. Clemson University.

World Conference of Faith and Order Collection. Special Collections. University of Chicago.

Governmental Publications

Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Act (Northern Ireland), 1922. Belfast: HMSO, 1922.

Disturbances in Northern Ireland: Report of the Cameron Commission Appointed by the Governor of Northern Ireland (Cameron Report). Belfast: HMSO, 1969.

Flags and Emblems (Display) Bill (Northern Ireland), 1954. Belfast: HMSO. 1954

Intoxicating Liquor and Licencing Bill (Northern Ireland). Belfast: HMSO, 1958.

Northern Ireland Constitution Act (1973). London: HMSO, 1973.

Parliament of Northern Ireland, Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons. Belfast: HMS, 1965-1967.

Report of the Advisory Committee on Police in Northern Ireland (Hunt Report). Belfast: HMSO, 1969.

Institutional Publications

Annual Reports of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. 1950 - 1967.

Book of Order: The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A). Louisville, KY:
General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), 1936.

Campaign for Social Justice in Ulster. Pamphlets.

Digest of Acts and Deliverances of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Divine Word News Service. 1963.

DUP Manifesto 2005. Belfast: Democratic Unionist Party, 2005.

50 Years... Carl McIntire and the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood 1933-1983.
Collingswood, NJ: The Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood, NJ, 1983.

Getting It Right. Belfast: Democratic Unionist Party, 2007.

International Council of Christian Churches. *Constitution of the International Council of Christian Churches.* Amsterdam: International Council of Christian Churches, 1948.

_____. Sixth Plenary Congress, Geneva Switzerland, August 5-11, 1965.

_____. *Concerning Rev. Ian Paisley, Belfast, N.I.* Cape May, NJ: Bible Presbyterian Church, 1966.

_____. Seventh Plenary Congress, 1968.

Introducing the Evangelical Protestant Society. Belfast: Evangelical Protestant Society. No publication date.

Irish Presbyterians, the Downgrade Continues! Belfast: Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster, 1955.

Minutes of the General Assembly and Directory of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1968.
Belfast: Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1968.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. June 1927.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Belfast: Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1955.

Minutes of the Twenty-Ninth General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, Christian Admiral, Cape May, N.J., October 19-15, 1965.

Minutes of the Thirtieth General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, Christian Admiral, Cape May, N.J. October 19-25, 1966.

Minutes of the Thirty-First General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, Cape May, N.J., 1967.

Record of the Trial of the Reverend J.E. Davey by the Belfast Presbytery and of the Hearing of Appeals by the General Assembly, 1927. Belfast: Presbyterian General Assembly, 1927.

Segregation and God's Word. Decatur, GA: The Voice of Liberty, No publication date.

Seventh Plenary Congress, Cape May, N.J. 1968. Collingswood, NJ: International Council of Christian Churches, 1968.

The Code: The Book of the Constitution and Government of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Belfast: Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1945.

The Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster: Crossgar Congregation. Belfast: Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster. No publication date.

Ulster Constitution Defence Committee and Ulster Protestant Volunteers Constitution and Rules.

Ulster Democratic Unionist Party Election Manifesto. Belfast: Ulster Democratic Unionist Party, 1973.

Who Is Carl McIntire? Testimony to Christ and a Witness for Freedom. Collingswood, NJ: Twentieth Century Reformation Hour, No publication date.

Miscellaneous

Anderson, Reverend J.T. *Talks on the Bible to Sunday School Teachers.* No publication information.

Barkley, John M. *The Antichrist: A Historical Survey: A Lecture Delivered at the Public Closing of the Presbyterian College, Belfast on 26th May, 1967.* Belfast: Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1967.

Bell Sr., Rod. *The Mantle of the Mountain Man.* Greenville, SC.: Bob Jones University Press, 1999.

“Bible Conference Speakers,” Archive Research Center. Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University.

- Briggs, Charles, A. *Biblical Study: Its Principles, Methods and History*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883.
- _____. *American Presbyterianism: Its Origin and Early History*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885.
- _____. *Whither? A Theological Question for the Times*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1889.
- Bryan, William Jennings. *In His Image*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1922.
- Bundy, Edgar C. *Collectivism in the Churches*. New York: Devin-Adair Company, 1954.
- Crossman, Richard. *The Diaries of a Cabinet Minister. Vol. III: Secretary of State for Social Services*. London: Hamish Hamilton and Jonathan Cape, 1972.
- Devlin, Bernadette. *The Price of My Soul*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969.
- Devlin, Paddy. *Straight Left: An Autobiography*. Belfast: The Blackstaff Press, 1993.
- Faulkner, Brian. *Memoirs of a Statesman*, John Houston, ed. London: Weidenfeld, 1978.
- Flynn, John T. *The Road Ahead, America's Creeping Revolution*. New York: Devin-Adair Company, 1949.
- _____. *The Roosevelt Myth*. New York: Devin-Adair Company, 1948.
- Foster, Arnold and Benjamin R. Epstein, *Danger on the Right*. New York: Random House, 1964.
- Gibson, Oliver. *We Are Not Divided*. Omagh: Omagh Democratic Unionist Association, 1972.
- Grier, W.J. *The Origin and Witness of the Irish Evangelical Church*. Belfast: Evangelical Book Shop, 1945.
- Hargis, Billy James. "Communist America Must it Be? Tulsa: Christian Crusade, 1962.
- _____. *The Muzzling of General Walker*. Tulsa: Christian Crusade Publications, 1962.
- _____. *My Great Mistake*. Green Forest, AR: New Leaf Press, 1985.
- _____. *Facts About...Christian Crusade*. Tulsa: Christian Crusade. No publication date.
- Jones, Bob Jr. *Cornbread and Caviar*. Greenville, S.C.: Bob Jones University Press, 1981.

- _____. *Fundamentals of Faith: A Series of Chapel Messages on the Bob Jones University Creed*. Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1964.
- Maddox, Lester Garfield. *Speaking Out: The Autobiography of Lester Garfield Maddox*. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1975.
- McIntire, Carl. *Author of Liberty*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1946.
- _____. *Dr. Robert Speer, the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and Modernism*. Collingswood, NJ: No publication information, 1935.
- _____. *Russia's Most Effective Fifth Column in America, A Series of Radio Messages by Carl McIntire*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1948.
- _____. *Servants of Apostasy*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1955.
- _____. *The Battle of Bangkok: Second Missionary Journey*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1950.
- _____. *The New Bible: Revised Standard Version, Why Christians Should Not Accept It*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1952.
- _____. *The Russian Baptists: Twenty Years of Soviet Propaganda: The Hammer and Sickle on The Platform of the Baptist World Alliance*. Collingswood, NJ: Twentieth Century Reformation Hour, no publication date.
- _____. *The Struggle for South America: First Missionary Journey*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1949.
- _____. *The Testimony of Separation*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1952.
- _____. *The Twentieth Century Reformation*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1945.
- Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association. "Constitution and Rules." 1967.
- O'Neill, Terence. *Ulster at the Crossroads*. London: Faber and Faber, 1969.
- _____. *The Autobiography of Terence O'Neill*. London: Granada Publishing, Limited, 1972.
- Paisley, Ian R.K. *An Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans: Prepared in the Prison Cell*. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1966.
- _____. *Christian Foundations*. Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1971.

- _____. *For Such a Time as This: Recollections, Reflections, Recognitions*. Belfast: Ambassador Publications, 1999.
- _____. *God's Ultimatum to the Nation*. No publication information.
- _____. "John Knox, a sermon preached 10th and 17th November 1963 to the Ravenhill Free Presbyterian Church. No publishing information.
- _____. *Life's Four Windows: A Sketch of My Life Story, Two Sermons Preached in the Martyr's Memorial Free Presbyterian Church on the Thirty-Seventh Anniversary of His Ministry*. No publication information.
- _____. *My Father and Mother: A Loving Tribute by their Younger Son*. Belfast: Martyrs Memorial Publications, 1976.
- _____. *Nicholson Centenary 1876-1976. From Civil War to Revival Victory*. Belfast: Martyr's Memorial Publishing, 1976.
- _____. *No to a United Ireland, Speech by Reverend Dr. Ian R.K. Paisley MP Delivered in the Northern Ireland House of Commons on Tuesday, 8th February 1972*. No publication information.
- _____. *Northern Ireland: Message Delivered at Bob Jones University, September 12, 1969*.
- _____. *Protestants Remember!.* No publication information, 1966.
- _____. *Souvenir Booklet: The 50th Anniversary of the Larne Gun-Running. Thanksgiving Service on Sunday, 26th April, 1964 in the Historic Ulster Hall*. Belfast: Puritan Printing Company, 1964.
- _____. *The Archbishop in the Arms of the Pope of Rome! Ministers in the Hands of the Police of Rome!* Belfast: Puritan Printing Company, 1966.
- _____. *The Battle of the Reformation: Why It Must Be Fought Today*. Belfast: Puritan Publishing Company, 1967.
- _____. *The Depths of the Baptist Downgrade: An Exposure of the Infidelity and Unitarianism of the President of the Baptist Union of GT. Britain and Ireland Dr. Howard Williams*. Belfast: Puritan Publications Company, Limited, 1976.
- _____. "The Faith, the Fire and Fight of a Fundamentalist," in *Word of Their Testimony: Sermons Delivered at the World Congress of Fundamentalists, Edinburgh Scotland June 15-22, 1976*.
- _____. *The '59 Revival: An Authentic History of the Great Ulster Awakening of 1859*. Belfast: Martyr's Memorial Free Presbyterian Church, 1958.

_____. *The Fundamentalist and His State*. Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1976.

_____. *The New English Bible: Version or Perversion*. Belfast: Free Presbyterian Church, 1961.

_____. *Union With Great Britain, Speech by Reverend Ian R.K. Paisley MP (Leader of the Opposition) Delivered in the Northern Ireland House of Commons on Wednesday 22 March 1972*. No publication information.

Peoples' Democracy. *Why PD?* No publication information.

Porter, Norman. *He Shall Reign For Ever And Ever: A Brief History of the Orangefield Baptist Church*. Belfast: Orangefield Baptist Church. No publication date.

Springer, Harvey H. *Catholicism in America: Our Hope the Bright and Morning Star*. No publication information.

The Fundamentals: A Testimony to Truth. Los Angeles: The Bible Institute of Los Angeles, 1917.

Waddell, Reverend John. *The Life Here and the Life After*. Belfast: Fisherwick Presbyterian Church. No publication date.

Statements Provided by Email

Bell, Sr., Rod.

Foster, Reverend Ivan.

Grier, John.

Inter-City Baptist Church. Allen Park, Michigan.

Free Presbyterian Church of North America.

Christian Periodicals

Baptists Today. 1967.

Canadian Revivalist. 2007.

Christian Beacon. 1936-1969.

Christian Crusade/ Christian Crusade Weekly. 1963-1998.

Church of Ireland Gazette. 1959-1969.

Evangelical Presbyterian. 1966.

Fisherwick Messenger. 1962-1964.

The Fellowship News. 1968-1970.

Independent Bulletin Board. 1935.

Irish Christian Advocate. 1961.

News and Views. 1966-1969.

Presbyterian Herald. 1954-1968.

Protestant Telegraph. 1966-1986.

The Baptist Bulletin. 1976.

The Burning Bush. 2007-2008.

The Gospel Witness. 1965-1968.

The Irish Evangelical. 1957-1965.

The Revivalist. 1963-1976.

The Reformation Review. 1961-1970.

The Sword of the Lord. 1966-1969.

Ulster Protestant. 1957-1967.

Weekly Crusader. 1967.

Western Voice. 1965-1969.

Whither Methodism? 1965.

Secular Newspapers

Atlanta Journal. 1967.

Ballymena Observer. 1951.

Belfast Telegraph. 1950-1989.
Camden-Courier Post. 1954.
Focus. 1965.
Glasgow Herald. 1967-1968.
(Harrisburg) Patriot. 1967.
New York Times. 1935-1981.
Oakland Tribune. 1976.
Philadelphia Inquirer. 1982.
The Greenville News. 1968.
The (Jackson) Clarion Ledger. 1962.
The (Philadelphia) Evening Bulletin. 1946-1971.
The Scotsman. 1962-1976.
Time. 1976.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Books and Dissertations

Abrams, Carl Douglas. *Selling the Old-Time Religion: American Fundamentalists and Mass Culture, 1920 – 1940.* Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2001.

Adams, Gerry. *Free Ireland: Towards A Lasting Peace.* Niwot, CO.: Roberts Rinehart, 1986.

_____. *Before the Dawn: An Autobiography.* New York: William Morrow, 1996.

Ahlstrom, Sydney E. *A Religious History of the American People.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.

Anderson, W.K. *James Connolly and the Irish Left.* Dublin: Irish Academic Press, Limited, 1994.

Arthur, Paul. *The People's Democracy 1968-1973.* Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 1974.

- Bardon, Jonathan. *A History of Ulster*. Belfast: The Blackstaff Press, Limited, 1992.
- _____. *Beyond the Studio: A History of BBC Northern Ireland*. Belfast: Blackstaff Press, Limited, 2000.
- Barnes, Stanley. *All For Jesus: The Life of W.P. Nicholson*. Belfast: Ambassador Publications, Limited, 1996.
- Beckett, J.C. *Protestant Dissent in Ireland 1687-1780*. London: Faber and Faber, 1948.
- Beggs, Reverend R.J. *Great is Thy Faithfulness: An Account of the Ministry of Pastor James Kyle Paisley and a History of the Separatist Testimony in Ballymena*. Ballymena: Ballymena Free Presbyterian Church. No publication date.
- Bell, Geoffrey. *The Protestants of Ulster*. London: Pluto Press, 1976.
- Bell, J. Bowyer. *The IRA 1968-2000: Analysis of a Secret Army*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970.
- _____. *The Irish Troubles: A Generation of Violence 1967-1992*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Bell, P.M.H. *Disestablishment in Ireland and Wales*. London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1969.
- Benn, Tony. *Office Without Power: Diaries 1968-1972, Vol.2*. London: Hutchinson, 1987.
- Bew, Paul, Peter Gibbon, and Henry Patterson. *The State in Northern Ireland, 1921-72: Political Forces and Social Class*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1979.
- _____. *Northern Ireland 1921-1994: Political Forces and Special Classes*. London: Serf, 1995.
- Biggs-Davison, John and George Chowdharay-Best. *The Cross of St. Patrick: The Catholic Unionist Tradition in Ireland*. Abbotsbrook, UK: The Kensal Press, 1984.
- Bloomfield, David. *Political Dialogue in Northern Ireland: the Brooke Initiative 1989-92*. London: MacMillan Press, 1998.
- _____. *Developing Dialogue in Northern Ireland: The Mayhew Talks, 1992*. Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave, 2001.
- Boulton, David. *The UVF 1966-73: An Anatomy of Loyalist Rebellion*. Dublin: Torc Books, 1973.
- Bowes, Egan and Vincent McCormick. *Burntollet*. London: LSR Publishers, 1969.

- Boyd, Andrew. *Holy War in Belfast*. Tralee: Anvil Books, 1969.
- _____. *Montgomery and the Black Man: Religion and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Ulster*. Dublin: The Columba Press, 2006.
- Boyer, Paul. *When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy Belief in Modern American Culture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Bremer, Francis J. *The Puritan Experiment: New England Society from Bradford to Edwards*. Hanover: University of New England Press, 1995.
- Brewer, John and Gareth Higgins, *Anti-Catholicism in Northern Ireland 1600-1998*. London: MacMillan Press, Limited, 1998.
- Brooke, Peter. *Ulster Presbyterianism: The Historical Perspective 1619-1970*. New York: St. Martins Press, 1987.
- Bruce, Steve. *No Pope of Rome!: Anti-Catholicism in Modern Scotland*. Edinburgh: Mainstream Publications, 1985.
- _____. *God Save Ulster!: The Religion and Politics of Paisleyism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- _____. *The Red Hand: Protestant Paramilitaries in Northern Ireland*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Edge of the Union: The Loyalist Political Vision*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- _____. *Paisley and Politics in Northern Ireland*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Bryan, Dominic. *Orange Parades: The Politics of Ritual, Tradition and Control*. London: Pluto Press, 2000.
- Joel A. Carpenter. *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- _____. "The Fundamental Leaven and the Rise of an Evangelical Front," in *The Evangelical Tradition in America*, Leonard I. Sweet, ed. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1980, 257-288.
- Carwardine, Richard. *Transatlantic Revivalism: Popular Evangelicalism in Britain and America, 1790-1865*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978.

- Chappell, David L. *A Stone of Hope: Prophetic Religion and the Death of Jim Crow*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Clabaugh, Gary K. *Thunder on the Right: The Protestant Fundamentalists*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Company. No publication date.
- Clarke, Liam. *Broadening the Battlefield: the H-Blocks and the Rise of Sinn Fein*. Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1987.
- Cochrane, Fergal. *Unionist Politics and the Politics of Unionism Since the Anglo-Irish Agreement*. Cork: Cork University Press, 1997.
- Cogswell, Thomas. *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War 1621-1624*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Cohodas, Nadine. *Strom Thurmond and the Politics of Southern Change*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993.
- Coogan, Tim Pat. *The Troubles: Ireland's Ordeal 1966-1995 and the Search For Peace*. London: Hutchinson, 1995.
- _____. *The I.R.A.* Niwot, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers, 1993.
- Cook, Fred J. *The Nightmare Decade: The Life and Times of Senator Joe McCarthy*. New York: Random House, 1971.
- Cooke, Dennis. *Persecuting Zeal: A Portrait of Ian Paisley*. Dingle: Brandon, 1996.
- _____. *Peacemaker: The Life and Work of Eric Gallagher*. Peterborough: Methodist Publishing House, 2005.
- Cooke, Ronald. *Ian Paisley: Protestant Protagonist Par Excellence*. Hollidaysburg, PA.: Manahath Press, 1984.
- Courtney, Kent and Phoebe. *The Case of General Edwin A. Walker*. New Orleans: Conservative Society of America, 1961.
- Cowan, Ian B. *The Scottish Reformation: Church and Society in Sixteenth-Century Scotland*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1982.
- Crosby, Jr., Donald F. *God, Church, and Flag: Senator Joseph R. McCarthy and the Catholic Church 1950-1957*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978.
- Dalhouse, Mark Taylor. "Bob Jones University and the Shaping of Twentieth-Century Separatism 1926-1990," Ph.D. diss., Miami University (Oxford, OH), 1991.

Davey, James Ernest. *Our Faith in God Through Jesus; Studies in the Origin and Development of Christian Forms of Belief, Institutions and Observance: Four Apocalyptic Addresses*. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1922.

_____. *The Changing Vesture of the Faith*. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1923.

Dickens, AG. *The English Reformation*. London: B.T. Batsford, 1965.

R.J. Dickson, *Ulster Emigration to Colonial America 1718-1775*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.

Dollar, George W. *A History of Fundamentalism in America*. Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University, 1973.

Dooley, Brian. *Black and Green: The Fight for Civil Rights in Northern Ireland and Black America*. London: Pluto Press, 1998.

Douglas, J.D. *Light in the North: The Story of the Scottish Covenanters*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.

Dudman, Richard. *Men of the Far Right*. New York: Pyramid Books, 1962.

Duke, Alistair and Gillian Lewis, eds. *Calvinism in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Edwards, Owen Dudley. *The Sins of Our: Roots of Conflict in Northern Ireland*. Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1970.

Farber, David. *The Age of Great Dreams: America in the 1960s*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1994.

Farrell, Michael. *Northern Ireland: The Orange State*. London: Pluto Press, 1976.

_____. *Civil Rights Twenty Years On: A Personal View*. Dingle: Brandon Book Publishers, Limited, 1988.

Farrell, Sean. *Rituals and Riots: Sectarian Violence and Political Culture in Ulster, 1784-1886*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2000.

Findlay, Jr., James F. *Dwight L. Moody: American Evangelist 1837-1899*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Flackes, W.D. and Sydney Elliott. *Northern Ireland: A Political Directory 1968-1988*. Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 1994.

Ford, Alan. *The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590-1641*. New York: Peter Lang, 1987.

- Forster, Arnold and Benjamin R. Epstein. *Danger on the Right*. New York: Random House, 1964.
- Fulton, Austin. *J. Ernest Davey*. Belfast: Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1970.
- Gallagher, Eric and Stanley Worrall, *Christians in Ulster, 1968-1980*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Gaines, David P. *The World Council of Churches: A Study of its Background and History*. Peterborough, NH: Richard R. Smith Company, Inc., 1966.
- Galphin, Bruce. *The Riddle of Lester Maddox*. Atlanta: Camelot Publishing, 1968.
- Garland, Roy. *Gusty Spence*. Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 2001.
- Gaspar, Louis. *The Fundamentalist Movement*. The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1963.
- Gibbons, Constantine. *Red Hand: The Ulster Colony*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972.
- Gillespie, Raymond. "The Religion of the Protestant Laity in Early Modern Ireland," in *Christianity in Ireland: Revisiting the Story*. Brendan Bradshaw and Daire Keogh, eds. Dublin: The Columba Press, 2002, 109-123.
- Gillies, Donald. *Unity in the Dark*. London: Banner of Trust, 1964.
- Goodman, Walter. *The Committee: The Extraordinary Career of the House Committee on Un-American Activities*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1964.
- Gray, Tony. *The Orange Order*. London: The Bodley Head Limited, 1972.
- Greaves, Richard L. *Theology and Revolution in the Scottish Reformation: Studies in the Thought of John Knox*. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian University Press, 1980.
- Griffith, Robert. *Politics of Fear: Joseph R. McCarthy and the Senate*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1987.
- Harbinson, John. *The Ulster Unionist Party 1882-1973: Its Development and Organization*. Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 1973.
- Harden, Margaret G. *A Brief History of the Bible Presbyterian Church and its Agencies*. No publication information.
- Hart, D.G. and John Muether. *Fighting the Good Fight: A Brief History of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church*. Philadelphia: Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1995.

- Hastings, Adrian. *A History of English Christianity 1920-1990* London: SCM Press, Limited, 1991.
- Hastings, Max. *Barricades in Belfast: The Fight for Civil Rights in Northern Ireland*. New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1970.
- Hatch, Nathan O. "Millennialism and Popular Religion in the Early Republic," in *The Evangelical Tradition in America*, Leonard I. Sweet, ed. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1980, 113-130.
- Heaney, Mavis. *To God Be the Glory: The Personal Memoirs of Reverend William P. Nicholson*. Belfast: Ambassador Publications, 2004.
- Heggarty, Karen. *From Vision to Victory: The History of the Ballymoney Free Presbyterian Church*. No publication information.
- Hennessey, Thomas. *The Northern Ireland Peace Process: Ending the Troubles?* New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Hill, Christopher. *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1964.
- _____. *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution*. London: Allen Lane, 1993.
- Hill, Samuel S. *Southern Churches in Crisis Revisited*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999.
- Holifield, E. Brooks. *Theology in America: Christian Thought from the Age of the Puritans to the Civil War*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Holmes, Finlay. *Henry Cooke*. Belfast Christian Journals, Limited, 1981.
- _____. "The Presbyterian Church in Ireland," in *Christianity in Ireland, Revisiting the Story*. Brendan Bradshaw and Daire Keogh, eds. Dublin: The Columba Press, 2002, 124-133.
- Holmes, R.F.G. *Our Irish Presbyterian Heritage*. Belfast: Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1985.
- Hutchinson, William R. *The Modernist Impulse In America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Jackson, Alvin. *Ireland: 1798-1998*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, Limited, 1999.
- Jamieson, John. *The History of the Royal Belfast Academical Institution, 1810-1960*. Belfast: William Mullan and Son (publishers), Limited, 1959.

- Janson, Donald and Bernard Eisman. *The Far Right*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.
- Johnson, R.K. *Builder of Bridges: The Biography of Dr. Bob Jones, Jr.* Murfreesboro, TN: Sword of the Lord, 1969
- Jorstad, Erling. *The Politics of Doomsday: Fundamentalists of the Far Right*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.
- Kauffman, Eric P. *The Orange Order: A Contemporary Northern Irish History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Larson, Edward J. *Summer of the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate Over Science and Religion*. New York: Basic Books, 1997.
- Ledwidge, Bernard. *DeGaulle*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982.
- Leyburn, James G. *The Scotch-Irish: A Social History*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989.
- Livingstone, David N. and Ronald A. Wells. *Ulster-American Religion: Episodes in the History of a Cultural Connection*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999.
- Longfield, Bradley J. *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Marrinan, Patrick. *Paisley: Man of Wrath*. Dublin: Anvil Books, 1973.
- MacCaffrey, Wallace. *The Shaping of the Elizabethan Regime 1558-1572*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- MacIver, Martha Abele. "Militant Protestant Political Ideology: Ian Paisley and the Reformation Tradition." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1984.
- Macquigg, J. Claude. *The Minnis Mills Tapestry: 1922-1968 Diaries, Warp and Weft of a Local Church*. Belfast: JC Macquigg, 2005.
- Marsden, George M. *The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience: A Case Study of Thought and Theology in Nineteenth-Century America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.
- _____. *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism: 1870-1925*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- _____. *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelism*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987.

- _____. *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1991.
- Matthews, Donald G. *Religion in the Old South*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Matthews, J.B. *Communism in our Churches*. Collingswood, NJ: Christian Beacon Press, 1958.
- McBride, Ian. *The Siege of Derry in Ulster Protestant Mythology*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997.
- McCann, Eamonn. *War and an Irish Town*. London: Pluto Press, Limited, 1980.
- McCluskey, Conn. *Up Off Their Knees: A Commentary on the Civil Rights Movement in Northern Ireland*. Galway: self-published, 1989.
- McDonald, Morris. *A Brief History of the Bible Presbyterian Church*. Charlotte, NC: Fundamental Presbyterian Publications, 2003.
- McMichael, Gary. *In Search of Common Ground in Northern Ireland*. Boulder, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers, 1999.
- Miller, David, "Did Ulster Presbyterians Have a Devotional Revolution?," in *Evangelicals and Catholics in Nineteenth-Century Ireland*. James H Murphy, ed. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005.
- Mitchel, Patrick. *Evangelicalism and National Identity in Ulster 1921-1998*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- _____. "Unionism and the Eschatological 'Fate of Ulster,'" in *Protestant Millennialism, Evangelicalism and Irish Society, 1790-2005*, Crawford Gribben and Andrew R. Holmes, eds. Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave, 2005.
- Mitchell, George J. *Making Peace*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999.
- Moloney, Ed. *Paisley: From Demagogue to Democrat?* Dublin: Poolbeg, 2008.
- Moloney, Ed and Andy Pollak. *Paisley*. Dublin: Poolbeg Press, 1986.
- Moore, James R. *The Post-Darwinian Controversies: A Story of the Protestant Struggle to Come to Terms With Darwin in Great Britain and America 1870-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, James. *The Preachers*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973.

- Mulholland, Marc. *Northern Ireland at the Crossroads: Ulster Unionism in the O'Neill Years 1960-9*. London: MacMillan Press, Limited, 2000.
- Murray, Ian H. *Spurgeon v. Hyper-Calvinism: The Battle for Gospel Preaching*. Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1951.
- Murray, Patrick. *Oracles of God: The Roman Catholic Church and Irish Politics, 1921-1937*. Dublin: University College Press, 2000.
- Neuheiser, Jorg and Steffan Wolff. (eds) *Peace at Last: The Impact of the Good Friday Agreement on Northern Ireland?* New York: Berghahn Books, 2002.
- Noll, Mark A. *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992.
- North, Gary. *Crossed Fingers: How the Liberals Captured the Presbyterian Church*. Tyler TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1996.
- O'Dochartaigh, Niall. *From Civil Rights to Armalites: Derry and the Birth of the Irish Troubles*. Cork: Cork University Press, 1977.
- Oliver, John A. *Working at Stormont*. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration, 1978.
- Penabaz, Dr. Fernando. "Crusading Preacher From the West;" *The Story of Billy James Hargis*. Tulsa: Christian Crusade, 1965.
- Pettegree, Andrew, Alistair Duke, and Gillian Lewis, eds. *Calvinism in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Philips, William Alison. *History of the Church of Ireland From the Earliest Times to the Present Day, Volume III, The Modern Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Porter, Josias Leslie. *The Life and Times of Henry Cooke, D.D., LL.D., President of Assembly's College, Belfast*. London: John Murray, 1871.
- Purdie, Bob. *Politics in the Streets: The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: The Blackstaff Press, 1990.
- Radosh, Ronald. *Prophets on the Right: Profiles of Conservative Critics of American Globalism*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975.
- Rawlyk, C.A. *Champions of the Truth: Fundamentalism, Modernism, and the Maritime Baptists*. Montreal: Centre for Canadian Studies, Mount Allison University, 1990.
- Redekop, John Harold. *The American Far Right: A Case Study of Billy James Hargis and Christian Crusade*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968.

- Richardson, Norman ed. *A Tapestry of Beliefs: Christian Traditions in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 1998.
- Robinson, James. *Pentecostal Origins: Early Pentecostalism in Ireland in the Context of the British Isles*. Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2005.
- Rosell, Garth M. in *The Evangelical Tradition in America*. Leonard Sweet, ed. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1980.
- Rovere, Richard H. *Senator Joe McCarthy*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1959.
- Roy, Ralph Lord. *Apostles of Discord: A Study of Organized Bigotry and Disruption on the Fringes of Protestantism*. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1953.
- Russell, C. Allyn. *Voices of American Fundamentalism: Seven Biographical Studies*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976.
- Russell, Conrad. *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637-1642*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Ryder, Chris and Vincent Kearney. *Drumcree: The Orange Order's Last Stand*. London: Methuen Publishing, Limited, 2001.
- Sandeen, Ernest R. *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Shannon, Catherine B. "From Housing Rights to Civil Rights 1963-8," in *The Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing Volume 5: Irish Women's Writing and Traditions*. New York: New York University Press, 2002.
- Shelley, Bruce L. *A History of Conservative Baptists*. Wheaton, IL: Conservative Baptist Press, 1971.
- Singer, C. Gregg. *The Unholy Alliance*. New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House Publishers, 1975.
- Skinner, Craig. *Spurgeon and Son: The Forgotten Story of Thomas Spurgeon and His Famous Father, Charles Haddon Spurgeon*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1999.
- Smith, MLR. *Fighting For Ireland?: The Military Strategy of the Irish Republican Movement*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Smith, Oran. *The Rise of Baptist Republicanism*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- Smyth, Clifford. *Ian Paisley: Voice of Protestant Ulster*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, Limited, 1987.

- Smylie, James H. *A Brief History of the Presbyterians*. Louisville: Geneva Press, 1996.
- Southern, Neil. "The Democratic Unionist Party and the Politics of Religious Fundamentalism." Ph.D. diss., Queen's University, Belfast, September 2000.
- Stackhouse, John Gordon Jr. "Proclaiming the Word of God: Canadian Evangelicalism Since World War I." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago Divinity School, 1987.
- Stewart, ATQ. *The Narrow Ground: Aspects of Ulster*. London: Faber and Faber, 1977.
- Stroman, John Albert. *The American Council of Christian Churches: A Study of Its Origin, Leaders, and Characteristic Positions*. Ph.D. diss., Boston University School of Theology, 1966.
- Tarr, Leslie K. *Shields of Canada: T.T. Shields (1873-1955)*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1967.
- Thompson, Joshua. *Century of Grace, The Baptist Union of Ireland: A Short History 1895-1995*. Belfast: Baptist Union of Ireland, 1995.
- Turner, Daniel L. *Standing Without Apology: The History of Bob Jones University*. Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1992.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of Arminianism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Walker, Graham. *A History of the Ulster Unionist Party: Protest, Pragmatism and Pessimism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.
- Webb, Clive, ed. *Massive Resistance: Southern Opposition to the Second Reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Weber, Timothy P. in *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*. Donald Dayton and Robert Johnston, eds. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1991, 5-21.
- "We Shall Overcome," *The History of the Struggle for Civil Rights in Northern Ireland, 1968-1978*. Belfast: Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association, 1978.
- Westerkamp, Marilyn J. *The Triumph of the Laity: Scots-Irish Piety and the Great Awakening, 1625-1760*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- White, Barry. *John Hume: Statesman of the Troubles*. Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 1984.
- J. H. Whyte, *Church and State in Modern Ireland 1923-1979*. Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1998.

ARTICLES

- Abbott, Don. "Ian Paisley: Evangelism and Confrontation in Northern Ireland," *Today's Speech* (Fall 1973): 49-55.
- Aunger, E.A. "Religion and Occupational Class in Northern Ireland," *Economic and Social Review* 7 (1975): 1-18.
- Birrell, Derek, "Relative Deprivation as a Factor in Conflict in Northern Ireland," *Sociological Review* 20 (1972): 321-325.
- Bruce, Steve. "Nicholson and Paisley," *Evangelical Voice* 8 (1990): 12-13.
- _____. "Fundamentalism and Political Violence: The Case of Paisley and Ulster Evangelicals," *Religion* 31 (2001): 387-405.
- Feeney, Vincent E. "Westminster and the Early Civil Rights Movement in Northern Ireland," *Eire-Ireland* 11 (1976): 3-13.
- MacIver, Martha Abele. "Ian Paisley and the Reformed Tradition," *Political Studies* 35 (September 1987): 359-379.
- Marsden, George. "Fundamentalism as an American Phenomenon: A Comparison with English Evangelicalism," *Church History* 56 (1977): 215-232
- Matthews, J.B. "Reds and Our Churches," *The American Mercury*. (July 1953): 3-13.
- "Mr. Protestant: Nelson Gonzalez Talks to the Reverend Ian Paisley MP MEP. *Third Way* (November 1996): 13-17.
- Peoples' Democracy. "A People's Democracy: A Discussion on Strategy," *New Left Review* 55 (1969): 31-45.
- Russell, C. Allyn. "Thomas Todhunter Shields, Canadian Fundamentalist," *Ontario History* 70 (December 1978): 263-280.
- Scott, F. Eugene. "The Political Preaching Tradition in Ulster: Prelude to Paisley," *Western Speech Communications* (Fall 1976): 249-259.
- Sidwell, Mark. "W.P. Nicholson and the Rise of Ulster Fundamentalism," *Biblical Viewpoint* 28 (April 1994): 93-104.
- Smyth, Clifford. "The DUP as a Politico-Religious Organisation," *Irish Political Studies* (1986): 33-43.

Vinz, Warren L. "Protestant Fundamentalism and McCarthy," *Continuum* 6 (August 1968): 314-325.

VITA

Richard Lawrence Jordan was born in Moorestown, New Jersey, on April 25, 1956, to Arthur David Jordan and the late Virginia Marieanne Stanson. Jordan came from a diverse cultural background: His father was born in Alabama, into a family whose descendants immigrated to the Massachusetts Bay and Jamestown, Virginia, colonies in the early 1700s. Virginia Stanson's parents were Romanian – her father deserting from the Austro-Hungarian Army in 1914 and fleeing to Akron, Ohio - and her mother emigrating from Bucharest after the War. Because of a contentious adolescence, Jordan received a GED from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1976. He chose to enter the business world instead of higher education and from 1976 through 1996, Jordan ran his own music company. Jordan imported and distributed various independent artists from Europe and the United States, until 1984 when he moved to Covington, Georgia.

From 1984 until 1996, the Fundamental Recording Company recorded “Americana” bands to market throughout the world. Such artists included the Butthole Surfers, Camper Van Beethoven, Henry Rollins, Eugene Chadbourne, Naked Prey, and Savage Republic. At various times, Fundamental was a partnership with English and Belgian music companies, and accordingly Jordan travelled often to the British Isles and continental Europe.

Tired of the dishonesty, egotism, and corruption inherent to the music industry, in 1996 Jordan enrolled at the University of Southern Mississippi and began an extensive study of the “Troubles” in Northern Ireland. During his academic career, Jordan has been a teaching assistant, a research assistant for NASA, has given papers to prestigious conferences (such as the American Conference for Irish Studies), and has on numerous occasions visited Belfast and other major cities in Ulster to research the province's history.