

ABSTRACT

HALBROOK, PATRICK NASON. *The Scopes Trial in American Memory*. (Under the direction of Dr. William Kimler).

The 1925 Scopes “Monkey” trial, in which high school teacher John T. Scopes was prosecuted in Dayton, Tennessee for violating the state’s Butler Act forbidding the teaching of human evolution, has been called “the Trial of the Century.” Fundamentalist politician William Jennings Bryan and celebrity defense attorney Clarence Darrow met at the Rhea County Courthouse in Dayton, Tennessee, for “a duel to the death.” The nation’s media descended on the small town and broadcast the sensational creation-evolution trial around the globe. The locals who arranged the trial had hoped the publicity would put their town on the map, but they never guessed that it would become one of the most prominent symbolic events in American memory. Nor could they have anticipated the way the story of the “World’s Most Famous Court Trial” would evolve into stage and screen adaptations, novels, and dozens of historical works.

This thesis explores the ways the Scopes story has been told and the meanings it has been said to embody. Through surveying the writings of historians, playwrights, authors of juvenile literature, residents of Dayton, antievolutionists, and political pundits, I show that the memory of the Scopes trial has both shaped and been shaped by subsequent cultural controversies over issues such as McCarthyism, creation science legislation, climate change science, and same-sex marriage. The memory of the Scopes trial is laden with symbolism and moral lessons. But the meaning and application of these qualities have depended largely upon the circumstances and interests of those who have appealed to it.

© Copyright 2012 by Patrick Nason Halbrook

All Rights Reserved

The Scopes Trial in American Memory

by
Patrick Nason Halbrook

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

History

Raleigh, North Carolina

2012

APPROVED BY:

Dr. William Kimler
Committee Chair

Dr. Jason Bivins

Dr. James Crisp

BIOGRAPHY

Patrick Nason Halbrook grew up in northern Virginia outside Washington, D.C., where the city's monuments, museums, and heritage sparked his interest in American history. His undergraduate work was in Biblical Studies and Liberal Studies (B.A., Florida College, 2005, summa cum laude), and he wrote his bachelor's thesis on "The Educational Philosophies of Alexander Campbell and John Dewey." He is a teacher at Cary Christian School, where he has taught high school and middle school classes on the Bible and the history of Christianity since 2006.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. James Crisp, Dr. Jason Bivins, and particularly Dr. William Kimler, for serving on my committee and providing invaluable feedback on this thesis. My idea for the project was inspired by Dr. Michael J. Allen's "History and Memory" course, which opened up for me new ways of thinking about history. Tom Davis of Bryan College deserves a hearty word of thanks for sharing his insights into Dayton's Scopes trial festival and for generously providing photographs that I was able to use in a presentation at the 2012 North Carolina Graduate Student Conference.

Dr. Monte Hampton helped me begin my research on the Scopes trial four years ago in an independent study. But his more significant contribution has been through our countless informal conversations on history, religion, politics, science, and many other topics over the years. I am blessed to count him as a friend. Similarly, I am grateful to my many undergraduate professors at Florida College who inspired me to love learning. I look back with particular fondness on my classes and conversations with Dr. Mark Bingham, Dr. Brian Crispell, Dr. Thaxter Dickey, Dr. David McClister, Dr. Doy Moyer, Martin Pickup, and Dr. Phil Roberts.

I am fortunate to have had the unique opportunity as a teenager to work part time during the summers performing historical research for my father, Dr. Stephen P. Halbrook. I did not realize at the time that while skimming through dusty books and whirring through microfilm, I was learning skills that I would one day put to use for my own research.

Finally, I am grateful to my wife, Kaylie, for her patience and love during the past six years. While I have been struggling to find time to complete my coursework and write a thesis, she has been engaged in the much more difficult task of being a mom to our three children (and being a great one, at that).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| CHAPTER 1: The Scopes Trial: The Construction of a Memory | 9 |
| CHAPTER 2: Juvenile Literature on the Scopes Trial | 52 |
| CHAPTER 3: “Inherit the Truth”: Revising History at Dayton’s Scopes Trial Festival | 77 |
| CHAPTER 4: Antievolutionists and the Memory of the Scopes Trial | 97 |
| CHAPTER 5: The Scopes Trial in America’s Culture Wars | 132 |
| REFERENCES | 185 |

INTRODUCTION

On March 21, 1925, Tennessee governor Austin Peay signed into law a bill deeming it unlawful for any public school teacher “to teach any theory that denies the story of the divine creation of man as taught in the Bible, and to teach instead that man has descended from a lower order of animals.” Peay declared that day that he did not think the law, which carried a maximum fine of \$500, would ever be put to use. Little did he suspect that four months later this law would bring about what would be called “The World’s Most Famous Court Trial,” the most influential science/religion event in American memory. That July, twenty-three-year-old high school science teacher John T. Scopes would be prosecuted for teaching evolution, and national celebrities, like three-time presidential candidate William Jennings Bryan, criminal defense lawyer Clarence Darrow, and smart-aleck journalist H.L. Mencken, would descend upon the town of Dayton, Tennessee, to battle before an international audience.

According to the popular version of the story, John Scopes was a courageous young teacher who wanted nothing more than to open his students’ minds to the scientific truths of the universe. In the name of freedom and scientific progress, he fearlessly defied an unjust and unreasonable law by teaching them Darwin’s theory of evolution. The people of Dayton were astounded and enraged. They arrested him and called on their hero, William Jennings Bryan, to prosecute him and defend the integrity of the Bible against the heresies of science. Unhappily for them, the dull, pompous Bryan turned out to be no match for Scopes’s

attorney, Clarence Darrow. Darrow made a fool of Bryan before the watching world, and even though he ultimately lost the case, he and his fellow evolutionists won in the arena of public opinion. Bryan died five days later (apparently out of humiliation), and the fundamentalists crawled away, ashamed that they and their hero had been proven to be so naïve, so intolerant, so archaic. The country moved on, and fundamentalism and antievolutionism became a thing of the past. Or at least, so the story goes.

The story of the Scopes trial was born in sensation and immediately grew into a legend. It is a story that has been performed on Broadway, taught in schoolrooms, narrated and re-narrated by historians, and aggrandized by journalists. Americans remember the trial as a turning point in the nation's history, an event from the past whose shadow is surprisingly long and whose lessons continue to be disturbingly relevant. It is most frequently applied as a symbol of the perennial American struggles between liberty and oppression, open-mindedness and bigotry, progress and tradition, and science and religion. And because these struggles remain with us, the Scopes trial continues to figure prominently in our collective memory, resurfacing from time with the hope that it might contextualize and enlighten our religious, scientific, and political discourse.

Popular conceptions of the trial, however, have hardly been applauded for their historical accuracy. As Ronald L. Numbers has written, "Despite a shelf of scholarly studies on Fundamentalism, antievolutionism, and Bryanism, the Scopes trial remains a grotesquely misunderstood event—largely the result, I think, of its ability to serve so many compelling

interests.”¹ Indeed, the trial may have been a turning point in American history—but from and to what did we turn? It may have an enduring significance and have left lessons to which we may appeal—but precisely what are those lessons? Even if it does symbolize a struggle between American values, what values are they and what does it suggest about them? To put it simply: what really happened at the Scopes trial, and how does it help us understand subsequent events? This thesis is a study of how historians, journalists, evolutionists, antievolutionists, and residents of Dayton have answered those two questions.

Historians of recent decades have written much about the study of collective memory. Maurice Halbwachs, the French sociologist from the early twentieth century whose writings provided the foundation for this perspective, described collective memory as “a current of continuous thought whose continuity is not at all artificial, for it retains from the past only what still lives or is capable of living in the consciousness of groups keeping the memory alive.”² Groups remember past events through the lens of the present. As Peter Novick put it, “present concerns determine what of the past we remember and how we remember it.”³ Americans’ memory of the Scopes trial conforms to this observation, for the trial can scarcely be invoked without drawing applications to contemporary manifestations of its popular themes. Its malleable significance and application exemplify the way “collective memory is continually reshaped by the social contexts into which it is received.”⁴

¹ Ronald L. Numbers, *Darwinism Comes to America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 76.

² Quoted in John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 11.

³ Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (Boston: Mariner, 1999), 3.

⁴ Patrick Hutton, “Recent Scholarship on Memory and History,” *The History Teacher* 33.4 (Aug. 2000), 537.

Collective memory is not only bound up in a group's present concerns. It is also, consequently, reductionistic: "Collective memory simplifies; sees events from a single, committed perspective; is impatient with ambiguities of any kind; reduces events to mythic archetypes."⁵ Groups shape their past into meaningful symbols, fit for application to new concerns. As Emily Rosenberg has written in her book on Pearl Harbor in American memory,

Memory is . . . an ever-changing process through which "realities" are remembered and forgotten, meanings are produced and contested, values are professed and debated, and political positions are expressed and challenged. Pearl Harbor "lives" less as a specific occurrence in the past than as a highly emotive and spectacularized icon in an ongoing present—always in interaction with the mediated representations that constitute memory/history.⁶

When terrorists attacked the United States in 2001, Rosenberg explained, Americans sought to understand and respond to the tragedy by comparing the events at Pearl Harbor to this new "day of infamy." Likewise, by the 1950s the Scopes trial had also become a "highly emotive and spectacularized icon," ready to be employed for its symbolic value in discussions of science and religion or liberty and oppression. According to Ronald Numbers, "What the trial has come to represent is far more important historically than what the trial accomplished."⁷

In discussing the relation between memory and history, some historians have drawn a strict demarcation between the two—roping off the work of professional historians from the memory of the public at large. Others have posited a great deal of overlap. It seems,

⁵ Novick, *Holocaust*, 4.

⁶ Emily S. Rosenberg, *A Date Which Will Live: Pearl Harbor in American Memory* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2003), 7.

⁷ Numbers, *Darwinism*, 91.

especially in a study of the Scopes trial, that the latter perspective is more sensible. The work of historians is, as Jay Winter has described, “an act of collective remembrance. . . . History is not simply memory with footnotes; and memory is not simply history without footnotes. In virtually all acts of remembrance, history and memory are braided together in the public domain, jointly informing our shifting and contested understandings of the past.”⁸ Memory and history not only overlap with each other, but also intersect with the modern media. As Rosenberg has observed,

In recent American culture, I would contend, historical memory . . . is inseparable from the modern media, in all their forms. Even so-called ‘lived memory,’ which revolves around individual ‘experience’ and ‘testimony,’ takes shape in interaction with diverse media effects and also must attract and be recorded in some kind of mediated form if it is to last and become part of known ‘history.’ Because media provide the matrix that collects and circulates diverse memories in America, shaping them in various ways and keeping some alive while burying others, memories are enhanced (and, perhaps, even implanted) through more rapid and widespread circulation in media. . . . In America, there is increasingly no effective memory or history outside of media, broadly defined . . . memory, history, and media all reproduce and re-present in *intertextual* relationships among diverse kinds of cultural material. . . . memory and history are blurred forms of representation whose structure and politics need to be analyzed not as oppositional but as interactive forms.”⁹

This insight is especially applicable to a study of the Scopes trial. Its most enduring memory, whose influence was felt among historians, was a Broadway play (later a motion picture), and applications of the trial’s enduring significance were most frequently encountered in the pages of newspapers, on television news programs, and through the internet.

This paper begins with a chapter on historiography and popular culture, surveying how a dominant memory of the Scopes trial was constructed and then contested. Although

⁸ Jay Winter, *Remembering War: The Great War between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 6.

⁹ Rosenberg, *A Date Which Will Live*, 3-5 (emphasis in the original).

first seen as a curious but innocuous event, then as a symbol of fundamentalism's demise, in the 1950s the Scopes trial came to be understood as a sinister plot to oppress freedom of thought: religion had declared war on science, tradition sought to stifle freethinking, and oppression threatened to crush liberty. Through the lens of McCarthyism, the Scopes trial's most enduring narrative, *Inherit the Wind* (1955), shaped the story into a simplistic battle between good and evil; at the same time, historians were taking on a similar perspective, which we will call the "orthodox" view. Between the 1960s and 1990s, however, historians took on a new view of the trial, exploring its complexities and seeking more nuanced understandings of fundamentalism, creationism, and the interaction between science and religion. These historians challenged the popular memory of the trial with limited success, thus opening a chasm between historiography and popular understanding.

Chapter two surveys juvenile literature about the Scopes trial. These books, written primarily in the 1970s-2000s for students in middle school and high school, followed the orthodox view of the trial, focusing on Bryan's ignorance and casting the trial in terms of academic freedom or science vs. religion. Since the late 1990s, however, some of these books have presented a much more nuanced approach, casting Bryan as a more realistic and complex character and introducing controversial themes like eugenics. We will examine the reasons for the shift in tone and historical accuracy, using these works as a gauge for the influence of professional historiography on more popularly-written works.

In chapter three, we will turn to a second group to challenge the dominant narrative of the Scopes trial: the residents of Dayton, Tennessee. In 1988, the town of Dayton began to

put on a Scopes trial play and festival at the Rhea county courthouse commemorating the trial. Since the festival began, three versions of the play were performed, all based on the court trial transcripts and intended to provide audience members with a historical response to *Inherit the Wind*.

Having surveyed ways the story has been told, we will then turn our attention to the trial's legacy: what kind of a shadow did it cast on subsequent controversies, and how did Americans appeal to its memory for rhetorical purposes? Chapter four delves into the creation-evolution debates, showing how antievolutionists found ways to take the trial's memory (which seriously maligned them) and use it to their rhetorical advantage by correcting its memory within the context of their arguments against evolution, and by associating themselves with John Scopes in arguing for academic freedom to teach controversial theories in science classrooms. Finally, chapter five explores the way the memory of the Scopes trial has made its way into broader cultural skirmishes on politics and scientific and social issues. To modern liberals, Scopes's intolerant persecutors represented modern conservatives; to modern conservatives, the mythologizing of the trial represented liberal media bias. The continued staging of *Inherit the Wind* has provided a never-ending opportunity for discussion, analysis, and application of the story's themes.

Throughout the varied groups and topics examined in this paper, we will explore how the memories of a historical event were created, challenged, and applied. In the writings of historians and authors of juvenile literature, at a local festival, and in the rhetoric of antievolutionists and political pundits, the Scopes trial's "ability to serve so many compelling

interests” has made it into a remarkable symbol of American concerns and values, ready to be applied over and over again to contemporary life.¹⁰

¹⁰ Numbers, *Darwinism*, 76.

CHAPTER 1

The Scopes Trial: The Construction of a Memory

Overall trends in how the Scopes trial has been remembered by historians and in popular culture may be divided into four phases. During the first phase (1925-1931), the Scopes trial was understood to be an interesting but only marginally-significant event in the history of fundamentalism. Beginning in 1931, a new phase (1931-1955) began, when it was seen as the moment when the embarrassment of fundamentalism reached a climactic failure. However, in the 1950s, the fundamentalist movement took on a more sinister reputation as it and the Scopes trial came to be compared to McCarthyism, marking a third phase in which America's most defining memory of the Scopes trial, *Inherit the Wind*, was constructed (1955-1965). This third phase established what we will call the "orthodox" view of the trial. The fourth phase (1965-present) has been an era in which historians have diverged from the orthodox view, relying on more meticulous research and fewer negative assumptions about fundamentalism in order to paint a richer portrait of the 1920s and of the trial itself. At the same time, popular conceptions of the trial changed very little. Overall, we will see in this chapter how journalists, historians, and playwrights contributed to the formation and reassessment of how Americans have remembered the story and meaning of the Scopes trial.¹¹

¹¹ This chapter is based primarily on three works that have dealt with historiography and popular culture: Ferenc M. Szasz, "The Scopes Trial in Perspective," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 30 (1971): 288-298; Paul M. Waggoner, "The Historiography of the Scopes Trial: A Critical Re-Evaluation," *Trinity Journal* 5 (1984): 155-174; and Edward J. Larson, *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing*

Phase One: 1925-1931

What were the immediate results of the Scopes trial, and what role did it play in the antievolution crusades of the 1920s? The most popular view held in the twentieth century (the one related to the third-phase orthodox view, as well as the second phase) is that William Jennings Bryan made such a fool of himself at the trial, especially on the day he allowed Clarence Darrow to interrogate him, and that the fundamentalists slunk away in embarrassment. However, as Ronald L. Numbers has demonstrated, nobody in 1925 held this view. It was reported that most Southern Baptists concluded that “goodness had vanquished evil,” and Baptist preacher J. Frank Norris proclaimed that Bryan had defeated Darrow just as Moses challenged Pharaoh, Elijah arraigned Ahab, and Paul defied Nero.¹² Even liberal Christian magazines like the *Christian Century* that opposed the antievolution law had had enough of Darrow, who had become “an embarrassment to the cause he insisted on championing.” *The Nation* predicted that Bryan’s legal victory at the trial would encourage more states to pass antievolution laws, and one editorial in *The Richmond Times-Dispatch* anticipated that the fundamentalists would be “thirsting for more blood.” Even H.L. Mencken declared that the fundamentalists were “completely triumphant” and that the other states “had better look to their arsenals before the Hun is at their gates.”¹³ In typical fashion he wrote, “The evil that men do lives after them. Bryan, in his malice, started

Debate Over Science and Religion (New York: Basic Books, 2006), particularly chapter 9 (“Retelling the Tale”). I have attempted to expand the range of works they surveyed to offer a thorough and up-to-date treatment.

¹² Ronald L. Numbers, *Darwinism Comes to America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 83.

¹³ Quoted in Numbers, *Darwinism*, 84, 87.

something that it will not be easy to stop.”¹⁴ Numbers concluded from his research of first-phase primary sources, “In examining coverage of the trial in five geographically scattered newspapers and over a dozen national magazines, I discovered not a single declaration of victory by the opponents of antievolutionism, in the sense of their claiming that the crusade was nearing an end.”¹⁵

As Waggoner has demonstrated, contemporary historians generally agreed that the Scopes trial did not hurt the antievolution movement. Stewart Cole wrote in *The History of Fundamentalism* (1931) that the trial began, not ended, fundamentalists’ most enthusiastic interest in fighting evolution.¹⁶ Another book, Preston William Slossen’s *The Great Crusade and After, 1914-1928* (1930), was less willing to credit an awakening of fundamentalism to the trial, but neither did it claim that it had been a defeat for the fundamentalists. Instead, it simply suggested that American religion was too complex to give the trial any kind of decisive role.¹⁷ Waggoner concludes, “These early analyses of the Scopes trial reflect the belief that the trial was best understood as an episode, more a media event, than any sort of critical watershed.”¹⁸

¹⁴ Quoted in Waggoner, “Historiography,” 157.

¹⁵ 85. Neither did William Jennings Bryan’s popularity abate among his loyal followers. The folk ballad “The Death of William Jennings Bryan” was recorded the week after his death and praised him for his noble efforts on behalf of the American public: “He fought the evolutionists and the infidel men, fools / Who are trying to ruin the minds of children in our schools.” (Larson, *Summer*, 204). See pp.204-205 for more examples of praise songs about Bryan and the Scopes Trial.

¹⁶ Waggoner, “Historiography,” 161.

¹⁷ Waggoner, “Historiography,” 160.

¹⁸ Waggoner, “Historiography,” 161. Larson agrees with Waggoner and Numbers. He observed, “The nation’s press initially saw little of lasting significance in the trial beyond its having exposed Bryan’s empty head and Darrow’s mean spirit.” Larson, *Summer*, 202.

Had William Jennings Bryan not died in 1925, one would have expected him to publish his own book and to tour the country for the rest of his life offering his version of the trial. But apart from his undelivered closing speech (which was afterward printed in newspapers throughout the country), the only book containing his perspective on the trial was his *Memoirs*, completed and published by his wife, Mary, the year of his death. She wrote of the trial only briefly, but it is clear that she did not deem the trial to be particularly significant:

The question involved was a purely legal one, namely, had Scopes violated that law, and the efforts of the opposition to make the case hinge on the truth or lack of truth in the theory of evolution were out of place. I attended every session of the trial and felt that, as the question in point was purely technical, it was irrelevant to the subject when men of far from unblemished reputation, exclaimed, 'I am a Christian; just as good a Christian as Mr. Bryan.' It was incongruous to see men, whose hopeless faces proclaimed them without faith of any sort, rise to defend that they called religious freedom.

Mr. Scopes' defense was defeated at every point and the decision of the court a triumph for the Tennessee statute.¹⁹

Although this description of the trial comes through the pen of Mary Bryan, one can imagine the themes her husband would have pursued in his version of the story had he lived as long as his opponents (bias and hypocrisy, perhaps). Yet such a story would never be written, and as a result the only books to ever be published by eyewitnesses at the trial that included extensive descriptions of it would be by Darrow, Hays, and Scopes—a factor that doubtlessly contributed to an enduring view of the trial hostile to the fundamentalists and sympathetic to the defendant and his attorneys.

¹⁹ William Jennings Bryan and Mary Bryan, *Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan* (1925): 483-484.

Phase Two: 1931-1955

A turning point in the historiography and memory of the Scopes trial came in 1931 with the publication of Frederick Lewis Allen's *Only Yesterday: An Informal History of the Nineteen-Twenties*.²⁰ *Only Yesterday* quickly became one of the most widely-used sources for those who studied the 1920s; it has been described as “the font at which most subsequent writers about the decade originally drank.”²¹ Although *Only Yesterday* sold over one million copies and came to be used as a standard college history text, its historical reliability is singularly unimpressive. Allen was not a historian but a journalist, and though he studied at Harvard University, he only took one history course while he was there.²² At the beginning of his book, in fact, he noted that he was fully aware of his book's deficiencies:

Further research will undoubtedly disclose errors and deficiencies in the book, and the passage of time will reveal the shortsightedness of many of my judgments and interpretations. A contemporary history is bound to be anything but definitive . . . I have wondered whether some readers might not be interested and perhaps amused to find events and circumstances which they remember well—which seem to have happened only yesterday—woven into a pattern which at least *masquerades as history* [emphasis mine].²³

Allen has been most strongly criticized for grotesquely oversimplifying most of what he writes about (a charge against which he may have defended himself by pointing out that *Only Yesterday* was not written as the serious historical work it ironically became). As Roderick Nash put it,

²⁰ Frederick Lewis Allen, *Only Yesterday: An Informal History of the Nineteen-Twenties* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1931).

²¹ Roderick Nash, *The Nervous Generation: American Thought, 1917-1930* (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1970), 5.

²² Waggoner, “Historiography,” 162.

²³ Allen, *Only Yesterday*, xiii-xiv.

The gap that normally separates history from journalism has been virtually erased, and the result is a distortion . . . Allen has succeeded in creating the belief that everyone in the twenties was either a rebellious hedonist, a rootless cynic, or a materialistic monomaniac. The book's most durable bequest to later interpreters has been the idea that older American values, traditions, and ideals meant little or nothing in the 1920s.²⁴

Allen characterized the twenties as a period of conflict between three groups:

Fundamentalists, who wanted to retain their traditional religious beliefs and generally hated science; Skeptics, who favored science and rejected religion; and Modernists, who sought some kind of middle ground between the two. According to Allen, this three-way debate “reached its climax in the Scopes case in the summer of 1925.”²⁵ The Scopes case was thus “a battle between Fundamentalism on the one hand and twentieth-century skepticism (assisted by modernism) on the other.”²⁶

Allen was clearly tapping into the sensational “conflict thesis” or “warfare model” of science and religion, popularized in the late 1800s by writers such as John William Draper and Andrew Dickson White, and generally taken for granted by historians until roughly the 1980s. According to this model, science and religion have always been in inherent conflict, and stories about the Church's criticism of Galileo, Copernicus, and Darwin tended to be offered as proof that religious people simply could not handle science. Frederick Lewis Allen—like H.L. Mencken, Clarence Darrow, and the *New York Times* before him—failed to recognize that the fundamentalists had not rejected science *per se*, but only a certain kind of science. Historians writing about the trial would, however, continue for decades to apply the

²⁴ Nash, *The Nervous Generation*, 8.

²⁵ Allen, *Only Yesterday*, 201.

²⁶ Allen, *Only Yesterday*, 202.

conflict thesis to the Scopes trial, until it began to be called into question in the 1980s (at which point, in this paper, we shall return to this topic).²⁷

Allen seems to have been the first “historian” to suggest that the Scopes trial was a resounding defeat for the fundamentalists.²⁸ He made this claim by discussing in great detail Darrow’s questioning of Bryan on the witness stand and emphasizing its significance. Writing with all the gusto of a sensationalist journalist (which is what he was), he described the scene:

The climax—both of bitterness and of farce—came on the afternoon of July 20th, when on the spur of the moment Hays asked the defense be permitted to put Bryan on the stand as an expert on the Bible, and Bryan consented . . . Bryan affirmed his belief that the world was created in 4004 B.C. and the Flood occurred in or about 2348 B.C. . . . It was a savage encounter, and a tragic one for the ex-Secretary of State . . . he was being covered with humiliation. The sort of religious faith which he represented could not take the witness stand and face reason as a prosecutor.²⁹

Here Allen perpetuates at least two myths that would later be popularized about the case: first, that the questioning of Bryan was done “on the spur of the moment,” and second, that Bryan believed the world was created in 4004 B.C. The questioning was in fact planned, and Bryan in fact suggested to Darrow that the days of creation were probably longer than twenty-four hour days. Other mistakes include leaving the ACLU out of the story altogether and claiming that Scopes intentionally broke the law so he would be arrested.³⁰

²⁷ The classic works that popularized the conflict thesis were John William Draper, *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science* (1874) and Andrew Dickson White, *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (1896). A later major book written from the same perspective was published the year of the Scopes trial: J.Y. Simpson, *Landmarks in the Struggle between Science and Religion* (1925).

²⁸ Numbers, *Darwinism*, 85; Waggoner, “Historiography,” 162-164.

²⁹ Allen, *Only Yesterday*, 204-205.

³⁰ Larson, *Summer*, 228.

Allen's conclusions shaped how the Scopes trial would be interpreted for decades to come. He wrote, "Theoretically, Fundamentalism had won, for the law stood. Yet really, Fundamentalism had lost . . . civilized opinion everywhere regarded the Dayton trial with amazement and amusement, and the slow drift away from Fundamentalist certainty continued." It was indeed true that the fundamentalist movement had faded from public view by Allen's day, and Allen assumed that it was the Scopes trial that caused their defeat.

According to Larson,

By the 1930s, fundamentalist political activity had decreased to such an extent that outside observers thought the movement had died. The Scopes trial offers a convenient explanation for this development, but the timing doesn't quite fit . . . antievolution activism increased noticeably for several years following the verdict, with additional states imposing restrictions. Fundamentalist church membership continued to grow during the twenties and on into the future. While it is true that open warfare between fundamentalists and modernists quieted down during the late 1920s, and that the political crusade to outlaw teaching evolution ended by 1930, at most the Scopes trial contributed only indirectly to any apparent decline of fundamentalism.³¹

One might excuse Allen's ignorance of where the fundamentalist movement had gone, for only in recent years have historians such as Joel A. Carpenter chronicled the way that the movement turned inward and became less visible until the 1970s and 1980s.³² In the 1990s, Mark A. Noll attributed the seeming disappearance of fundamentalism not to any defeat at the Scopes trial, but to the death of William Jennings Bryan, fundamentalism's most prominent public figure, and to new theological trends within the movement. As Noll summarized it, "Bryan's optimistic prospects for reform and his support for active

³¹ Larson, *Summer*, 229.

³² Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

government gave way to cultural pessimism and a fear of government encroachment. Concern for political involvement was replaced with an almost exclusive focus on personal evangelism and personal piety. Current events evoked interpretations of prophecy instead of either reforming activism or political analysis.”³³

In spite of Allen’s historical blunders and ignorance of what had really happened to the fundamentalists, a generation of equally unaware historians relied on *Only Yesterday* as a valuable source of information on the 1920s. Soon after *Only Yesterday*’s publication, the trial came to be seen as a decisive turning point in American fundamentalism and American culture in general. Gaius Glen Atkins’ *Religion in Our Times* (1932) and Mark Sullivan’s *Our Times: The United States, 1900-1925* (1935) both relied on Allen and reflected his interpretation in their books. Sullivan reflected Allen’s journalistic excitement when he noted that at the Scopes trial the fundamentalist controversy “reached an explosive climax.”³⁴ William W. Sweet revised his book *The Story of Religion in America* (1930, 1939) to reflect this new view, calling the Scopes trial “fundamentalism’s last stand.”³⁵

Beside the Scopes trial’s effects, historians also considered its meaning for the fundamentalist movement as a whole. As Waggoner points out, many of these historians in the 1930s came to “only consider fundamentalism in the context of the Scopes trial and thus the Scopes trial begins to define fundamentalism (and not vice versa).”³⁶ In an effort to make fundamentalism easier to understand (and perhaps easier to disregard), the fundamentalists

³³ Mark A. Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 164-165.

³⁴ Quoted in Waggoner, “Historiography,” 163.

³⁵ Quoted in Larson, *Summer*, 229.

³⁶ Waggoner, “Historiography,” 164.

were reduced to caricatures of William Jennings Bryan, taking a pounding on the witness stand as they were assaulted by what Allen called “reason as a prosecutor.”³⁷

This is also the period in which Clarence Darrow published his memoir, *The Story of My Life* (1932), which further seared an anti-fundamentalist view of the trial into American memory. According to Darrow, Bryan’s support for the Butler Act had been a “campaign against knowledge.” Bryan was “the idol of all morondom,” and “as to science, his mind was an utter blank.” At the cross-examination, it was revealed that “his speculations had ripened into unchanging convictions. He did not think. He knew. His eyes plainly revealed mental disintegration.”³⁸ Defense attorney Arthur Garfield Hays published his memoir, *Let Freedom Ring*, in 1937. His treatment of the trial was less scathing, but still in basic agreement with Darrow. In an oft-quoted passage he called the Scopes trial “a battle between two types of mind—the rigid, orthodox, accepting, unyielding, narrow, conventional mind and the broad, liberal, critical, cynical, skeptical, and tolerant mind.”³⁹

Overall, second-phase authors tended to ridicule the fundamentalists by simplistically identifying them with Bryan’s worst qualities, providing an easy explanation for their disappearance. The Scopes trial was, for the most part, just another example of the ridiculous (though entertaining) 1920s, and antievolutionism was no longer something to be taken seriously. During the 1950s, however, this perspective changed dramatically when the Scopes trial began to be interpreted as a much graver event.

³⁷ Allen, *Only Yesterday*, 205.

³⁸ Clarence Darrow, *The Story of My Life* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1932), 248-250, 277.

³⁹ Arthur Garfield Hays, *Let Freedom Ring*, 1932 (New York: Da Capo, 1972), 27-28.

Phase Three: 1955-1965

We will diverge slightly from the work of professional historians in order to consider the opening of Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee's *Inherit the Wind* on Broadway in 1955, which marks the beginning of the third phase of Scopes interpretation. The division is, of course, not so neat, and the 1950s were as a whole more of a transition period. But what made the 1950s different than the 1930s or 1940s was the threat of communism and the onslaught of McCarthyism. As American intellectuals became increasingly concerned that Americans' liberties were being threatened, especially their freedom of conscience, the Scopes trial came to be viewed through this lens. This stage was also characterized by fierce attacks on Bryan and fundamentalism as a whole.

Richard Hofstadter, for instance, blasted Bryan in a series of books beginning with *The American Political Tradition* (1948): "The post-war era found him identified with some of the worst tendencies in American life—prohibition, the crusade against evolution, real-estate speculation, and the Klan . . . The Scopes trial, which published to the world Bryan's childish conception of religion, also reduced to the absurd his inchoate notions of democracy."⁴⁰ In 1955 he wrote, "The pathetic postwar career of Bryan himself, once the bellwether for so many of the genuine reforms, was a perfect epitome of the collapse of rural idealism and the shabbiness of the evangelical mind."⁴¹ Hofstadter's college textbook, *The United States: The History of a Republic* (co-authored with William Miller and Daniel

⁴⁰ Richard Hofstadter, *The American Political Tradition: And the Men Who Made It* (New York: Knopf, 1948), 199-202.

⁴¹ Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R.* (1955), quoted in Larson, *Summer*, 235.

Aaron) placed fundamentalism “alongside the Red Scare, the Ku Klux Klan, immigration restrictions, and Prohibition in a section on the ‘intolerance’ that darkened the 1920s.”⁴²

The work that came to most memorably associate the Scopes trial with McCarthyism was Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee’s *Inherit the Wind*. *Inherit the Wind* opened on Broadway in 1955, two years after Arthur Miller’s *The Crucible*, another play to associate McCarthyism with a notorious religious event in America’s past. Enjoying 806 performances over a period of three years, it became the longest-running drama that up to that point had been performed on Broadway. It was soon translated into over twenty languages and performed all over the world.⁴³ In 1960, Stanley Kramer directed a film that starred Spencer Tracy, Frederic March, Gene Kelly, and Dick York, and this film is perhaps the most widely-known version of the play.⁴⁴

Although the play’s popular success is evident by its long-running performance history, *Inherit the Wind* initially received mixed reviews. Richard Watts, Jr. of the *New York Post* declared, “As a colorful, picturesque and absorbingly exciting essay in dramatic Americana, it is brilliant.” Another critic wrote, “the contest between religious fundamentalism and science is told with an exciting dramatic touch, irony and humor that is

⁴² Larson, *Summer*, 236. Larson also notes that “Ever since, nearly every American history survey text has lumped fundamentalism with reactionary forces during the 1920s and featured similar depictions of the Scopes trial . . . Most reduce the trial to an emotional encounter between Darrow and Bryan that resulted in a decisive moral defeat for the fundamentalists . . . As in many of the texts, the ACLU and all of Darrow’s co-counsel entirely lost their place in history” (236). Thus the fundamentalist movement is simplistically reduced to the Scopes trial, and the Scopes trial is simplistically reduced to Bryan’s embarrassing performance on the witness stand.

⁴³ Stanley Richards, ed., *America on Stage: Ten Great Plays of American History* (New York: Doubleday, 1976), 695; Larson, *Summer*, 243.

⁴⁴ *Inherit the Wind*, DVD, Directed by Stanley Kramer (1960; Los Angeles: MGM; 2001). Television versions were released in 1965 (starring Melvyn Douglas and Ed Begley), 1988 (Jason Robards and Kirk Douglas), and 1999 (Jack Lemmon and George C. Scott).

alternately kindly and biting.”⁴⁵ However, other reviewers decried the way *Inherit the Wind* distorted the Scopes trial. “History has not been increased but almost fatally diminished,” according to the *New Yorker*. *Time* also criticized *Inherit the Wind* for offering vicious caricatures of some characters while “wildly and unjustly” idealizing others.⁴⁶ Sue Hicks, a friend of John Scopes and one of the prosecutors in his case, considered buying television time in order to broadcast a critique of the play’s inaccuracies.⁴⁷

However, *Inherit the Wind* was, like *The Crucible*, never intended to provide an accurate description of the historical events it described. Lawrence and Lee (who had spent most of their careers writing scripts for popular radio shows) wrote at the beginning of their script,

Inherit the Wind is not history. The events which took place in Dayton, Tennessee, during the scorching July of 1925 are clearly the genesis of this play. It has, however, an exodus entirely its own. Some of the characters of the play are related to the colorful figures in that battle of giants; but they have life and language of their own—and, therefore, names of their own.⁴⁸

Indeed, by writing a play merely inspired by historical events and not claiming to actually portray them, Lawrence and Lee hoped to make its message more timeless than a strictly historical version would have been:

The Collision of Bryan and Darrow at Dayton was dramatic, but it was not drama. Moreover, the issues of their conflict have acquired new dimension and meaning in the thirty years since they clashed at the Rhea County Courthouse. So *Inherit the Wind* does not pretend to be journalism. It is theatre. It is not 1925. The stage directions set the time as “Not too long ago.” It might have been yesterday. It could

⁴⁵ Quoted in Richards, *America*, 695.

⁴⁶ Quoted in Larson, *Summer*, 243.

⁴⁷ Larson, *Summer*, 243.

⁴⁸ Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee, *Inherit the Wind* (New York: Bantam Books, 1955), n.p.

be tomorrow.⁴⁹

Lawrence and Lee were not concerned with continued debates over antievolutionism, for these debates had disappeared during the 1930s and would not reappear until the 1970s. The ongoing danger was McCarthyism. Lee said, “I was very concerned when laws were passed, when legislation limits our freedom to speak; silence is a dangerous thing.”⁵⁰

Because of its importance in shaping public memory about the Scopes trial, it is helpful to examine *Inherit the Wind*'s plot and characters in detail.⁵¹ One spring morning, high school science teacher Bertram T. Cates (representing John Scopes) stands up to teach his eleventh graders about Darwin's theory of evolution. As he begins his lesson, a group of town leaders burst in, arrest him, and take him to jail for violating a recently-passed Tennessee law that prohibited the teaching of evolution in public schools. As news of Cates's arrest sweeps across the country, drawing national attention to the small town of Hillsboro (Dayton), two famous attorneys volunteer to come to argue the case. Matthew Harrison Brady (William Jennings Bryan) comes to prosecute Cates and defend the Biblical account of creation, and Henry Drummond (Clarence Darrow) comes to defend Cates and his freedom to think for himself. Drummond's fees are paid by the *Baltimore Herald*, a newspaper which sends the cantankerous E.K. Hornbeck (H.L. Mencken) to Hillsboro in order to report on the trial, and to poke fun at Southerners and Christians in general.

⁴⁹ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, n.p.

⁵⁰ Quoted in Larson, *Summer*, 240.

⁵¹ In this analysis, I will be blending together dialogue and scenes from both Lawrence and Lee's original play and the 1960 film adaptation. For lines present in both the play and the film, I will cite the play, but for lines only found in the film, I will cite the film.

In contrast with the more ambiguous events of the actual Scopes trial, Lawrence and Lee so simplify the story that there is no question about who is good and who is evil. Matthew Harrison Brady, though admired by the simple folks of Hillsboro, is “a mindless, reactionary creature of the mob.”⁵² He was “the biggest man in the country—next to the President, maybe,” but he “came here to find himself a stump to shout from. That’s all.”⁵³ The townspeople throw a party in Brady’s honor when he arrives, even adapting their favorite hymn to sing his praises:

Gimme that old-time religion,
 Gimme that old-time religion,
 Gimme that old-time religion,
 It’s good enough for me!

It was good enough for father,
 It was good enough for father,
 It was good enough for father,
 And it’s good enough for me!

...
 It is good enough for Brady,
 It is good enough for Brady,
 It is good enough for Brady,
 And it’s good enough for me!⁵⁴

In the 1960 film, the townspeople drone on and on and on and on with this song, marching through the town shouting it mindlessly. These fundamentalists not only confess their inability to think for themselves—they boast about it! Later, during jury selection, one juror is asked whether he believes in the Bible. He proudly replies: “I believe in the Holy Word of

⁵² Larson, *Summer*, 241.

⁵³ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 8, 34.

⁵⁴ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 18-19.

God. And I believe in Matthew Harrison Brady!” The stage directions add, “There is some applause, and a few scattered ‘Amens.’ Brady waves acceptance.”⁵⁵

There is, however, very little to admire in Brady if one is not a mindless citizen of Hillsboro. The play and film do go out of their way at times to show that he is at least honest and sincerely believes in what he is doing. A series of slow-paced and marginally-touching scenes in the film between Brady and his wife, for instance, show that she loves him for his honesty and courage in spite of his glaring flaws. But overall, he is still more concerned with preserving his religious traditions and punishing those who oppose him than with pursuing truth. “The way of scientism is the way of darkness,” he declares. When Drummond asks him how familiar he is with Darwin’s *Origin of Species*, he replies, “I am not in the least interested in the pagan hypotheses of that book.” “Never read it?” Drummond asks. Brady responds, “And I never will.” When it comes to the Bible, however, Brady insists that “Everything in the Bible should be accepted exactly as it is given there.”⁵⁶

While Brady is a mindless reactionary, Lawrence and Lee created a more serious character who represents the darker side of Hillsboro’s religious beliefs, the Reverend Jeremiah Brown. Brady wants to convict and punish Cates in the courtroom, but the more-ambitious Brown longs to send him to hell. He stirs up the crowd at a prayer meeting, asking, “Do we believe the Truth of the Word? . . . Do we curse the man who denies the Word? . . . Do we cast out this sinner in our midst? . . . Do we call down hellfire on the man who has sinned against the Word?” To each question the crowd roars back with an emphatic

⁵⁵ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 41.

⁵⁶ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 86, 87.

“Yes!” He continues: “O Lord of the Tempest and Thunder! O Lord of Righteousness and Wrath! We pray that Thou wilt make a sign unto us! Strike down this sinner, as Thou didst Thine enemies of old, in the days of the Pharaohs! Let him feel the terror of Thy Sword! For all eternity, let his soul writhe in anguish and damnation!” When Brown’s daughter, who is secretly in love with Cates, protests his imprecations, he condemns her as well: “Lord, we call down the same curse on those who ask grace for this sinner—though they be blood of my blood, and flesh of my flesh!”⁵⁷ At this point Brady rebukes him for being overzealous, appealing to him to be forgiving and quoting the Proverb on which the play is based: “He that troubleth his own house shall inherit the wind.”⁵⁸ This is one of Brady’s more moderate moments in which we see that, as disturbing as people like Brady may be, there are some (i.e., Reverend Brown) who are even worse.

Although Bert Cates is never actually struck down by God, he does suffer the wrath of the townspeople. Cates, the one who has started the whole ordeal, gives himself as a martyr for his cause in spite of whatever punishment lies in store for him. Early on, Rachel Brown (the reverend’s daughter) begs him to recant his views and tell everyone that his teaching evolution was just a joke. Cates responds in unequivocal opposition: “Tell them if they’d let my body out of jail, I’d lock up my mind?”⁵⁹ He is, in essence, an innocent and idealistic young man who just wanted to open his students’ minds and who is willing to stand

⁵⁷ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 65-66.

⁵⁸ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 67.

⁵⁹ *Inherit the Wind*, DVD.

up for what he believes in—namely, scientific truth.⁶⁰ Although he does not go to church, he is not anti-religious. As it is revealed during the trial, he left Reverend Brown’s church solely because of Reverend Brown. Two years before the trial, an eleven-year-old boy who had been a friend of Cates drowned in the river. Because the boy had never been baptized, Brown insisted that his soul “was damned, writhing in hellfire!”⁶¹ Consequently, Cates left the church.

Henry Drummond, Cates’s attorney, is an older version of Cates. Like Cates, Drummond simply wants to stand up for freedom of thought. Many of the play’s most memorable lines are spoken by Drummond, whose opposition to anti-evolutionism is equally applicable to McCarthyism. “The right to think is on trial,” he insists. “I came here to defend his [Cates’s] right to be different.” Drummond’s primary concern is not simply whether his client is found guilty or not guilty; he is concerned with what it will imply for the future of America if he is found guilty:

Can't you understand? That if you take a law like evolution and you make it a crime to teach it in the public schools, tomorrow you can make it a crime to teach it in the private schools? And tomorrow you may make it a crime to read about it. And soon you may ban books and newspapers. And then you may turn Catholic against Protestant, and Protestant against Protestant, and try to foist your own religion upon the mind of man. If you can do one, you can do the other. Because fanaticism and ignorance is forever busy, and needs feeding. And soon, your Honor, with banners flying and with drums beating we'll be marching backward, **BACKWARD**, through the glorious ages of that Sixteenth Century when bigots burned the man who dared

⁶⁰ He is also bland and uninteresting, and quickly fades into the background as soon as Brady, Drummond, and Hornbeck show up.

⁶¹ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 77.

bring enlightenment and intelligence to the human mind!⁶²

Drummond is not opposed to religion per se, but insists that religion is all too often based upon “ignorance, bigotry, and hate.” At times, he sounds like he wants to reject Christianity altogether: “For progress, we must abandon faith.”⁶³ But at other times, he wonders whether religion and science are compatible: “How can you be so cocksure that the body of scientific knowledge systematized in the writings of Charles Darwin is, in any way, irreconcilable with the spirit of the Book of Genesis?”⁶⁴

Just as Brady stands in contrast to the religious extremist Brown, so does Drummond stand in contrast to the cynical Hornbeck. While Drummond spends his time in court courageously defending Cates and the right to think, Hornbeck is content to stand on the sidelines and crack jokes about the ignorance of Southern religious people. “Darwin was wrong!” he proclaims to Drummond. “Man is still an ape!”⁶⁵ At the end of the play when Brady dies, Hornbeck delivers a mocking eulogy to Drummond:

Matthew Harrison Brady died of a busted belly.
 You know what I thought of him,
 And I know what you thought.
 Let us leave the lamentations to the illiterate!
 Why should we weep for him? He cried enough for himself!
 The national tear-duct from Weeping Water, Nebraska,

⁶² *Inherit the Wind*, DVD. Many of these particular lines come from Darrow’s speech on the second day of the trial. *The World’s Most Famous Court Trial: Tennessee Evolution Case* (Union, N.J.: The Lawbook Exchange, 1997), 87.

⁶³ *Inherit the Wind*, DVD.

⁶⁴ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 86. In the actual Scopes trial, one of Darrow’s main arguments was that the teaching of evolution did not in fact violate the Butler Act. The Act prohibited the teaching of “any theory that denies the Story of the Divine Creation of man as taught in the Bible.” Darrow and his defense team insisted that it was perfectly possible to reconcile Genesis with evolution as long as one did not interpret the text literally. Darrow himself did not care for the book of Genesis, however—this was only his approach in court (See Larson, *Summer*).

⁶⁵ *Inherit the Wind*, DVD.

Who flooded the whole nation like a one-man Mississippi!
 You know what he was:
 A Barnum-bunkum Bible-beating bastard!⁶⁶

Drummond, who has become increasingly irritated with Hornbeck, slams down his brief case in anger: “You smart-aleck! You have no more right to spit on his religion than you have a right to spit on my religion! Or my lack of it!” He then, in a moment of admirable consistency, declares to Hornbeck, “I tell you Brady had the same right as Cates: the right to be wrong!”⁶⁷

Larson has shown that *Inherit the Wind* distorts the Scopes trial in three important ways.⁶⁸ First, it turns the trial into a mob attack on John Scopes (Cates), when in fact the entire trial was a mere set-up to test the Butler Act and bring Dayton some publicity. No one in the town hated Scopes, and no one threatened to kill him.⁶⁹ He was not, in fact, a courageous martyr for academic freedom who was arrested in the middle of a class on evolution. He was a football coach who periodically substituted for science classes who was asked by the ACLU and some ambitious townspeople of Dayton to voluntarily allow himself to be charged for teaching evolution.

A second change is in the character of William Jennings Bryan (Brady). In *Inherit the Wind* he is reduced to a simplistic, mindless, religious bigot who cared about little besides fighting anyone who dared challenge the Bible. In reality, although he was no

⁶⁶ Lawrence and Lee, 125. “Died of a busted belly” is a reference to the enormous amounts of food Brady (and W.J. Bryan) ate. In actuality, it was not Mencken but Darrow who uttered this remark after Bryan died (Larson, 242). Drummond’s real-life counterpart was clearly not so sympathetic.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 125, 127.

⁶⁸ The following descriptions come from Larson, *Summer*, 100, 207, 242-243.

⁶⁹ In the 1960 film, the town is seen one night marching outside the jail, burning an effigy of Cates, and singing about how “We’ll burn Bert Cates!” and “We’ll hang Henry Drummond!” to the tune of “Glory, Glory, Hallelujah.”

scientist, he was well informed of Darwin's theories, bringing his own copy of *The Descent of Man* to the trial and quoting from it during his arguments. He did not believe that the world was created "on the 23rd of October in the Year 4004 B.C. at—uh, at 9 A.M.!"⁷⁰ Actually, he theorized that the six days of creation were figurative, and gladly admitted that the earth was probably quite ancient. Furthermore, Bryan's primary objection to the teaching of evolution was not that it contradicted the Bible, but that taking evolution's philosophy to its logical conclusion meant justifying an unjust attitude of "survival of the fittest" when it came to social matters. This philosophy, he claimed, is what captivated the Germans before they started first World War, and had led to the excesses of capitalism in his own country. When it came to banning the teaching of evolution in public schools, Bryan's justification came more from his populist political philosophy than from his reading of the Bible. The citizens of Tennessee, he believed, had a right to determine what their children would be taught, and no higher authority ought to dictate to them what to do.

The third change is in Clarence Darrow's character (Drummond), who became a likeable, tolerant character. In fact, Darrow was a hard-nosed agnostic attorney who offended people as much as he inspired them, and who even bothered those who were on his side in the case. As the New Orleans *Times-Picayune* commented at the close of the case, "Mr. Darrow, with his sneering . . . and his ill-natured and arrogant cross-examination of Bryan on the witness stand, has done more to stimulate 'anti-evolution' legislation in the United States than Mr. Bryan and his fellow literalists, left alone, could have hoped for."⁷¹ In

⁷⁰ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 96.

⁷¹ Quoted in Larson, *Summer*, 207.

Inherit the Wind, Darrow's personality dissolved away and all Lawrence and Lee left is a spokesman for freedom of thought.

In spite of its historical inaccuracy, *Inherit the Wind* became one of the influential forces in shaping how Americans have remembered the Scopes trial. Due to its continued popularity on television and in theaters, Americans have continued to be exposed to its interpretation (and distortion) of what happened in Dayton in 1925. Unfortunately, *Inherit the Wind* has been frequently shown for educational purposes. The 1994 instructional standards published by the National Center for History in Schools, for instance, recommended that teachers “use selections from the Scopes trial or excerpts from *Inherit the Wind* to explain how the views of William Jennings Bryan differed from those of Clarence Darrow.”⁷² Ronald Numbers comments on this bad advice, “This strikes me as being a little like recommending *Gone with the Wind* as a historically reliable account of the Civil War.”⁷³ Elsewhere, he has written, “*Inherit the Wind* dramatically illustrates why so many Americans continue to believe in the mythical war between science and religion. But in doing so, it sacrifices the far more complex historical reality.”⁷⁴

Inherit the Wind established the orthodox interpretation of the Scopes trial on a popular level, associating it with sinister trends like McCarthyism—but other more serious works from this period came to similar conclusions. William E. Leuchtenburg wrote about the Scopes trial in his college textbook *The Perils of Prosperity, 1914-1932* (1956). He placed it in a chapter entitled “Political Fundamentalism” along with the KKK and the

⁷² Quoted in Larson, *Summer*, 244.

⁷³ Numbers, *Darwinism*, 87.

⁷⁴ Ronald L. Numbers, “*Inherit the Wind*,” *Isis* 84.4 (Dec. 1993): 764.

Prohibition movement. Leuchtenburg “cast antievolution as a peril to progress and the Scopes trial as the purgative.”⁷⁵

Leuchtenburg reflects the continued trend to treat the Scopes trial simplistically and in passing references, but during the same period some scholars were trying to study the trial in greater depth. The “first authoritative book-length study” of the Scopes trial was published in 1958 by Ray Ginger. *Six Days or Forever? Tennessee v. John Thomas Scopes* became one of the most widely-used sources on the Scopes trial. On some points Ginger challenged the orthodox interpretation, questioning the notion that the trial killed the fundamentalist movement. Ginger also took pains to more accurately place the trial within its cultural context. “But otherwise,” Waggoner writes, “Ginger approves, almost relishes, the accepted consensus,” describing its characters in “dated stereotypes.”⁷⁶

The publishers of *Six Days or Forever?* took advantage of *Inherit the Wind*'s popularity by designing the 1960 paperback edition like a movie poster. On its bright red front cover, Bryan holds his Holy Bible in the air and shouts at Darrow, with large yellow letters above proclaiming, “DARROW versus BRYAN—the clash of the titans at the famous ‘MONKEY TRIAL’—the explosive battle for the freedom of science that incited the emotions of the courtroom . . . and of the world!!!!!!!!!!” The back cover is equally melodramatic:

The Broadway hit *Inherit the Wind* touched on the trial scenes. Darrow and others have written personal accounts. Now you can read the first behind-the-scenes drama of the famous ‘Monkey trial.’

⁷⁵ Larson, *Summer*, 235; see also Waggoner, “Historiography,” 165.

⁷⁶ Waggoner, “Historiography,” 165-166.

Here is the exciting story of how the young teacher John Scopes was tricked into the ‘test case.’ . . .

Here is the highly charged courtroom battle between archenemies William Jennings Bryan and Clarence Darrow . . .

Here are the action-packed events that turned the town of Dayton, Tennessee into a revival camp and a carnival . . .

HERE IS THE FULL RECORD—THE BACKGROUND, THE PERSONALITIES, THE PEOPLE, THE POLITICS—OF ONE OF THE MOST EXPLOSIVE COURTROOM BATTLES THE WORLD HAS EVER WITNESSED! [ellipses and capitalization original]⁷⁷

The publishing company’s advertising team notwithstanding, Ginger wrote *Six Days or Forever?* as a serious scholarly book. At the same time, Ginger had no qualms about periodically inserting his own opinions about everything from the authority of the Bible to the dangers of capitalism.⁷⁸ “The Bible is a magnificent book,” he wrote, “but like any book it must be read with a scientific and human mind, not with the mind of a superstitious, frightened, and ungenerous past.”⁷⁹ His sentiments could have been taken directly from *Inherit the Wind*, in which Henry Drummond likewise remarked, “The Bible is a book. A good book. But it’s not the only book.”⁸⁰

Ginger also spent a great deal of time placing Bryan on the psychologist’s couch to psychoanalyze his religious beliefs. He wrote,

The modern mind is not the feudal mind, and Bryan’s pathetic fate shows the folly of any attempt to pretend that it is . . . [When he crusaded against evolution, Bryan’s] code of morality had led him into a tragically immoral course of action . . . the authoritarian ethics that Bryan had imbibed in his youth had prevented him from ever growing up . . . He was tragically immature . . . His juvenile grandiosity was manifest in his agreement to be examined by Darrow . . . It was a fatal error of tactics: if a

⁷⁷ Ray Ginger, *Six Days or Forever? Tennessee vs. John Thomas Scopes* (New York: New American Library, 1958).

⁷⁸ Ginger, *Six Days*, 190; 206.

⁷⁹ Ginger, *Six Days*, 206.

⁸⁰ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 98.

person holds irrational ideas and insists that others should accept them because of their authoritative source, he should never agree to be questioned about them. This lesson was emphasized, thirty years after Bryan's downfall, by the Senate hearings regarding Joseph R. McCarthy.⁸¹

Like *Inherit the Wind's* Matthew Brady, Ginger's Bryan is the adversary of all that is rational and good in the world.

Books that followed told the same story, frequently relying on Ginger just as previous works had relied on Allen. One such work was Sheldon Norman Grebstein's *Monkey Trial: The State of Tennessee vs. John Thomas Scopes* (1960). Despite mostly being a collection of primary sources, *Monkey Trial* managed to side definitively on the side of Scopes. In the preface, Grebstein laid out the stakes of the trial in the same simplistic fashion as most other writers during these years:

It was to become a case of Fundamentalism versus Modernism, theological truth versus scientific truth, literal versus liberal interpretation of the Bible, Genesis versus Darwin; and it was to have grave implications for democracy as well. Did the majority in Tennessee or elsewhere have the right to dictate what should or should not be taught in the public schools? Did the police power of the state allow it to control the minds of its citizens? Were church and state really separate in America? Did America's tradition as a Christian nation also commit her to an acceptance of the Bible as part of the articles of government? Such were the issues of the trial, and they are still with us.⁸²

Overshadowed were William Jennings Bryan's more nuanced concerns about Social Darwinism and his (pre-modern) scientific critique of Darwinism (which would be brought

⁸¹ Ginger, *Six Days*, 191, 203, 204.

⁸² Sheldon Norman Grebstein, ed. *Monkey Trial: The State of Tennessee vs. John Thomas Scopes*, Houghton Mifflin Research Series (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960), x. In the "Essential Reading" section, Grebstein recommended Ginger's *Six Days or Forever?* as "An indispensable reference, a history of the trial, its participants, its issues, and the climate of opinion; also valuable for its annotated bibliography," 210.

out more clearly by later historians). According to Grebstein, Bryan's real motive was little more than police-state-style mind control.

Other works on the Scopes trial published during this period were Jerry R. Tompkins' *D-Days at Dayton: Reflections on the Scopes Trial* (1965), a book Waggoner describes as "an uneven and on the whole unimportant set of reflective essays," Scopes's memoir, *Center of the Storm* (1967), and *The Great Monkey Trial* (1968), an account of the trial written by L. Sprague de Camp.⁸³ De Camp, a science fiction author and avowed materialist, placed the trial within the larger context of warfare between science and religion: "The Scopes trial was a battle—one of many, but an important and picturesque one—in a war that has been going on for at least 2,500 years and will probably long continue." As an epigraph to his chapter on Darrow's cross-examination of Bryan, de Camp quoted from Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking Glass*, in which the Queen tells Alice, "Why, sometimes I've believed as many as six impossible things before breakfast."⁸⁴

It is no accident that De Camp and other third phase authors who showed contempt for Bryan and the fundamentalists were writing during a time when science was enjoying heightened prestige. Following the Soviet Union's 1957 launch of Sputnik, Americans turned their attention like never before to science and science education. This was the era in which, beginning in 1959, the Biological Science Curriculum Study began rewriting high

⁸³ Jerry R. Tompkins, *D-Days at Dayton: Reflections on the Scopes Trial* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965); Waggoner, "Historiography," 168; John Thomas Scopes and James Presley, *Center of the Storm: Memoirs of John T. Scopes* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967); L. Sprague de Camp, *The Great Monkey Trial* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968). De Camp's book was written during what we are considering the "fourth period," but based on its content it is more of a third-phase work.

⁸⁴ De Camp, *Great Monkey Trial*, 490, 369.

school textbooks to give renewed prominence to the theory of evolution. As American society became “increasingly deferential to scientific opinion,” religion—particularly fundamentalist Christianity—seemed to elite Americans to have become more unnecessary and backwards than ever.⁸⁵

In addition to the heightened prestige of science, this era was also characterized by a strong reaction to McCarthyism. By understanding the Scopes trial in light of McCarthyism and reducing its participants’ complex motivations to whatever forces were thought to control McCarthy, many Americans of the 1950s (particularly intellectuals) found it easier to understand. Associating the two had implications for McCarthyism as well. As Waggoner describes, “The more bizarre the fundamentalism of the twenties appeared, the better it cast disrepute on the forces behind McCarthy. The fall of fundamentalism was of interest for it foretold of McCarthy’s own eventual collapse. Otherwise the religious issues of the twenties, many believed, would appear ancient and uninteresting to the modern reader.”⁸⁶ The consensus of the third period continued unchallenged until the 1960s.

Phase Four: 1965-Present

In the mid 1960s, however, some historians began to contest the orthodox view of the Scopes trial by resisting its tendency to cast its plot and characters in such simplistic terms. They began to take both sides of the trial more seriously and to approach it from a greater variety of perspectives. In 1965, Lawrence W. Levine published a book that began a new era

⁸⁵ Edward J. Larson, *Trial and Error: The American Controversy Over Creation and Evolution*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 91-92.

⁸⁶ Waggoner, “Historiography,” 168.

of Scopes historiography, *Defender of the Faith: William Jennings Bryan: The Last Decade, 1915-1925*. The “first revisionist historian of the Scopes trial,” Levine “rescu[ed] Bryan from the wastebin of history” by challenging all of the stereotypes about Bryan and fundamentalism.⁸⁷ Levine rejected the view that Bryan was a religious extremist who wanted to send America back to the dark ages and argued that he was essentially motivated by his genuine concern for modern society. True, some views on evolution challenged the authority of the Scriptures, but Bryan’s primary objection to it was that he believed Darwin’s theory encouraged lawlessness and oppression. Levine’s work was soon followed by Paola Coletta’s *William Jennings Bryan: Political Puritan* (1969), another book sympathetic to Bryan. Nearly every biography of Bryan since has followed Levine in seeking a more understanding view of Bryan and refusing to reduce him to the simplistic buffoon of *Inherit the Wind*.⁸⁸

While some scholars focused on redeeming Bryan’s reputation, others focused on the significance of the Scopes trial. What effects did it actually have on the fundamentalist movement, if any? On this question we have seen that historians were already split, but during this period an increasing number rejected the view that the Scopes trial killed fundamentalism.⁸⁹ Two important articles published during this time were among the first to

⁸⁷ Waggoner, “Historiography,” 168-169.

⁸⁸ Ibid. Similar works on Bryan published during the 1970s include Louis W. Koenig’s *Bryan: A Political Biography of William Jennings Bryan* (New York: Putnam, 1971) and William Smith’s *The Social and Religious Thought of William Jennings Bryan* (Lawrence, Kan.: Coronado Press, 1975).

⁸⁹ See Paul Carter, *The Twenties in America* (New York: Crowell, 1975) and Roderick Nash, *The Nervous Generation: American Thought, 1917-1930* (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1970). (Nash, whom we quoted from earlier, provided scathing analysis of the deficiencies of Frederick Lewis Allen’s *Only Yesterday*.) Other historians, however, continued to argue the more traditional view: see, for instance, James R. Moore, *The Post-Darwinian Controversies* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

consciously trace the historiography of the Scopes trial. In 1971, Ferenc M. Szasz published “The Scopes Trial in Perspective,” arguing that most historians had misunderstood the effects of the trial because they failed to place it in proper perspective.⁹⁰ A similar article appeared in 1984, “The Historiography of the Scopes Trial: A Critical Re-Evaluation.” Its author, Paul Waggoner, also focused on the results of the trial, though he delved deeper than Szasz was able to do.⁹¹

Nearly thirty years would pass between the last third phase scholarly monograph on the Scopes trial (de Camp’s *Great Monkey Trial*, 1968) and the first fourth phase one (Edward Larson’s *Summer for the Gods*, 1997). These intervening years, however, marked significant progress in the historiography of science and religion. James Moore’s *Post-Darwinian Controversies: A Study of the Protestant Struggle to Come to Terms with Darwin in Great Britain and America, 1870-1900* (1979), Jon H. Roberts’s *Darwinism and the Divine in America: Protestant Intellectuals and Organic Evolution, 1859-1900* (1988), and a collection of essays edited by David C. Lindberg and Ronald L. Numbers, *God and Nature: Historical Essays on the Encounter between Christianity and Science* (1986), all challenged the traditional conflict thesis and presented a more nuanced approach to the relationship between science and religion. Roberts, for instance, suggested that the relationship ought to be described as “tension” rather than “conflict.” Science had indeed come to dominate American life more and more since the time of Darwin, and theology had indeed lost a degree of its former status as a trusted means of explaining reality. Many Christians rejected

⁹⁰ Ferenc M. Szasz, “The Scopes Trial in Perspective,” *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 30 (1971): 289.

⁹¹ Waggoner, “The Historiography of the Scopes Trial.”

the claims of scientists, and many materialists sought to use science to extinguish religion. But Roberts considered the conflict model—in which “the history of the relationship between science and Christian theology” was but a “steady triumph of the forces of enlightenment over the stubborn resistance of the forces of obscurantism”—to be a “caricature,” totally “inappropriate” and inadequate in describing the varieties and nuances of history.⁹² Roberts and other historians of this period countered the assumptions of the conflict model by uncovering previously-unknown facets of the Galileo affair, Sir Isaac Newton’s religious views, and sympathetic Christian responses to Darwin, all of which made the simplistic warfare thesis between science and religion unsustainable.⁹³

While these historians were bringing out the complexities of science/religion controversies, others turned their attention to fundamentalism and creationism. George M. Marsden’s *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (1980) and Ronald L. Numbers’s *The Creationists* (1992), for instance, advanced the same sort of more nuanced, less demeaning, and less conflict-oriented approach. As Numbers observed, “the creationist conflicts rarely conformed to the battle lines drawn” by the traditional warfare model. In spite of his

⁹² Jon H. Roberts, *Darwinism and the Divine in America: Protestant Intellectuals and Organic Evolution, 1859-1900* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988), iv-xv.

⁹³ Other key works include: James R. Moore, *The Post-Darwinian Controversies* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1979); George E. Webb, “The ‘Baconian’ Origins of Scientific Creationism,” *National Forum* 63.2 (1983): 33-35; Ronald L. Numbers, “Science and Religion,” *Osiris*, 2nd ser., 1 (1985): 59-80; David C. Lindberg and Ronald L. Numbers, eds., *God and Nature: Historical Essays on the Encounter between Christianity and Science* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986); David C. Lindberg and Ronald L. Numbers, “Beyond War and Peace: A Reappraisal of the Encounter between Christianity and Science,” *Church History* 55 (1986): 338-54; David N. Livingstone, *Darwin’s Forgotten Defenders: The Encounter Between Evolutionary Theory and Evangelical Thought* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987); John Hedley Brooke, *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Richard G. Olson, *Science and Religion, 1450-1900: From Copernicus to Darwin* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2004).

personal rejection of creationism, his book was a critical but congenial portrait of those advancing that view.⁹⁴

George Marsden paid unprecedented attention to the way twentieth-century fundamentalists and evangelicals viewed science. They had not, as had been assumed, rejected science completely. In fact, many fundamentalists, including William Jennings Bryan, held science in quite high regard. The reason they rejected evolution, he explained, was that they tended to adhere to an older, pre-Darwinian view of science. To fundamentalists, science continued to be understood in Baconian terms, as a process of testing and experimentation which would establish with certainty the laws and facts of the universe. This meant that they rejected evolution not simply because they considered it unbiblical, but because it required a kind of theorizing that lay outside their understanding of science. As a case in point, Marsden offered William Jennings Bryan, who described evolution as “merely hypothesis—it is millions of guesses strung together.”⁹⁵

It was in this context of a renewed and nuanced interest in science-religion controversies that Edward J. Larson published three major works that would shape future understandings of the Scopes trial. Larson held a J.D. from Harvard, a Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison (where he had studied under Ronald Numbers), and a history professorship at the University of Georgia. *Trial and Error: The American*

⁹⁴ Ronald L. Numbers, *The Creationists* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1992), 12-13. George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980). Both books would be updated in 2006.

⁹⁵ Marsden, *Fundamentalism*, 212-221 and George M. Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), especially chapter 5, “The Evangelical Love Affair with Enlightenment Science,” 122-152. See also Christopher P. Toumey’s discussion of “Creationism and Scientific Authority,” which include insights from anthropology, in Christopher P. Toumey, *God’s Own Scientists: Creationists in a Secular World* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1994), 14-28.

Controversy over Creation and Evolution (1st ed., 1985) dealt briefly with the Scopes trial before contextualizing it within subsequent creation-evolution controversies. *Sex, Race, and Science: Eugenics in the Deep South* (1995) was one of the first major books to trace the history of eugenics in the Southern United States, exploring the connection in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries between Darwinism and racially motivated sterilization programs intended to improve the human race. Finally, *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate over Science and Religion* (1997), for which Larson won the Pulitzer Prize, quickly gained a reputation as the trial's most definitive treatment yet.

Summer for the Gods was a unique and improved treatment of the Scopes trial for two reasons. First, Larson was able to access previously-unseen archival material from the American Civil Liberties Union, Bryan College, and other archives and libraries. Second, he was able to build upon the work of historians from the previous three decades, both those who had advanced a more accurate historiography of the trial (Szasz and Waggoner) and those who had established a balanced and scholarly approach to fundamentalism and creationism (Marsden, Numbers, and others). Indeed, as historian Barry Hankins later posited, "Larson's *Summer for the Gods* could not have been written between 1930 and 1980." He had needed others to go before him to "chip away at the well-worn notion that fundamentalism was gone forever, that the Scopes trial and other events of the 1920s had relegated traditional religion to the private sphere where only a small number of Americans would cling to its outmoded worldview." Hankins argued that it had been "the rise of the

Christian Right in the 1980s” that had finally caused historians to realize that fundamentalism had not died out, and therefore needed to be taken much more seriously.⁹⁶

In book reviews, it was Larson’s success in building on such scholarship that earned him the most praise from other historians. D.G. Hart lauded his “ability to humanize the trial” and his “refus[al] to portray the trial simply as a contest between dogma and reason.”⁹⁷ Ferenc M. Szasz, no doubt pleased to see the thesis of his 1971 *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* article finally represented in a major book on the trial, called *Summer for the Gods* “a welcome relief from the usual cartoon-like presentations as found in . . . *Inherit the Wind* . . . [it] provides a thoughtful, reasoned approach to comprehending a deep-rooted culture clash” and “illuminates the ambiguity and complexity of the case.”⁹⁸

Mark A. Noll concurred, writing, “The strength of the book lies in Larson’s careful construction of the trial’s timeline, his expert treatment of the case’s legal dimensions, and his painstaking analysis of how the Scopes legend grew.” It made “several notable contributions,” including its description of the oft-forgotten role of the ACLU, an accurate portrayal of Bryan—a man motivated by a populist, anti-capitalist, political philosophy most interested in the rights and needs of “America’s workers, farmers, women, children, and the poor”—and the way the legend of the trial shaped subsequent creation-evolution debates. But its “greatest contribution,” he said, “is in revealing how easily the public disputants

⁹⁶ Barry Hankins, *Jesus and Gin: Evangelicalism, the Roaring Twenties, and Today’s Culture Wars* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 104-105.

⁹⁷ D.G. Hart, review of *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America’s Continuing Debate over Science and Religion*, by Edward J. Larson, *American Historical Review* 104.1 (Feb. 1999): 206-207.

⁹⁸ Ferenc M. Szasz, review of *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America’s Continuing Debate over Science and Religion*, by Edward J. Larson, *Journal of Southern History* 66.1 (Feb. 2000): 154-155.

arguing about evolution in 1925 and since could slide from considering natural phenomena to making grandiose statements about ‘the nature of things.’” He concluded,

With the Scopes trial firmly fixed in the national consciousness and continuing to generate so much obscurantist nonsense even today, the dismaying evidence Larson presents with such skill helps explain why our public discourse on evolution and related matters in both religion and science has so rarely been marked by logic, reason, and restraint.⁹⁹

Overall, *Summer for the Gods* earned near-unanimous praise from those on both sides of the creation-evolution debate. One exception was historian Burt W. Folsom, Jr. (then a professor at Northwood University), who praised the book but for being “less biased than others,” but thought it was “still not a solid treatment of the subject.” Folsom, an antievolutionist, believed Larson had failed to perceive how well Bryan had actually done during his interrogation by Darrow. Folsom had, in fact, written an article on the topic in the late 1980s, explaining how Darrow repeatedly blundered—citing, for instance, “book of Elijah” in the Bible—and that Bryan had done quite well answering questions about Buddhism and Confucianism. Folsom’s article is, incidentally, never cited in Larson’s book.¹⁰⁰

The story of the historiography of the Scopes trial ends, in one sense, with *Summer for the Gods*. It rendered previous monographs on Scopes virtually obsolete and has yet to be superseded or seriously criticized by any newly-uncovered research or radically new perspective. Indeed, when Michael Lienesch published a new book on the Scopes trial a few years later, Michael Ruse dismissed it as “a book too far”:

⁹⁹ Mark A. Noll, review of *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate over Science and Religion*, by Edward J. Larson, *Isis* 90.2 (June 1999): 383-384.

¹⁰⁰ “Two Scopes Trial Myths Debunked,” *Human Events* 54.55 (Nov. 1998): 24; Burt W. Folsom, Jr., “The Scopes Trial Reconsidered,” *Continuity* 12 (1988): 103-127.

Larson wrote but ten years ago. Why on earth would anyone want to write another book on the Scopes trial, unless he or she had found some altogether new incriminating documents, for instance that Darrow had been paid by Christians to do a bad job or some such thing? . . . [Lienesch] takes us over the old ground once again, using much of the stuff that has gone before.¹⁰¹

In the years that followed the publication of *Summer for the Gods* (which would be reprinted in 2006 with a new afterword), a number of scholars published books and articles on various aspects and perspectives of the Scopes trial and antievolutionism from a view atop Larson's shoulders. These new works analyzed the trial's context within the 1920s, its connection to race and gender issues, its place within the antievolution movement, its connection to eugenics, and more, including two books that examined extant photographs from the trial.¹⁰²

The fourth phase understanding of the Scopes trial had begun with Bryan biographers Levine and Coletta, and the work of Larson and other historians interested in the creation-evolution conflict contributed further to a reevaluation of Bryan. One of his latest

¹⁰¹ Michael Ruse, review of *In the Beginning: Fundamentalism, the Scopes Trial, and the Making of the Antievolution Movement*, by Michael Lienesch, *Church History* 76.4 (Dec. 2007): 872.

¹⁰² Ronald L. Numbers's chapter on "The Scopes Trial: History and Legend" in *Darwinism Comes to America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), was published after *Summer for the Gods* but penned before it. Subsequent books that cite and expand upon Larson's book include: Paul Keith Conkin, *When All the Gods Trembled: Darwinism, Scopes, and American Intellectuals* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1998); Edward Caudill, ed. *The Scopes Trial: A Photographic History* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2000); Constance Areson Clark, "Evolution for John Doe: Pictures, the Public, and the Scopes Trial Debate," *Journal of American History* 87 (2001): 1275-1303; Jeffrey P. Moran, *The Scopes Trial: A Brief History with Documents* (New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2002), "Reading Race into the Scopes Trial: African American Elites, Science, and Fundamentalism," *Journal of American History* 90 (2003): 891-911, *American Genesis: The Evolution Controversies from Scopes to Creation Science* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); Charles A. Israel, *Before Scopes: Evangelicalism, Education, and Evolution in Tennessee, 1870-1925* (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 2004); Michael Lienesch, *In the Beginning: Fundamentalism, the Scopes Trial, and the Making of the Antievolution Movement* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Peter J. Bowler, *Monkey Trials and Gorilla Sermons: Evolution and Christianity from Darwin to Intelligent Design* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007); Karen L. Riley, Jennifer A. Brown, and Ray Braswell, "Inherit the Wind as an Appraisal of the American Teacher," *American Educational History Journal* (2007): 263-273; Marcel C. LaFollette, *Reframing Scopes: Journalists, Scientists, and the Lost Photographs from the Trial of the Century* (Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas, 2008); Adam Laats, *Fundamentalism and Education in the Scopes Era: God, Darwin, and the Roots of America's Culture Wars* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

biographers, Michael Kazin, summarized the dramatic shift in scholarly thinking about Bryan in his 2006 book, *A Godly Hero: The Life of William Jennings Bryan*:

Scholars have increasingly warmed to Bryan's motives, if not his actions . . . Midway through the twentieth century, such liberal historians as Richard Hofstadter and Ray Ginger shuddered at Bryan's religious "bigotry" and his mistrust of intellectuals. In recent years, however, the recognition that most evolutionists in the 1920s were dedicated to "improving" the human race through eugenics has made Bryan seem more sympathetic, even to a secular Darwinist such as Stephen Jay Gould and an unorthodox Catholic such as Garry Wills. For them, Bryan's rejection of modern biology was mitigated somewhat by his revulsion at the prospect of sterilizing the slow-witted and the disadvantaged.¹⁰³

But while scholars of the past half century may have moved away from Clarence Darrow's and H.L. Mencken's caricature of Bryan and his fundamentalist friends, revising the memory of the Scopes trial among the rest of Americans has been considerably more difficult. *Inherit the Wind*, which continues to be performed in countless high school and community theaters every year and experienced a revival on Broadway as recently as 2007, continues to offer the still-dominant orthodox view of the trial. The vast majority of the time, references or allusions to the Scopes trial in movies, plays, and television shows have reinforced this view.

In 1974, for instance, *Clarence Darrow*, a one-man show starring Henry Fonda, debuted on Broadway. The play was based on Irving Stone's highly sympathetic biography, *Clarence Darrow for the Defense* (1941), and was later broadcast on TV and sold in VHS and DVD format. It consists of an hour-long monologue in which Darrow tells the story of his life, highlighting his major accomplishments as a defender of the helpless. He comes

¹⁰³ Michael Kazin, *A Godly Hero: The Life of William Jennings Bryan* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2006), 263.

across as a tough but good-humored man who is concerned, above all, with justice for the oppressed and marginalized.

Toward the end of the play, Darrow discusses his involvement with the Scopes trial. “The most religious people, the most righteous believers of all,” he tells the audience, “are of course the Fundamentalists, who believe that every word of the Bible is literally true and don’t want the schools or anyone else teaching anything different. Noah got two of every species of animal on the ark, including a million insects.” Darrow then begins his interrogation of an imaginary Bryan, using some actual lines from the transcript combined with fictitious dialogue.¹⁰⁴

The stage directions in the play show how Darrow is intended to be portrayed. He is to talk about the fundamentalists “pleasantly, enjoying himself.” Following his remark about Noah’s ark, he is to stop and “scratch himself innocently.” But Darrow changes tone as he prepares to confront Bryan for battle, and “stripping off his jacket like a barroom fighter,” he slowly speaks his opponent’s name and approaches the “stand.” Reaching the climax of his argument, he looks “Bryan” in the eye and declares, “You say my argument’s going in one ear and out the other? I’m not surprised—there’s nothing in between to stop it!” Then, “he walks away, angry, to get his jacket . . . but he can’t stay mad; he’s enjoying himself too much.”¹⁰⁵ The Clarence Darrow played by Henry Fonda is virtually identical to the Clarence Darrow of *Inherit the Wind*: he has a bit of a temper (always for just causes), but is overall a reasonable, amicable, and likeable—and ultimately one-dimensional—man.

¹⁰⁴ David W. Rintels, *Clarence Darrow: A One-Man Play* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1975), 53.

¹⁰⁵ Rintels, *Clarence Darrow*, 53-59.

A handful of films and television shows in the second half of the twentieth century featured allusions to the Scopes trial which relied upon and reinforced the orthodox view. The original *Planet of the Apes* (1968), as well as episodes of *The Simpsons* and *Star Trek: Deep Space Nine*, incorporated science vs. religion themes in which questioners of religious orthodoxy were victimized or even formally tried for their scientific heresies, including belief in human (or ape) evolution. In the *Star Trek: Deep Space Nine* episode, a Scopes-like teacher was interrupted in the middle of a class for rejecting a treasured religious dogma. On *The Simpsons*, the local minister persuades the principal to teach creationism instead of evolution, and a court case ensues when students are caught covertly studying Darwin after school. In every episode, the religious characters were portrayed as dangerous at worst and naïve and ignorant at best, and were often driven by political motives, while the purported heretics are simply righteous and honest seekers of truth.¹⁰⁶

In 2011, however, a new film about the Scopes trial was released that directly challenged *Inherit the Wind*, relying on the latest scholarship to tell a new version of the story highly sympathetic to Bryan, the fundamentalists, and the town of Dayton. *Alleged*,

¹⁰⁶ *Planet of the Apes*, directed by Franklin J. Schaffner (APJAC Productions, 1968); “In the Hands of the Prophets,” *Star Trek: Deep Space Nine*, season no. 1, episode no. 20, first broadcast 20 June 1993 by CBS, directed by David Livingston and written by Robert Hewitt Wolfe; “Lisa the Skeptic,” *The Simpsons*, season no. 9, episode no. 8, first broadcast 23 Nov. 1997 by FOX, directed by Neil Affleck and written by David S. Cohen; “The Monkey Suit,” *The Simpsons*, season no. 17, episode no. 21, first broadcast 14 May 2006 by FOX, directed by Raymond S. Persi and written by J. Stewart Burns.

For further discussion of *Planet of the Apes*, see M. Keith Booker, *Alternate Americas: Science Fiction Film and American Culture* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2006), 102.

For description and analysis relating to these *Simpsons* episodes, see Mark I. Pinsky, *The Gospel According to the Simpsons* (Louisville : Westminster John Knox Press, 2001); Matthew Henry, “Gabbin’ About God: Religion, Secularity, and Satire on *The Simpsons*,” in *Homer Simpson Marches on Washington: Dissent through American Popular Culture*, ed. Timothy M. Dale and Joseph J. Foy (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2010): 141-166; Theresa Sanders, *Approaching Eden: Adam and Eve in Popular Culture* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2009).

which starred Fred Thompson as William Jennings Bryan, Brian Dennehy as Clarence Darrow, and Colm Meaney as H.L. Mencken, did not have a large budget and was only shown at a few film festivals before going straight to a DVD release. The film was distributed by Slingshot Pictures, a new “faith-based” division of Image Entertainment that heralded *Alleged* as its first release. It had an inspirational message marketed toward Christians (the DVD even came with a Bible-based discussion guide for use in churches), but also introduced viewers to many previously-ignored aspects of the trial with which only historians tended to be familiar.¹⁰⁷

The plot of *Alleged*, which billed itself as a romantic drama, revolves around the fictitious Charles Anderson, a young reporter in Dayton trying to launch a career, and his fiancée, Rose. When H.L. Mencken comes to town to cover the Scopes trial, Anderson quickly latches into him, trying to impress him enough to land a job with the *Baltimore Sun*. Charles finds himself in the midst of a moral dilemma when he discovers that Mencken’s success as a journalist has come from writing sensational stories that ignored the facts. Charles becomes torn between reporting on the trial as it is actually happening, and blatantly caricaturing Bryan and the fundamentalists, as his new mentor is doing. At the end of the film, he must choose between ambition and honesty as he prepares to write a story about Darrow’s cross-examination of Bryan.

Alleged introduces a large number of themes and facts about the trial that undermine the orthodox, *Inherit the Wind* narrative. The most prominent theme, media bias, provokes viewers to question whether the story they have always heard about the trial was true, or only

¹⁰⁷ *Alleged*, DVD, directed by Tom Hines (Chatsworth, Calif.: Slingshot Pictures, 2011).

what is “alleged” to have happened. A second theme is the association between evolution and eugenics, which is developed by a significant sub-plot involving Rose’s half-sister, a kind but unintelligent half-black girl who has been marked for sterilization after a poor score on an IQ test. In one scene, racist selections from Hunter’s *Biology* are read to Mencken, who laughs and walks away, smiling in approval.

The roles of William Jennings Bryan and Clarence Darrow are quite closer to what we know about the actual men than are their counterparts in *Inherit the Wind*. Bryan objects to evolution because of its social implications and its connection to eugenics and unbridled capitalism, and posits Friedrich Nietzsche, Margaret Sanger, and Leopold and Loeb as infamous examples of Darwin’s influence. His kindness is evident when he offers to pay Scopes’s fine for him. The film also emphasizes the fact that Bryan had originally agreed to go on the witness stand only if Darrow would go on it the following day. When Bryan finds out he will not have that opportunity he is angry and distraught, realizing that he will not have the opportunity to show whether Darrow even knew the answers to his own questions. But as it turns out, even without a cross-examination of Darrow, a number of townspeople (including Charles) were convinced that Bryan had already shown himself to be the wiser and more honorable of the two.

Bryan is not, however, uplifted at Darrow’s expense, for the defense attorney is allowed to come across as a quite likeable character (the racist, sexist, bigoted Mencken alone is the true antagonist). Darrow is not necessarily more intelligent than Bryan, as the film suggests when Darrow refers during a speech to the nonexistent biblical books of “1

Elijah” and “Samson.” The film also raises questions over evolution, as it shows Darrow uneasy about the evidence his expert witnesses planned to show for evolution, including supposed missing links such as Java Man and Nebraska Man, as well as recapitulation theory. Interestingly, however, Darrow plays a key role in the film’s resolution when he helps Charles prevent the sterilization of Rose’s sister. The real Clarence Darrow was in fact, unlike many of his evolutionist companions, passionately opposed to eugenics.¹⁰⁸

Overall, *Alleged* presents a narrative of the Scopes trial that, with the possible exception of Mencken, avoids caricaturing its subjects. It also introduces numerous explicit and subtle historical corrections to the orthodox view of the trial which make Bryan, the people of Dayton, and the fundamentalists considerably more reasonable and likeable. These were in fact the primary goals of the film, according to screenwriter and producer Fred Foote. Foote, who had never written a screenplay before and financed the four million dollar film with his family’s charity organization, wanted to create a film that challenged the inaccuracies of *Inherit the Wind* and told the “true” story of the trial. “It’d be like dueling movies,” he described in one interview.¹⁰⁹ Foote also wanted to explicitly show the connection between evolution and eugenics. He explained,

This aspect of the trial (including its inclusion in the textbook that Scopes allegedly used) has been dropped down the memory hole.

Why? Precisely because it was advanced by the same materialist elites then as who run the public schools and major media outlets today. With the support of our leading Universities and the rest of the scientific establishment, 60,000 Americans were sterilized in the name of eugenics. Who opposed it? Who forecasted that this

¹⁰⁸ See Clarence Darrow, “The Eugenics Cult,” *The American Mercury* 8.30 (1926), 129-137.

¹⁰⁹ Liz Shaw, “‘Alleged’ Screenwriter Fred Foote Discusses the Story behind His Story on the Scopes Monkey Trial,” *Flint Journal*, 24 Sept. 2009, http://www.mlive.com/news/flint/index.ssf/2009/09/alleged_screenwriter_fred_foot.html.

doctrine was harmful? William Jennings Bryan, the Catholic Church, Billy Sunday, and others, of course.¹¹⁰

Foote's suspicion toward American universities is somewhat evident in the film, which ends with a surprising quote from John Scopes himself: "There is more intolerance in higher education than in all the mountains of Tennessee."

The film was perhaps best received by antievolutionists (although no antievolutionist organizations were directly involved in its production). John West of the Discovery Institute excitedly wrote a review of the film entitled, "New Film Exposes Bigotry and Junk Science of Early Twentieth-Century Darwinists."¹¹¹ Answers in Genesis, likewise, lauded the film for revealing "how the major media delivered a distorted view of the trial in an attempt to attack biblical Christianity."¹¹² Nonetheless, it should not be assumed that *Alleged* is a mere antievolutionist rebuttal to *Inherit the Wind*. It is a film that, for the most part, reflected the latest scholarship on the Scopes trial and raised important questions rarely considered in the popular memory of the trial.

As of the second decade of the twenty-first century, the orthodox memory of the Scopes trial remains the one that most Americans are most likely to encounter. As long as *Inherit the Wind* retains its popularity—and there are no signs that it will lose it anytime soon—historians will have a difficult time reaching the public with the more nuanced and

¹¹⁰ Matthew Milam, "An Interview with Fred Foote, Co-Writer and Producer of 'Alleged,'" ChicagoNow, 20 Aug. 2010, <http://www.chicagonow.com/matthew-milams-films-and-music/2010/08/an-interview-with-fred-foote-co-writer-and-producer-of-alleged/>.

¹¹¹ John G. West, "New Film Exposes Bigotry and Junk Science of Early Twentieth-Century Darwinists," Evolution News and Views, 10 Nov. 2011, http://www.evolutionnews.org/2011/11/new_film_exposes_bigotry_and_j052751.html.

¹¹² "The Scopes Retrial," Answers in Genesis, 24 July 2010, <https://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v5/n3/scopes-retrial>.

more thoughtful understanding they have developed in recent decades. Indeed, for half a century now, two dominant memories of the Scopes trial have developed, one among most of the public, and the other among historians. Although the work of historians periodically breaks through into some of the public's consciousness—in the form of a Pulitzer prize winning book, a scarcely-noticed film, or (as we will see in later chapters) books written for juvenile audiences and a festival held in Dayton, Tennessee—the memory most Americans have of what happened in Dayton in 1925 continues to owe more to a 1955 play than to the events themselves.

CHAPTER 2

Juvenile Literature on the Scopes Trial

About twenty books on the trial have been published for children and young adults since the 1970s. Almost all of these books were written either by teachers or by writers who specialize in the genre of juvenile literature. One author was a successful novelist. Marketed for schools and libraries, these books have been, next to history textbooks and *Inherit the Wind*, one of the primary ways that children (and their teachers) have learned about the Scopes trial.

Because these books were not written by professional historians, but by authors who depended upon the history books available to them at the time, their content reflects the influence of new scholarly works on the Scopes trial. One can easily imagine one such author walking into a public or university library, perusing the catalog for relevant books, and sitting down to research and write a book of thirty to one hundred pages—perhaps under a strict deadline.

For this study, I am most interested in two aspects of this process. First, what works did these authors use in their research? Second, when and how did the shift in Scopes historiography that began to take place in the 1960s start influencing these writers? While a study of this nature will depend on some broad generalizations (for which there are some noteworthy exceptions), we will see that overall, it was not until the publication of *Summer for the Gods* in the late 1990s that writers of juvenile literature began to catch up with the

progress historians had been making for the past thirty years. And even then, a number of books in the 2000s have continued to perpetuate the third-phase orthodox perspective of the trial, now discarded by historians.

As a way of gauging each book's perspective, we will pay close attention to the tone and content of four aspects of the trial. First, how are Bryan and the fundamentalists portrayed? Second, how is Darrow's interrogation of Bryan presented, and what significance is attributed to it? Third, what is their perspective on *Inherit the Wind*? And fourth, to what degree do they introduce moral complexities such as eugenics into the story?¹¹³

¹¹³ "Pre-Larson" books include, in chronological order: Miriam Gurko, *Clarence Darrow* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1965); Alice Kosner, *The Voice of the People: William Jennings Bryan* (New York: Julian Messner, 1970); Mary Lee Settle, *The Scopes Trial* (New York: F. Watts, 1972); D.C. Ipsen. *Eye of the Whirlwind: the Story of John Scopes* (Reading, MA : Addison- Wesley, 1973); Bill Lacy. *The Trial of John Scopes: a Re-creation of John Scopes' Trial in 1925, Debating Man's Origin-Science vs. Fundamentalism* (El Cajon, Calif. : Interaction Publishers, DBA Interact, 1980, 1992) [This is not a normal book, but a teacher's guide to leading a class in a reenactment of the trial]; Tom McGowen, *The Great Monkey Trial: Science Verses Fundamentalism in America*, A Twentieth Century American History Book (New York: Franklin Watts, 1990); John Evans Driemen, *Clarence Darrow* (New York : Chelsea House, 1992); Robert A. Allen, *William Jennings Bryan: Golden-Tongued Orator* (Milford, Mich.: Mott Media, 1992); Ellen Hansen, *Evolution on Trial* (Lowell, Mass.: Discovery Enterprises, 1994); Arthur Blake, *The Scopes Trial: Defending the Right to Teach*, Spotlight on American History (Brookfield, Conn.: Millbrook, 1994); Don Nardo, *The Scopes Trial*, Famous Trials (San Diego: Lucent Books, 1997).

"Post-Larson" books include: Betsy Harvey Kraft, *Sensational Trials of the 20th Century* (New York: Scholastic Press, 1998); Freya Ottam Hanson, *The Scopes Monkey Trial: A Headline Court Case*, Headline Court Cases Series (Berkeley Heights, N.J.: Enslow Publishers, 2000); Renee Graves, *The Scopes Trial*, Cornerstones of Freedom (New York: Children's Press, 2003); Steven P. Olson, *The Trial of John T. Scopes: A Primary Source Account*, Great Trials of the 20th Century (New York: Rosen Pub. Group, 2004); *The Scopes Trial: Interpreting Alternate Viewpoints in Four Primary Source Documents*, Debating the Documents (Fort Atkinson, WI : Highsmith, 2004) [This is not a normal book, but a slim teaching packet on photographs and political cartoons about the trial]; Sabrina Crewe and Michael V. Uschan, *The Scopes "Monkey" Trial*, Landmark Events in American History (Milwaukee, WI : World Almanac Library, 2005); Anne Janette Johnson, *The Scopes "Monkey Trial," Defining Moments*, (Detroit: Omnigraphics, 2007); Stephanie Fitzgerald, *The Scopes Trial: The Battle Over Teaching Evolution*, Snapshots in History (Minneapolis: Compass Point Books, 2007); Jim Whiting, *The Scopes Monkey Trial*, Monumental Milestones: Great Events of Modern Times (Hockessin, Del.: Mitchell Lane Publishers, 2007); Kathainn M. Kowalski, *Evolution on Trial: From the Scopes "Monkey" Case to Inherit the Wind*, Famous Court Cases that Became Movies (Berkeley Heights, NJ : Enslow, 2009); Samuel Willard Crompton, *The Scopes Monkey Trial: The Debate Over Evolution*, Milestones in American History (New York: Chelsea House, 2010); Michael Burgan, *The Scopes Trial: Faith, Science, and American Education* (Tarrytown, N.Y.: Marshall Cavendish Benchmark, 2011).

Between 1965, the year the first book on the Scopes trial (or its main characters) aimed at younger audiences was published, and 1998, the year of the first one that cited *Summer for the Gods*, eleven books were published for juvenile audiences. The sources most widely used in these books generally represent the third-phase orthodox view of the trial: De Camp's *Great Monkey Trial* (cited in eight), Irving Stone's admiring biography, *Clarence Darrow for the Defense* (cited in seven), Ginger's *Six Days or Forever?* (cited in six), Scopes's memoir, *Center of the Storm* (cited in six), and Darrow's memoir, *The Story of My Life* (cited in five).¹¹⁴

Books published after 1998 relied primarily on a different set of scholarly works. Some of the older ones were still mentioned, though with less frequency: De Camp was cited in only two books, Ginger in three, and Stone in none. The two most widely used works of this period became Larson's *Summer for the Gods* (cited in eight books) and law professor Douglas O. Linder's "Famous Trials" website (cited in five).¹¹⁵ The next-most-popular books were a mixture of the old and the new: Darrow's *The Story of My Life*, Scopes's *Center of the Storm*, Freya Ottam Hanson's 2000 book *The Scopes Monkey Trial: A Headline*

¹¹⁴ These data come from the bibliographies, works consulted pages, footnotes, or recommendations for further reading found within these books.

¹¹⁵ Douglas O. Linder, professor at the University of Missouri-Kansas City Law School, created his "Famous Trials" website in 1996 (<http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/ftrials.htm>). It contains information and primary sources on dozens of famous trials through history, including the Scopes trial. As of 2003, it was averaging about 600,000 visitors per month. See Linder, "Goals and Purpose of the Famous Trials Site," Famous Trials. <http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/trialsgoals.html>; Carl S. Kaplan, "Rounding up the Century's Greatest Trials Online," *Cyber Law Journal*, 15 Oct. 1999, <http://partners.nytimes.com/library/tech/99/10/cyber/cyberlaw/15law.html>.

Court Case (which was itself a work of juvenile literature), and PBS's 2002 "Monkey Trial" episode in its series on *The American Experience* were all cited in four different books.¹¹⁶

In the analysis that follows, we will make some generalizations about the content of these books. Each book is of course a unique work, and a much different sort of paper could be written about their differences. Furthermore, while books written before 1998 tended to follow the orthodox view of the trial and books written afterwards tended to follow fourth-phase historians, there were notable exceptions to this rule. Nonetheless, grouping the books together into "pre-Larson" and "post-Larson" books reveals general patterns in tone and content that offer insightful conclusions.

Nearly all pre-Larson juvenile works describe William Jennings Bryan and his fellow fundamentalist Christians according to the orthodox view, emphasizing their alleged ignorance and bigotry. Southern fundamentalists were "intellectually starved," "resentful," "hurt and bitter," and fundamentalist leaders were characterized by "fear—and the hate that always attends it."¹¹⁷ They represented "a system which prevents . . . academic freedom in an atmosphere of narrow-mindedness and ignorance."¹¹⁸ They had "contempt for scientific discoveries." During the trial, as Bryan prepared to give a speech, "Fundamentalists licked their chops and rubbed their hands in glee."¹¹⁹ A number of post-Larson works carried on these descriptions, asserting that the fundamentalists "had little interest in education . . . They

¹¹⁶ PBS's "Monkey Trial" featured interviews with historians Edward Larson, Lawrence Levine, and Paul Boyer, as well as Eugenie Scott and Phillip Johnson. A transcript of the program is available online: "Monkey Trial." *American Experience*, PBS, 2002, <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/monkeytrial/filmmore/pt.html>. The special billed itself as "An all-out duel between science and religion."

¹¹⁷ Settle, *Scopes Trial*, 16, 21, 27.

¹¹⁸ Lacy, *Trial of John Scopes*, 3.

¹¹⁹ McGowen, *Great Monkey Trial*, 44, 67.

did not *think* about religion, they *felt* it.”¹²⁰ The authors frequently assumed that all fundamentalists were devoted to young-earth creationism.

These descriptions of Bryan and the fundamentalists tended to conform precisely to the impression Clarence Darrow intended to advance at the Scopes trial. Bryan was “a sincere, honorable man . . . a liberal . . . However, it appears that Bryan was not a very deep thinker. Apparently, he would form opinions about things he did not understand very well, or didn’t understand at all, and never both to find out if his opinion was valid or not.”¹²¹ This “mangy . . . caricature of a backcountry politician” had one “abiding weakness, shared by his followers . . . He never asked a question. He only answered. He believed with his heart and let his mind grow rigid.”¹²² They also followed Darrow (as well as the conflict thesis in general) in asserting that the trial was a simplistic matter of “science vs. religion.” Bryan had never agreed with this assessment, preferring instead to describe the conflict in terms of “evolution vs. Christianity.” As discussed in the previous chapter, Bryan had a very high view of science, though his view of science was quite different from Darrow’s. But such nuances tended to be overlooked in these books. One author placed Darrow’s view in Bryan’s mouth, writing, “In his opening statement, Bryan flatly declared that the trial was a matter of ‘science versus religion.’”¹²³ Another provided her own take on what was at stake: “At its core, the 1925 Scopes Trial pitted science against religion.”¹²⁴ Yet another author

¹²⁰ Kraft, *Sensational Trials*, 25.

¹²¹ McGowen, *Great Monkey Trial*, 43.

¹²² Settle, *Scopes Trial* 18, 61-65.

¹²³ Dreimen, *Clarence Darrow*, 93.

¹²⁴ Hansen, *Evolution on Trial*, 12.

took a middle view by titling his book “Science versus Fundamentalism.”¹²⁵ This particular book quite bluntly takes sides against the fundamentalists. Its preface, written by Stephen Jay Gould, assures the young readers that “we are as sure evolution occurred as we are that the earth revolves around the sun,” while describing the trial as “a confrontation that pitted modern scientific knowledge against the Old Testament stories of the Bible.”¹²⁶

Another book singles out young-earth creationists and people who believe in miracles as rejecting reason and scientific evidence, relying instead on the emotional appeal of the Bible as the basis for their thinking.¹²⁷ Some later books, however, minimize the scientific controversy altogether. One described “the Conflict” in terms of whether “school boards or state governments [would] decide what parts of scientific knowledge should be excluded from the curriculum.” This statement does, on the other hand, treat evolution as established “scientific knowledge,” and so reframes the issue while still affirming which side included the real scientists.¹²⁸

One work included in this survey is a published educational guide for teachers and students to use in their classrooms to help them to re-enact the trial. Each student assigned to role-play as one of the major trial participants is to prepare by reading a character sketch, and the one on Bryan reads as if it had been written by an actor preparing for *Inherit the Wind*:

You love the spotlight . . . You fervently believe in the fundamentalist cause and will do anything to further it while ridiculing science . . . Emphasize that any person who ‘preaches’ a theory which puts godless science in authority over Divine Scriptures should be punished . . . Stand tall and proud during this trial. Wrap your religious

¹²⁵ McGowen, *Great Monkey Trial*.

¹²⁶ McGowen, *Great Monkey Trial*, 11, 17.

¹²⁷ Blake, *Scoeps Trial*, 57-60.

¹²⁸ Crompton, *Scopes Monkey Trial*, 3.

beliefs around you like a warm comforter . . . Defend the Butler Act. Point out that this trial is a duel between science and religion. There is no compromise. A person cannot be devoted to both causes . . . You believe that every word in the Bible should be interpreted *literally* . . . believing in the Bible excludes believing in science and evolution.

Instructing the student on how to interrogate a scientist who will be put on the witness stand, the materials suggest that he angrily protest, “You’re just another one of these Godless scientists called here to sneak in some heretical evidence and damage our beliefs, aren’t you, professor?”¹²⁹

The one trait of Bryan that is consistently praised in these books is his rhetorical skill. “The beautiful voice of William Jennings Bryan ebbed and flowed, played and sang over the courtroom,” wrote one author.¹³⁰ Bryan “passionately and eloquently defended the truth of Scripture,” wrote another.¹³¹ Ultimately, however, Bryan’s speaking ability is not a positive quality. It has two primary effects: moving the mindless masses of fundamentalists and hiding Bryan’s own lack of intelligence.¹³²

Regarding Bryan’s conduct during the trial, one book described the “familiar sight” of “Bryan’s lecturing tone and posture.”¹³³ Bryan is inaccurately said to have “no familiarity with the work of Darwin,” caring about nothing but “that the Bible should not be questioned.”¹³⁴ One caption accompanying a photograph of Bryan reads, “Fan in hand, Bryan appears to listen respectfully to testimony during the trial. In truth, he tried to ridicule

¹²⁹ Lacy, *Trial of John Scopes*, 4, 15, 30, 31, 34.

¹³⁰ Settle, *Scopes Trial*, 90.

¹³¹ Blake, *Scopes Trial*, 48.

¹³² For an analysis of the way Clarence Darrow, H.L. Mencken, and *Inherit the Wind* similarly portrayed Bryan as eloquent but mindless, see Kary Doyle Smout, *The Creation/Evolution Controversy: A Battle for Cultural Power* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1998), 74-77, 83-84.

¹³³ Blake, *Scopes Trial*, 30.

¹³⁴ Blake, *Scopes Trial*, 39.

the defense.” The caption accompanying Darrow’s picture says nothing negative about his own controversial and frequently offensive conduct.¹³⁵

Even some of the books written after *Summer for the Gods* carried on inaccurate or overly-negative descriptions of Bryan. One author, discussing Bryan’s earlier life, noted that “Woodrow Wilson appointed him secretary of state, but from the beginning it was clear Bryan was not cut out for the job.”¹³⁶ This author seems to have been unaware that Bryan stepped down because Wilson changed his position about whether the United States should enter the First World War, and therefore assumed that his incompetence was the real reason. Many of these later works, however, treated Bryan much more sympathetically and more thoroughly explained his real motives for opposing the teaching of evolution in public schools. “Bryan did not oppose science or the teaching of facts,” one author wrote. “But he believed that students should not learn ideas about creation that could not be proven. He called the theory of evolution a ‘guess.’ Bryan also said citizens had the right to control what was taught in the public schools they supported through taxes.”¹³⁷ Bryan’s line of reasoning at the trial becomes much more coherent and even clever, such as when he quoted from Darrow’s arguments in the Leopold and Loeb trial to show the potentially detrimental impact that ideas can have on young people (an argument rarely mentioned in earlier works).¹³⁸ But more significant than this additional information on Bryan is the way that negative assessments of his intellect or motives became increasingly uncommon.

¹³⁵ Blake, *Scopes Trial*, 38.

¹³⁶ Kraft, *Sensational Trials*, 28.

¹³⁷ Burgan, *Scopes Trial*, 25; see also Whiting, *Scopes Monkey Trial*, 17, 27.

¹³⁸ Burgan, *Scopes Trial*, 39.

Earlier works tended to portray Clarence Darrow in a positive light. It was not uncommon for authors to describe him as significantly brighter and better educated than Bryan. As one author described, “He had a brilliant legal mind that he improved by constant reading . . . he often fell asleep while reading late into the night.”¹³⁹ Bryan’s own enthusiastic love for reading tended to be overlooked or even denied.¹⁴⁰ The trial re-enactment guide for students offers significantly different advice to the student playing Darrow than to the one playing Bryan: “If you wish to be inspired during your planning to role-play Clarence Darrow,” it says, “find and read portions of his autobiography.”¹⁴¹ No comparable suggestion is made for the other student to to read Bryan’s *Memoirs*. In another work, Darrow “happened to land on the side of the future and to serve it well. Bryan’s and the country’s tragedy was that his talents could only serve the past.”¹⁴² Darrow appears most noble and triumphant in a 1992 biography, in which the author gushed, “Clarence Darrow . . . loved the common people. He dedicated his life to them. His greatness and brilliance were matched only by his humility.”¹⁴³ Such descriptions and imbalanced comparisons between Bryan and Darrow appear much more rarely in post-Larson works.¹⁴⁴

¹³⁹ Blake, *Scopes Trial*, 22.

¹⁴⁰ Settle’s early work, *Scopes Trial*, portrays both Bryan and Darrow negatively. For more comment on Settle, see Lawrence Mark Bernabo, “The Scopes Myth: The Scopes Trial in Rhetorical Perspective” (Ph.D. diss., University of Iowa, 1990), 407-414. Bernabo describes the book as “an interesting combination of pro-evolution and pro-South. One of the few works to chastise both Darrow and Bryan, Settle takes the prosecution to task for challenging science and chid[es] the defense for stereotypical thinking about the people of Dayton, Tennessee and the South” (407). Nonetheless, in my opinion Settle makes a number of exaggerated sweeping generalizations, such as the ones quoted in this paper.

¹⁴¹ Lacy, *Trial of John Scopes*, 33.

¹⁴² Settle, *Scopes Trial* 112.

¹⁴³ Dreimen, *Clarence Darrow*, 106. Another biographer wrote that his dominant traits were “the love of knowledge, the fearless search for truth, the application of reason and tolerance to the solution of human conflicts. . . . The prime motive of his nature was compassion. . . . He was a giant of his own age and, in courage, spirit, and crusading energy, an inspiration to ours” (Gurko, *Clarence Darrow*, 267). The same author

Just as at the trial itself, John Scopes himself received considerably less attention than did Bryan and Darrow. Some books portray him heroically. He became “renowned as a person who let his conscience be his guide against a law he felt to be unjust.”¹⁴⁵ The educated young teacher, who “grew up with a lively and curious imagination” in “a family that believed in academic freedom,” “felt that he had to” oppose the antievolution law, even though it “would be a risk to his career.”¹⁴⁶ But many books (both before and after Larson) identify his role as being a minor one. “The story of John Scopes is the story of perhaps the world’s most famous bystander . . . Scopes remained little more than an interested spectator . . . he spent most of his life trying to shake what he had called ‘the monkey on my back.’”¹⁴⁷ The young teacher “faded into the background, and the leading lawyers on either side of the duel took center stage.”¹⁴⁸ Some books describe his admission to a reporter that he had never actually taught evolution.¹⁴⁹ Descriptions of Scopes’s heroism and irrelevance may be found in both older and newer books. Overall, portrayals of John Scopes did not noticeably change in the early 2000s, as did portrayals of Bryan and Darrow. Scopes remains a highly sympathetic character but not especially important character.¹⁵⁰

is considerably less impressed by Bryan: he “loved to eat and found it hard to stop nibbling between his gargantuan meals” (214).

¹⁴⁴ A consistent exception is Kraft, *Sensational Trials* (1998), who describes how Darrow “had studied all the world’s religions and had read the Bible and everything Darwin had ever written,” while ignoring the fact that Bryan had done the same, and had even written a book on world religions (28). For an account of Bryan’s knowledge of world religions, see Burt W. Folsom, Jr., “The Scopes Trial Reconsidered,” *Continuity* 12 (1988): 103-127.

¹⁴⁵ Johnson, *Scopes “Monkey Trial,”* 5.

¹⁴⁶ Blake, *Scopes Trial*, 16, Olson, *Trial of John T. Scopes*, 12

¹⁴⁷ Ipsen, *Eye of the Whirlwind*, 156.

¹⁴⁸ Burgan, *Scopes Trial*, 20.

¹⁴⁹ Settle, *Scopes Trial* 54, 110; Whiting, *Scopes Monkey Trial*, 26.

¹⁵⁰ In a copy of Hanson’s book that I received through interlibrary loan from Appalachian State University, someone had written “I love John!” and a heart in pink highlighter over Scopes’s picture in the front

One of the most striking differences between pre- and post-Larson books is the way they describe Darrow's interrogation of Bryan and the significance they attribute to it. Earlier books tended to portray Darrow as the protagonist who, though he may be overly cruel, is in near-total control of the situation, while Bryan grows increasingly angry and upset. Earlier books also tended to claim that Bryan's admission that the days of creation may have lasted millions of years and the crowd's alleged reaction of horror was a turning point in the interrogation. Later books usually depicted this event in a more nuanced way, observing that different people viewed the interrogation and its significance in ways that reflected their preconceptions.

When Darrow called Bryan to the witness stand to testify as an expert on the Bible—"the high point in Darrow's spectacular career"—Bryan is said to have been either horrified at the prospect or oblivious to the pending disaster.¹⁵¹ One book describes both reactions at the same time: he "seemed to freeze in shock," but then "cheerfully agreed."¹⁵² Darrow's interrogation is an extraordinarily traumatizing experience for Bryan. At first, he "nervously awaited Darrow's examination."¹⁵³ As the session progressed, Bryan "snapped," "scowled," and "angrily shrieked out," "screaming, hysterical."¹⁵⁴ He was "confused and rattled," his "composure . . . rapidly disappearing as Darrow led him into a minefield of contradictions,

of the book. The sticky notes this reader had left throughout the book with notes on them indicated that she was probably a young teacher preparing to teach the book to an elementary school class.

¹⁵¹ Dreimen, *Clarence Darrow*, 15.

¹⁵² McGowen, *Great Monkey Trial*, 82.

¹⁵³ Blake, *Scopes Trial*, 45.

¹⁵⁴ McGowen, *Great Monkey trial*, 86-88, Crewe and Uschan, *Scopes "Monkey" Trial*, 22, Settle, *Scopes Trial*, 108.

memory lapses, and nervous responses.”¹⁵⁵ Bryan becomes Darrow’s “perspiring witness,” while Darrow appears to both figuratively and literally keep his cool.¹⁵⁶ By the time the interrogation is approaching the end, Bryan had become “noticeably less assured” and increasingly “exhausted, confused, and ashamed.”¹⁵⁷ On the witness stand, his “profound ignorance” was “exposed as a scalpel.”¹⁵⁸

As in *Inherit the Wind*, Bryan seems utterly bewildered by the questions that are put before him. After having spent his life as a great orator who had toured the country, winning the hearts of the thousands who sucked in every word of his powerful speeches, he becomes helpless when he is forced (apparently for the first time) to actually think about his beliefs. “Under Darrow’s remorseless questioning, it became obvious that Bryan was almost completely ignorant of all of the proven, established facts of archaeology, geology, and the origins of languages and that he did not even quite understand what gravity was.”¹⁵⁹ Darrow “managed . . . to show that Bryan did not know enough about science to have any valid opinions about it.”¹⁶⁰ “Bryan’s voice rose lamely,” one author wrote:

Stripped away from Bryan were all his protections of fame and brilliance, his fantastic talent as an orator, and the love of his followers. He sat before intelligence, the one attribute he had ignored, belittled, and hidden from since he, the unquestioning son of a small-town Puritan father, had succeeded as Americans succeeded, through being popular—like the heroes of Horatio Alger and a thousand

¹⁵⁵ Kraft, *Sensational Trials*, 43.

¹⁵⁶ Kraft, *Sensational Trials*, 43.

¹⁵⁷ Gurko, *Clarence Darrow*, 230; Olson, *Trial of John T. Scopes*, 50.

¹⁵⁸ Settle, *Scopes Trial*, 110.

¹⁵⁹ McGowen, *Great Monkey Trial*, 85. The alleged gravity reference does not seem to be recorded in the trial transcript.

¹⁶⁰ Blake, *Scopes Trial*, 46.

matinees—as a defender of the right, his country, and his God. It was a slaughter.¹⁶¹

When Bryan’s foolish answers provoked audience members to “burst into laughter . . . Bryan turned to glare at them. He was not used to being laughed at and obviously did not like it.”¹⁶²

Even direct excerpts from the trial transcript are tweaked in order to convey this tone, as in one book where “(confused)” is inserted before one of his more ambiguous lines.¹⁶³ The line is Bryan’s response to Darrow’s question: “Do you think about things that you do think about?” to which Bryan responds, “Well, sometimes.” This line is quoted in many of these books as an indication of his confusion. However, given the sense of humor Bryan constantly displayed in other answers to Darrow, it is quite possible that Bryan spoke this line in jest.

Bryan is also sometimes said to have unquestioningly accepted Bishop Ussher’s 4004 B.C. date of creation.¹⁶⁴ Two books (one before and one after Larson) go even further, having Bryan provide the exact date and time of creation: October 23 at 9:00 A.M., a date “widely accepted by Fundamentalists.”¹⁶⁵ At this point in the trial, one book claims, “At this time, an unknown person in the audience yelled out, ‘Eastern Standard Time!’ Not used to

¹⁶¹ Settle, *Scopes Trial*, 106. Mary Lee Settle was a successful writer who won the national book award in 1978 for her novel, *Blood Tie*. Her prose may not be entirely accurate or objective, but it clearly makes for fine reading.

¹⁶² McGowen, *Great Monkey Trial*, 83.

¹⁶³ Blake, *Scopes Trial*, 46.

¹⁶⁴ Gurko, *Clarence Darrow*, 229; Lacy, *Trial of John Scopes*, 17; Nardo, *Scopes Trial*, 71; Olson, *Trial of John T. Scopes*, 47-48.

¹⁶⁵ Olson, *Trial of John T. Scopes*, 47-48.

such mockery, Bryan frowned.”¹⁶⁶ In fact, this line first appeared in *Inherit the Wind*, in which it was spoken by Darrow’s character.¹⁶⁷

The alleged “pinnacle of the trial,” however, was when Darrow trapped Bryan into admitting that the days of Genesis may have represented millions of years.¹⁶⁸ Books that take the orthodox narrative almost always emphasize the audience’s reaction: “the entire courtroom gasped at Bryan’s answer” for denying the truthfulness of Scripture.¹⁶⁹ Overall, the dramatic confrontation is presented precisely the way Darrow had hoped: “Darrow had clearly won the day, but it was a bittersweet victory. He had exposed Bryan and the fundamentalists as naïve, unthinking, and out of touch. But in the process, he had destroyed a great hero.”¹⁷⁰

Some post-Larson books carry on the orthodox narrative about the interrogation (particularly Kraft, Olson, and Crompton). Other works, however, adopt a more academic tone. Rather than identifying the interrogation as the most crucial part of the trial and

¹⁶⁶ Nardo, *Scopes Trial*, 71.

¹⁶⁷ “DRUMMOND: That Eastern Standard Time? (*Laughter*) Or Rocky Mountain Time? (*More laughter* It wasn’t daylight-saving time, was it? Because the Lord didn’t make the sun until the fourth day!” In Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 96.

¹⁶⁸ Dreimen, *Clarence Darrow*, 96.

¹⁶⁹ Lacy, *Trial of John Scopes*, 33; see also McGowen, *Great Monkey Trial*, 85, 87-88, who also claims that people rebuked Bryan afterward; Dreimen, *Clarence Darrow*, 97; Gurko, *Clarence Darrow*, 229; Blake, *Scopes Trial*, 46; Kraft, *Sensational Trials*, 44; Olson, *Trial of John T. Scopes*, 48; Hansen, *Evolution on Trial*, 37) Some early accounts claimed this (i.e. the *New York Times*), but it is not clear the degree to which they were actually shocked because the day-age theory was widely accepted among fundamentalists, as Numbers has shown in *Darwinism Comes to America*. Furthermore, if there were people in the audience who were shocked, who were they—fundamentalist Christians or northern reporters?

¹⁷⁰ Kraft, *Sensational Trials*, 44. The tone reflects Darrow’s in his autobiography: triumph tempered by pity. “The people seemed to feel that he had failed and deserted his cause and his followers when he admitted that the first six days might have been periods of millions of ages long. Mr. Bryan had made himself ridiculous and had contradicted his own faith. I was truly sorry for Mr. Bryan.” (Darrow, *Story of My Life*, 277).

describing it in detail, they depict it as exciting but lacking in real meaning.¹⁷¹ These authors were still unimpressed by Bryan's performance (as even Larson was), but they described it in less definitive terms, as when one author wrote, "Sometimes he even *appeared* to trip over his own words" [emphasis mine].¹⁷² Rather than Bryan being the only uncomfortable one, Darrow also "became increasingly frustrated and angry."¹⁷³ Another author wrote, "Darrow defended reason and science while Bryan defended God and the Bible."¹⁷⁴ While this may sound at first like the orthodox view, it is in fact more subtle. It seems to be describing what each man believed he was *defending*, as Bryan is never said to have *attacked* reason and science. This same account later says, "Darrow continued, *trying to show* that Bryan was ignorant of basic facts of science and history. *It appeared* Bryan was not even curious about the world around him or other peoples and their civilizations" [emphasis mine].¹⁷⁵ In many of these later works, even Bryan's admission that the days of Genesis 1 may have represented millions of years was sometimes mentioned in mere passing, with some books failing to record any audience reaction whatsoever.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷¹ Kowalski, *Evolution on Trial*, spends about 2.5 out of 95 pages on it, and Burgan, *Scopes Trial*, spends about 2 out of 85.

¹⁷² Whiting, *Scopes Monkey Trial*, 32.

¹⁷³ Graves, *Scopes Trial*, 34.

¹⁷⁴ Burgan, *Scopes Trial*, 44.

¹⁷⁵ Burgan, *Scopes Trial*, 46.

¹⁷⁶ Kowalski, *Evolution on Trial*, 7; Burgan, *Scopes Trial*, 46. Crompton, *Scopes Monkey Trial*, mixes the older and newer narratives by presenting the orthodox narrative of the trial but not giving an objective declaration about who won: "Some audience members gasped" when Bryan admitted the earth may be millions of years old, which amounted to "twisting, or perverting the Bible's truth." Bryan realized his gaffe, and began shouting at Darrow. He becomes "almost a wreck on the stand," sweats "profusely," and "implore[s] the audience to stay with him...seem[ing] like a parody of the man who had eagerly stepped to the witness stand an hour and a half before" (82). But in discussing the reaction, Crompton states that "The recollections of the many observers varied, as did their memories, when asked years later...on the whole, the observers *seemed to feel* that this part of the trial had revealed more 'truth' than any other" (83, emphasis mine).

In assessing the overall outcome of the interrogation, many recent authors were more likely to report what people thought rather than attempt to make an objective declaration. One wrote, “It was not a total victory for Darrow, but many people who read about the exchange in the papers and heard the trial over the radio were quick to declare Darrow to be the winner of the debate . . . The press reported on the event as though Bryan had been thoroughly defeated.”¹⁷⁷ According to another, “Most of the reporters thought Darrow was the clear winner, while many Christian groups gave the nod to Bryan.”¹⁷⁸ Yet another book qualified its account by attributing the notion of Bryan’s defeat to the *New York Times*, and the claim that the crowd ignored Bryan while congratulating his opponent to Darrow himself.¹⁷⁹

Pre- and post-Larson books differ widely in their treatment of and dependence upon *Inherit the Wind*. Most earlier works ignore the play altogether. The ones that do mention it write about it approvingly, suggesting that it is an essentially accurate portrayal of the trial. “Slightly exaggerated to cater to theatrical tastes,” one author wrote, “the characters in the play and movie, nonetheless, rekindle the spirit of the two real titans.”¹⁸⁰ Another author—the same one who borrowed from it Bryan’s claim to know the date and time of creation—called it “intellectually stimulating . . . the authors have changed the names . . . but have

¹⁷⁷ Graves, *Scopes Trial*, 35-36.

¹⁷⁸Whiting, *Scopes Monkey Trial*, 31. He also comments, “It was great theater, but it had little bearing on the actual case” (32).

¹⁷⁹ Burgan, *Scopes Trial*, 46. For another example, see Kowalski, *Evolution on Trial*, 58.

¹⁸⁰ Lacy, *Trial of John Scopes*, 45.

retained the essence of the proceeding, including close paraphrases of many of the lines from the actual court transcripts . . . the whole film is gripping throughout.”¹⁸¹

Later books, on the other hand, approach the play more similarly to Larson, as a fascinating and influential but fundamentally flawed version of the story. Only “loosely based on the Scopes trial,” *Inherit the Wind* “did not claim to show the Scopes trial exactly as it happened . . . several important facts were changed.”¹⁸² The play “takes many liberties with the actual events” and should be understood as a comment on McCarthyism, not the Scopes trial.¹⁸³ Many of these books describe the differences between the trial and the play, focusing on the transformation of William Jennings Bryan into “a narrow-minded man who opposes all science,” which turns out to be “a distortion of Bryan’s actual views.” Overall, *Inherit the Wind* is said to reflect the thinking of H.L. Mencken more than the actual events, thus “creat[ing] an image of the *Scopes* trial that most historians argue is false and unfair to Bryan.”¹⁸⁴

Finally, post-Larson books were more likely to introduce moral complexities into the story of the trial by discussing eugenics and its relation to racism and Darwinism. Some of these books quote from the passage in Hunter’s *Biology* that describes the superiority of the Caucasian race and the supposed virtue of weeding the unfit out from society. “William

¹⁸¹ Nardo, *Scopes Trial*, 89.

¹⁸² Graves, *Scopes Trial*, 30.

¹⁸³ Whiting, *Scopes Monkey Trial*, 37, 42, citing Linder and Larson.

¹⁸⁴ Kowalski, *Evolution on Trial*, 44; Burgan, *Scopes Trial*, 70; see also Whiting, 42, Kowalski, 64, 73-77; Crompton’s main complaint is that the play did not do justice to those “who believed that the Bible and evolution could be reconciled”—a curious complaint, given the symbolism in the play’s last scene in which the Darrow character picks up a Bible and Darwin’s *Origin of Species*, stacks them together under one arm and walks offstage (93-94); one book inaccurately claims that *Inherit the Wind* is the play that is performed annually in the courthouse in Dayton at the Scopes trial festival (Crewe and Uschan, *Scopes “Monkey” Trial*, 26).

Jennings Bryan and other Americans opposed [such thinking]” one author wrote, considering it “another harmful aspect of Darwinism.”¹⁸⁵ Earlier authors, who usually preferred to frame the trial and its participants in much more simplistic terms, were either unaware of the significance of eugenics or simply preferred to avoid introducing moral complexities. In this regard, later authors were following the precedent set by historians such as Larson.

These observations are generalizations, and each book is of course a work of its own. But among the eight pre-Larson books surveyed here, one book is significantly different from the others. Robert A. Allen’s *William Jennings Bryan: Golden-Tongued Orator* (1992) is a biography of Bryan written from a Christian perspective. Featuring endorsements by James Dobson and Tim LaHaye on its back cover, Allen’s book was published as part of a “Sowers Series” of biographies, and treats Bryan as a great hero who performed wisely and nobly at the Scopes trial.¹⁸⁶ This is one of only two books (before or after Larson) that cites a significant number of scholarly biographies of Bryan, and therefore benefited from the improved scholarship on Bryan of which most others were at that time unaware (the other is Kosner’s 1970 biography of Bryan).

By beginning its description of Bryan in his childhood rather than when he was an adult, *William Jennings Bryan: The Golden-Tongued Orator* includes a perspective on Bryan nearly always absent from other works of juvenile literature. The book describes his

¹⁸⁵ Burgan, *Scopes Trial*, 18-19; see also Whiting, *Scopes Monkey Trial*, 12 and Kowalski, *Evolution on trial*, 18-19.

¹⁸⁶ The “Sowers Series,” published in the 1980s and 1990s by Mott Media, also included biographies of Abigail Adams, Johnny Appleseed, Robert Boyle, George Washington Carver, Christopher Columbus, George Frideric Handel, Mahalia Jackson, Stonewall Jackson, Johannes Kepler, Francis Scott Key, Jason Lee, Robert E. Lee, Abraham Lincoln, Samuel F.B. Morse, Isaac Newton, Florence Nightingale, Louis Pasteur, Samuel Francis Smith, Billy Sunday, Teresa of Calcutta, George Washington, Danuel Webster, Susanna Wesley, and the Wright Brothers.

education at Whipple College and Illinois College, where he learned to love to read Aristotle, Cicero, and the New Testament in their original languages, and carried on discussions of Plato with his favorite professors in the evenings. When Bryan first heard about evolution, “an especially dangerous theory just coming into some of the schools in the East,” he sat down with his friend Julian who told him to simply “believe the Bible” and forget about the theory. “That’s fine for you, Julian,” Bryan says in the reconstructed dialogue: “I’m going into public life and . . . I need to know what I believe . . . I’ve been taught the Bible all my life, now it’s time for me to hear what those on the other side say so I can make up my own mind, once and for all.” He then writes a letter to the famous agnostic orator Robert Ingersoll, hoping he can answer his multitude of questions, but is disappointed when all he receives back is a copy of a speech and a form letter. Having received no help from this particular agnostic—one whom, because of his celebrity status, Bryan considered a spokesman for evolution—young Bryan decides he must read the works of Darwin and study evolution on his own.¹⁸⁷

Years later, at the Scopes trial, Bryan puts his studies to use by using the ideas of Darwin, Nietzsche, and even Darrow to explain the dangers of theory of evolution. As Bryan sits down on the witness stand, a scene dramatically different than the one recounted in other works transpires:

Bryan answered good-naturedly and the crowd responded with applause and laughter. They were glad to see their hero get the best of the big lawyer from Chicago . . . For the next two hours he sat and answered questions on every topic imaginable, many of which had nothing to do with the trial itself. Under Darrow’s questioning he explained that although he believed in a literal interpretation of the Bible there were

¹⁸⁷ Allen, *William Jennings Bryan*, 20-26.

figures of speech like ‘Ye are the salt of the earth,’ which could not be taken literally.¹⁸⁸

This “big lawyer from Chicago” is, it seems, no match for the “golden-tongued orator.” “Clarence Darrow was shrewd and repeatedly ridiculed Bryan for what he believed,” yet Bryan retained control of the situation. “‘I object to that!’ Darrow interrupted loudly, but Bryan continued in his most powerful voice . . . Darrow shouted again . . .”¹⁸⁹ The picture that accompanies the description is a sketch of Bryan speaking at the trial. He appears not angry, upset, or confused, but friendly and thoughtful.¹⁹⁰ Overall, the man one encounters in reading *William Jennings Bryan: Golden-Tongued Orator* is virtuous, wise, and courageous. Indeed, in this book, Bryan appears to be a mirror image of a man described in most other juvenile books on the Scopes trial—his opponent, Clarence Darrow.

While the historical accuracy of juvenile literature on the Scopes trial generally began to improve beginning in the early 2000s, two works of historical fiction for young people backtracked by returning to the orthodox perspective. These books placed John Scopes and Clarence Darrow back on their pedestals of tolerance and reason while stereotyping Bryan and the fundamentalists as backwards bigots.

Ronald Kidd’s *Monkey Town: The Summer of the Scopes Trial* (2006) tells the story of the trial through the eyes of Frances Robinson, a fifteen-year-old girl with a crush on her teacher, “Johnny” Scopes. Even though many of the townspeople are suspicious of

¹⁸⁸ Allen, *William Jennings Bryan*, 147-8.

¹⁸⁹ Allen, *William Jennings Bryan*, 149.

¹⁹⁰ Allen, *William Jennings Bryan*, 146.

Johnny—the local Baptists, for instance, disapprove when they hear that he goes to concerts and dances—all of his students love him. As Frances describes,

Johnny was different from most people in Dayton. For him the world didn't begin and end on Market Street. It extended over the mountains, into strange and wonderful places, places I dreamed of going someday. Johnny felt the same way about ideas. He didn't like the small, familiar ones that people talked about in Dayton. He looked for ideas that would 'stretch your mind,' as he liked to say.¹⁹¹

The “Johnny” of *Monkey Town* resembles the Bertram Cates of *Inherit the Wind* much more closely than he does the real John Scopes.

In Jen Bryant's *Ringside 1925: Views from the Scopes Trial* (2008), Scopes is similarly portrayed as a nice, likeable, “handsome” young teacher who simply loves learning and wants to provide his students with the best science education possible. Clarence Darrow is portrayed favorably as well. When Darrow arrives in Dayton, one high school girl comments,

The way most townfolks have been talking, I thought Clarence Darrow would look like the devil himself, complete with a tail and horns and a pitchfork. Well. Clarence Darrow does not look like the devil himself. He looks more like a well-weathered farmer or like someone's eccentric grandfather . . . I admit, from the moment I laid eyes on Clarence Darrow, there was something about him I just plain liked. He has a quiet kind of energy—like a big old dog that's happy to eat and nap on the porch . . . but everyone knows not to disturb him while he's lying there guarding your door.

Bryan, on the other hand, is a blundering buffoon reminiscent of Matthew Harrison Brady who “so clearly enjoy[s] the sound of his own voice.”¹⁹²

¹⁹¹ Ronald Kidd, *Monkey Town: The Summer of the Scopes Trial* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006), 5-6. Frances adds, “I wanted to stretch my mind, and I desperately wanted Johnny Scopes to help me.”

¹⁹² Jen Bryant, *Ringside 1925: Views from the Scopes Trial* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008), 12-13, 44-46, 61.

Like *Inherit the Wind*, both of these novels portray the events in Dayton as a source of inter-generational conflict, with the innocent and open-minded teenagers siding with Scopes and Darrow while their traditionalist parents are too afraid of their beliefs being challenged to even consider the possibility that they might be wrong. The most vicious antagonist of the novels is *Ringside 1925*'s Betty Barker, a "member of the ladies' Bible study group" in Dayton who is determined to "save these children from [the] wicked, wicked ways" of "the devil-worshipping defendant J.T. Scopes." Betty rivals *Inherit the Wind*'s Reverend Brown in self-righteous intolerance. She protests that the children of Dayton have gone from being "obedient, trustworthy, [and] modest" to "shameless, rebellious, [and] lustful," largely due to the influence of jazz, cars, bootleg whiskey, and Hollywood films. At one point she confiscates a copy of *The Great Gatsby* from the town library, tosses it to the ground and lights it on fire, and proclaims that "all the sinners who read it will burn if they do not turn and repent!"¹⁹³ *Monkey Town* and *Ringside, 1925* are creative and engaging retellings of the Scopes Trial. But despite having been written after *Summer for the Gods*, they surpass even the older nonfiction juvenile literature in perpetuating stereotypes about Bryan and fundamentalist Christians.

It is clear from this survey of juvenile literature on the Scopes trial that the primary factor that has affected the tone and content of these books has been the quality of historical works consulted by their authors. Descriptions of Bryan and the fundamentalists, Bryan's interrogation and its significance, the accuracy of *Inherit the Wind*, and the connection between evolution and eugenics all tended to follow the historians that were being cited. The

¹⁹³ Bryant, *Ringside*, 20, 103, 19, 147-148.

most noticeable change occurred after the publication of Larson's *Summer for the Gods*. But two further observations are in order.

First, while pre-Larson writers had only third-phase books on the Scopes trial to consult, they failed to encounter the fourth-phase historical works because they failed to take advantage of the scholarly work on William Jennings Bryan. As discussed in the previous chapter, the beginning of the fourth phase began with Lawrence W. Levine's *Defender of the Faith* (1965) and Paola Coletta's *William Jennings Bryan: Political Puritan* (1969), which were soon followed by Louis W. Koenig's *Bryan: A Political Biography of William Jennings Bryan* (1971) and William Smith's *The Social and Religious Thought of William Jennings Bryan* (1975). Writers of juvenile literature, however, primarily consulted books on the Scopes trial or on Clarence Darrow, rarely (and with one notable exception) consulting biographies of Bryan. The reason for this disregard is not clear. Were these books not as easily available? Did the authors simply not think to look for biographies of Bryan? Were they uninterested because of a predisposition to dislike him? Whatever the reason, they may have written somewhat different books had they familiarized themselves with contemporary Bryan scholarship.

It must also be noted, however, that the period in which these authors wrote and the sources they cited did not strictly determine the tone and quality of their books. Allen's *William Jennings Bryan: Golden-Tongued Orator* is in one sense an example of a book from the early 1990s that took advantage of the best available scholarship. Allen cited a number of scholarly works on Bryan (including Levine), and avoided the stereotypes that beset other

works. But it must not be overlooked that Allen was a fundamentalist himself, and his biography of Bryan—written for an audience intended to be inspired by Bryan’s life—often errs in the opposite direction by ignoring Bryan’s faults.¹⁹⁴ Levine and Coletta may have been more understanding of Bryan than previous historians, but they were not exactly hagiographers.

Likewise, some of the later authors who cite *Summer for the Gods* failed to grasp Larson’s understanding of the trial. The first book to cite Larson, Betsy Harvey Kraft’s *Sensational Trials of the 20th Century* (1998), is not substantially different from older pre-Larson works; neither is Steven P. Olson’s *The Trial of John T. Scopes*, which perpetuates the myth that Bryan believed the world was created on October 23, 4004 B.C. at 9:00 A.M. It is, however, not difficult to see why this might be the case. An author who cited or listed a book in his or her bibliography may or may not have actually read it carefully, or picked it up at all; or he or she may have simply disagreed with it, or preferred to stick to the orthodox view of the trial either from bias or from a desire to make the story more interesting or simple. Indeed, the traditional view of the Scopes trial easily lent itself to common themes found in stories for young people: inter-generational conflict, problems with authority figures, and the questioning of inherited beliefs; likewise, authors desiring to provide a positive role model for children could select either William Jennings Bryan or Clarence Darrow (depending on one’s perspective and intended audience), and simplify him into a wise, compassionate, and courageous model American. Finally, novelists Ronald Kidd and

¹⁹⁴ Allen was the head of the speech department at Pillsbury College, an Independent Fundamentalist Baptist College in Minnesota (Allen, *William Jennings Bryan*, 163).

Jen Bryant took the liberties allowed by their genre and portrayed the Scopes trial in a fashion more akin to *Inherit the Wind* than to history.

The value of this study is twofold. First, it provides generalizations about the types of books on the Scopes trial that an inquisitive child or teenager may encounter in his public library, or in a class at school. Second, it shows the way these books have followed (or ignored) contemporary historical scholarship. Though delayed for over three decades, the work of contemporary historians has finally begun—if only incompletely—to influence the quality of juvenile literature on the Scopes trial.

CHAPTER 3

“Inherit The Truth”: Revising History at Dayton’s Scopes Trial Festival

In the quaint town of Dayton, where the towering Rhea County Courthouse still overlooks the small shops and businesses downtown, local residents went about their business for most of the twentieth century trying to forget about the Scopes trial. A curious visitor might have encountered a local who still remembered or had even witnessed the trial. One could visit the campus of nearby Bryan College, a small, fundamentalist, liberal arts school founded in 1930 and named after the famed politician who prosecuted the case. But otherwise, the town of Dayton was almost completely silent about the one event that had brought it world-wide notoriety.

This all changed toward the end of the twentieth century. In the late 1980s, the town came together to put on the first of many Scopes Trial plays and festivals. Reexamining the original trial records, they had discovered that the popular narrative of the trial was devastatingly inaccurate, and that their own role in the trial’s history had been seriously misconstrued. The Scopes Trial was not in fact a simplistic battle between freedom and intolerance, or science and religion. It was instead a local publicity stunt gone awry, having featured complex personalities who were hardly the clear-cut heroes and villains constructed for popular consumption. Dayton took this new understanding of its history and placed it at the center of the annual festival created to challenge the dominant narrative of the trial and to

give the townspeople a venue to tell their own story—the true story—of what *really* happened at the Scopes “Monkey” Trial.¹⁹⁵

The story of the Scopes Trial Festival begins in 1988. Frank Chapin, a drama director working in Chattanooga, had come to Dayton with an idea. He wanted to book the courthouse to put on a production of *Inherit the Wind*, the famous 1955 play about the Scopes Trial by Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee. The town leaders he met with were not impressed with his idea. The film version of *Inherit the Wind* had premiered in Dayton in 1960, and the locals who attended were shocked and infuriated by how they were portrayed. They were the story’s villains, a reactionary mob set on destroying the heretic who dared teach their children Darwin’s theory. William Jennings Bryan, the fundamentalist hero, was turned into a simpleminded laughingstock. True, the playwrights had not intended *Inherit the Wind* to be taken as accurate history, and had changed the names of all the characters in order to make this clear. The teaching of evolution was not a public controversy in the 1950s—the play was really a parable about McCarthyism. But *Inherit the Wind* told a powerful story, and anyone not already familiar with the Scopes Trial would naturally take it

¹⁹⁵ Tom Davis, interview by author, email exchange, 3-19 January 2012. In possession of author. Very little has been written about the Scopes Trial Festival by scholars. The most comprehensive treatment may be found in Rodger Lyle Brown, *Ghost Dancing on the Cracker Circuit: The Culture of Festivals in the American South* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1997), although this work was able to only take into account the festival’s first eight or nine years. Edward Larson wrote a very brief article recording his impressions of the 2000 festival in “Monkey Business,” *Oxford American* (Nov/Dec 2000): 35-37. Journalist Matthew Chapman, a descendant of Charles Darwin, wrote about an episode in which he travelled to Dayton to attend the festival, but arrived a week late, in *Trials of the Monkey: An Accidental Memoir* (New York: Picador, 2001).

as true unless taught otherwise. It is little wonder that Chapin was met with little enthusiasm when he suggested putting on a play that mocked the town in their own courthouse.¹⁹⁶

Chapin might have left disappointed had it not been for a conversation with Dr. Richard M. Cornelius, professor of literature at Bryan College and a leading expert on the Scopes Trial. Cornelius naturally disliked a revival of *Inherit the Wind* as much as anyone else in town, but he suggested an alternative: why not take the transcripts from the actual court trial and use them to write a new play? This one could be what *Inherit the Wind* was not—both entertaining *and* accurate. Chapin took up Dr. Cornelius’s offer, and by July—the sixty-third anniversary of the trial—was ready to put on a performance. *Destiny in Dayton* starred local residents playing the parts of John Scopes, William Jennings Bryan, Clarence Darrow, and other trial participants, and was performed in the Rhea County Courthouse in the same room as the original trial. The play was such a success that it was performed again the next year.

Destiny in Dayton attracted hundreds of attendees in 1988 and 1989, and in 1990 Dr. Cornelius and his associates from Bryan College decided to plan a festival to go along with the play. The 1925 trial itself had been a national spectacle, with multitudes of visitors pouring in to the town, creating a carnival atmosphere complete with street preachers, vendors hawking “monkey fizz” soda, and even a chimpanzee. Although the 1990 crowd would not be quite so colorful, a festival atmosphere would incite interest in and excitement for the play. Holding a festival was a natural decision for a town in Tennessee, where

¹⁹⁶ Davis, interview. For more on the festival’s origins, see also Rodger Lyle Brown, *Ghost Dancing on the Cracker Circuit: The Culture of Festivals in the American South* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1997), 138.

tourism is a multi-billion dollar sector of the economy and hundreds of local festivals, such as the Tennessee Strawberry Festival and the National Cornbread Festival, are held across the state every year. More events would draw larger crowds, and these crowds would show up not only to spend money, but also to learn the real story behind the Scopes Trial—a story which would rehabilitate the reputation of previously-maligned fundamentalist Christians (not to mention the namesake of the local college). The small town, long mocked as a home for intolerant, Bible-thumpin’ rednecks, was reclaiming its history.

While Cornelius and his associates at Bryan College were the first to jump at the opportunity to be involved, other community organizations and individuals also sponsored the festival over the years. These included the Dayton Chamber of Commerce, the Rhea County Historical and Genealogical Society, Main Street Dayton, the Rhea Economic and Tourism Council, and Rhea County Executive Billy Ray Patton.¹⁹⁷ With the exception of director Frank Chapin, who was only involved the first year, the festival and play have consistently been run and performed by residents of Dayton. At the same time, one might question the degree to which the festival is truly a local effort, because many key participants were not natives to Dayton, but moved there as adults. Even Bryan College, unaffectionately referred to by some as “that college on the hill,” has always been composed largely of faculty and students from other places.¹⁹⁸ Of course, most of the major players in the Scopes trial

¹⁹⁷ “Ready for Trial,” *Chattanooga Times*, 19 July 1996, B1; Tom Davis, “New Play Recounts Dayton’s Strategy in Landing the Scopes Case,” *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 6 May 2009, B2; Clint Cooper, “Pickers and Play Highlight Dayton’s Scopes Festival,” *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 15 July 2011, H22.

¹⁹⁸ Brown, *Dancing*, 137. Key participants who were not originally from Dayton included Frank Chapin, Gale Johnson (writer of *Monkey in the Middle*), Tom Davis (chair of eighteen festivals), Raymond Legg (the actor who frequently played Bryan and a professor at Bryan College), and Timothy Cruver (author of *You Be the Judge*). Other festival participants, on the other hand, did grow up in Dayton, including actor Tony

were not originally from Dayton either. This included not only Darrow and Bryan, but also residents George Rappleyea, the New Yorker who first suggested the idea for the trial as a publicity stunt, and John Scopes himself, who grew up in Kentucky and attended college in Illinois. Dayton, it seems, simply happened to be the place where their fates would converge. The Scopes Trial Festival, similarly, might be considered a local effort, not because it is run entirely by Dayton natives (it is not), but because it has been led by people who have either taken a keen interest in the town or have chosen to call it their home.

Participation waxed and waned over the years, but the Scopes Trial Festival has featured a variety of festivities for curious visitors. According to Tom Davis, Director of Public Information at Bryan College and chair of eighteen of the past twenty-four festivals, “When the trial was held in 1925, local residents set up to sell everything from lemonade to monkey dolls We try to recapture some of that atmosphere with the music and crafts. We also spotlight traditional crafts which are a part of our regional heritage by inviting artists such as blacksmiths and basket makers to demonstrate their skills on Saturday.”¹⁹⁹ Some years have featured horse-and-carriage tours of historic sites related to the trial such as the boarding house where Scopes lived.²⁰⁰ Antique auto and tractor displays have decorated the courthouse lawn and street.²⁰¹ Some participants donned 1920s-era clothing.²⁰² Pony rides

McCuiston (who frequently played Darrow), musician Tom Morgan, and *One Hot Summer* author Curtis Lipps. Some of these people will be discussed below.

¹⁹⁹ June Hatcher, “Getting Ready for Scopes Trial Festival in Dayton,” *Chattanooga Free Press*, 6 July 1997, K5.

²⁰⁰ John Shearer, “Homes to Serve Dinner During Scopes Festival,” *Chattanooga Free Press*, 30 June, 1996. Chris Shackleford, “Dayton Gears Up for Scopes Festival,” *Chattanooga Free Press*, 25 June 2001, B2.

²⁰¹ Howard Cross, “Quick Glance at Today’s News,” *Chattanooga Free Press*, 16 July 1997, A2.

²⁰² Shackleford, “Dayton Gears Up,” B2.

were made available for children, as well as a “musical petting zoo.”²⁰³ A “Scopes challenge quilt show” was held in 2006 on the lower floor of the courthouse.²⁰⁴ And a 2000 “reunion” for descendants of trial participants was attended by the granddaughter of the judge, the grandson of the state representative who introduced the antievolution bill, and the only surviving trial participant, T.J. Brewer, who pulled names from a hat to pick the jury when he was four years old.²⁰⁵

Music has also played a prominent role in the Scopes Trial Festival. Local musician Tom Morgan, part of a family who has lived in Dayton for many generations (one member of whom was a student of Scopes and testified at the trial), was one frequent performer at the festivals. The “Monkey Trial” had been a topic of popular subject for folk music in the 1920s, and Morgan and his fellow musicians have kept these traditional songs alive by introducing festival attendees to songs like “The Ballad of John Scopes,” “The Ballad of William Jennings Bryan,” and “There Ain’t No Bugs on Me.”²⁰⁶ These songs pay tribute to the legacy of the great Commoner with lyrics such as these:

He fought the evolutionists and infidel men, fools,
 Who are trying to ruin the minds of children in our schools;
 By teaching we came from monkeys, and other things absurd,
 Denying the works of our Savior and God’s own holy word.²⁰⁷

²⁰³ “Scopes Festival Starts Friday.” *Chattanooga Free Press*, 8 July 2006. Cliff Hightower, “Scopes Trial Show Kicks Off Tonight,” *Chattanooga Free Press*, 18 July 2008, B1.

²⁰⁴ “Scopes Festival,” *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 7 July 2006, H11.

²⁰⁵ Ron Clayton, “Symposium, Reunion Part of Scopes 75th Anniversary,” *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 13 July 2000, B1.

²⁰⁶ Kimberly McMillian, “Festival Renews Scopes Trial Events,” *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 17 July 2010.

²⁰⁷ Quoted in Norm Cohen, “Scopes and Evolution in Hillbilly Songs,” *JEMF Quarterly* 6 (1970): 176.

In 1997 Mr. Morgan and his family joined Bryan College music professor Mel Wilhoit for a lecture and concert advertised as “You Can’t Make a Monkey Out of Me: Music and the Scopes Trial.”²⁰⁸

Beyond the festivities and socializing, though, has always been the serious task of correcting misconceptions about the Scopes Trial. Bryan College has sponsored a number of academic symposia over the years, some of which have coincided with the dates of the festival and play and have been open to the public.²⁰⁹ In 2000 Dayton resident Timothy Cruver, owner of the local General Store, published a compilation of 1925 articles from the *Des Moines Register* about the Scopes Trial. He gave it the title *You Be the Judge*, explaining that readers could peruse original articles and decide for themselves what to think about creation and evolution.²¹⁰ Chattanooga’s PBS station, WTCI, filmed a documentary about the trial, *12 Days in Dayton*, which was sold at the festival in 2001 to help raise money for the local chamber of commerce.²¹¹ In 2011, local students participated in an activity called “The History Within Us,” in which they interviewed senior citizens in an effort to better understand their local history.²¹²

²⁰⁸ June Hatcher, “Scopes Trial Play & Festival,” *Chattanooga Free Press*, 22 June 1997.

²⁰⁹ See “Creation of an Evolving Controversy: A Symposium on the 70th Anniversary of the Scopes Evolution Trial” (July 21, 1995) and “Righting Wrongs and Wrong Writing” (2002). An event held during a different time of year was “Deconstructing Scopes: Unraveling the Mythology of the World’s Most Famous Trial” (March 20-21, 2006). See also the publication *IMPACT: The Scopes Trial, William Jennings Bryan, and Issues that Keep Revolving* (Dayton, Tenn.: Bryan College, 2000), featuring articles by Edward J. Larson, Stephen Jay Gould, and others.

²¹⁰ Timothy C. Cruver and Janet M. Cruver, ed., *You Be the Judge* (N.p.: College Press, 2000).

²¹¹ “Chris Shackleford, “Strawberry, Scopes Festivals Post Profits for Dayton, Chamber of Commerce,” *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 20 Aug. 2001, B2.

²¹² Kimberly McMillian, “Students Delve into History During Scopes Festival Activity,” *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 8 June 2011, B2.

The festival's most prominent and powerful means of offering a new and better narrative of the trial has been the annual play. *Destiny in Dayton* was performed through 1997, but a new version of the play was written in 1998 by local resident and amateur playwright Gale Johnson. Her longer version, *Monkey in the Middle*, was also based almost entirely on the trial transcripts. It was also somewhat more sympathetic to Bryan and the town of Dayton. This version ran through 2007, when it was recorded by Bryan College and sold as a DVD entitled *Inherit the Truth*.²¹³ When the director and main actors retired from that play, a new one was written by Dayton resident and retired military officer Curtis Lipps. It was entitled *One Hot Summer* and produced from 2009 through 2011.²¹⁴

While the host of people involved with the festival were likely driven by a range of motives—attracting tourists or reviving the reputation of fundamentalists, for instance—the writers of the plays unanimously affirmed that their primary intention was to get the story right and correct the myths promoted by *Inherit the Wind*. Gale Johnson said, “My goal, when I wrote it, was to blend history with the theater. I want to give people not only a feel for the trial, but of the events taking place in 1925 and the attitudes of the people and the media”²¹⁵ According to Curtis Lipps, “the spirit of what the Scopes festival has tried to do all along” has been to “tell the truth about the Scopes trial” and to “detail the history that

²¹³ Tom Davis estimates that somewhere around 200-300 copies had been sold as of 2012 (interview). According to Dr. Stephen Livesay, president of Bryan College, the DVD would be marketed “to home-school groups, law schools and libraries.” Cliff Hightower, “Scopes Trial Film Begins July 14,” *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 6 July 2007.

²¹⁴ No play was performed in 2008. That year Ted Kachel came to Dayton to perform a Chautauqua-type performance as William Jennings Bryan (Tom Davis, interview).

²¹⁵ Chris Shackelford, “Rhea Festival Will Center on 1925 Scopes Evolution Trial,” *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 20 June 2002, B2. Bryan College has apparently been so involved with the festival over the years that the writer of this article misidentified Johnson as a Bryan College professor.

hadn't been taught."²¹⁶ As we turn to the content of these plays, we will see that they challenge the conventional *Inherit the Wind* narrative in a variety of ways.

The most recent of the Scopes festival plays, *One Hot Summer*, clarifies the origins of the trial and is vastly different than the story told in *Inherit the Wind*. According to *Inherit the Wind*, John Scopes (called Bertram Cates) intentionally broke the antievolution law in the name of truth and academic freedom. In its opening scene, he was arrested and handcuffed while lecturing to his students, and taken to prison. A mob threatened to burn him to death and the local preacher prayed that "his soul [would] writhe in anguish and damnation."²¹⁷ But the young teacher stood firm in his beliefs. When asked to recant in order to be set free, he asked: "Tell them that if they'd let my body out of jail, I'd lock up my mind?"²¹⁸ He was, in essence, an innocent and idealistic young man who just wanted to open his students' minds and who was willing to stand up for what he believed in—namely, scientific truth. And his town was filled with hateful bigots who felt threatened by anyone who challenges their cherished beliefs.

The Scopes Trial Festival's *One Hot Summer* tells a much different story. Following the historical records but taking creative liberties with the dialogue, the play begins in F.E. Robinson's drug store, where its owner is sipping sodas with George Rappleyea. Rappleyea, we discover, had come to town to run a mining venture, but he and the rest of Dayton's

²¹⁶ Tom Davis, "New Play Recounts Dayton's Strategy in Landing the Scopes Case," *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 6 May 2009, B2; Kimberly McMillian, "24th Scopes Festival Offering Bluegrass, Historical Drama," *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 15 July 2011.

²¹⁷ Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee, *Inherit the Wind* (New York: Bantam, 1955), 65-66.

²¹⁸ This line is not part of the original script, but was added to the 1960 film, which featured a handful of minor modifications.

residents found themselves thwarted by a bad economic downturn. Robinson turns to Rappleyea and suggests, “We need a gimmick to get a lot of people into town and bring some money with them.” Rappleyea agrees, “We sure need something to liven up business around here.”²¹⁹

As they brainstorm ideas, Rappleyea discovers an intriguing article in the *Chattanooga Times*. A law had been passed forbidding the teaching of evolution, but the American Civil Liberties Union had offered to pay the court costs of any Tennessee teacher willing to stand trial to challenge the law. Rappleyea looks up with a glimmer in his eye. “If we can get a teacher to say that he taught evolution in the classroom, and he is willing to stand trial, then we’d have the trial here in Rhea County,” he exclaims to Robinson. “A trial like that might even draw in people from Knoxville, Chattanooga, maybe Nashville. Your drugstore would be a beehive of activity, good for business.”²²⁰ Robinson agrees to the plan—now, all they need is a science teacher.

The two schemers send for John Scopes. He comes into the drug store and sits down. “Would you be willing to stand trial for what you taught?” Startled, the young man replies, “My teaching is not that bad!” They explain to him the plan, and he furrows his brow. “Could I end up in jail?” “No chance,” Robinson says. “You’ll only be fined if they find you guilty—I’ll pay your fine. All you have to do is go to court. The ACLU will provide an attorney for your defense.”²²¹ He reluctantly agrees to stand trial, but only after realizing that he has nothing to lose by doing his friends a favor. This John Scopes quite closely resembles

²¹⁹ Curtis Lipps, *One Hot Summer* (unpublished), 2. In possession of author.

²²⁰ Lipps, *One Hot Summer*, 3.

²²¹ Lipps, *One Hot Summer*, 5-6.

the actual one, who once said, “I furnished the body that was needed to sit in the defendant’s chair.”²²²

Beyond the reluctance of John Scopes to involve himself in a case motivated entirely by economic factors, another theme that develops in the Scopes festival plays is media prejudice. The Scopes Trial has not been called “the South’s greatest public relations fiasco” without reason.²²³ Most major American newspapers mocked Dayton for its apparent backwardness, and no reporter was more scathing than the *Baltimore Sun*’s H.L. Mencken. The inflammatory journalist called the trial “a religious orgy,” described the judge as “a clown in a ten-cent sideshow” who “postured before the yokels,” and called the residents of Tennessee “gaping primates” and “poor ignoramuses.” His most scathing criticism was reserved for William Jennings Bryan, a man “of peculiar imbecilities,” an “old buzzard,” “infinitely pathetic,” “a poor clod like those around him, deluded by a childish theology, full of an almost pathological hatred of all learning, all human dignity, all beauty, all fine and noble things.”²²⁴

Mencken’s vitriolic articles, widely published throughout the United States, helped form the popular memory of the trial. But in *One Hot Summer*, the people of Dayton found a way to poke fun at their former abuser. Mencken shows up early on in the play, walking into Robinson’s drug store and spewing his usual insults. The “local yokels” are nothing more

²²² Quoted in Douglas Linder, “John Scopes,” Famous Trials, 2004. http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/scopes/sco_sco.htm. In *Monkey in the Middle*, it is revealed that Scopes admitted to reporters that he did not recall whether he had actually taught evolution. One reporter says to another: “Buy me a monkey fizz at Robinson’s and I’ll tell you the scoop I got last night. Scopes isn’t even sure he taught evolution...He can’t take the witness stand without perjuring himself...” (p.16)

²²³ Brown, *Ghost Dancing*, 139.

²²⁴ See articles compiled in H.L. Mencken, *A Religious Orgy in Tennessee: A Reporter’s Account of the Scopes Trial* (Hoboken, N.J.: Melville House, 2006).

than “ignorant rednecks,” and William Jennings Bryan is “that pompous windbag” who spews “religious bigotry.” But as Mencken stands there holding forth, swatting the insects that are buzzing around him, Dayton turns *him* into the butt of a joke. “What kind of flies are these?” he asks a local yokel. “They’re zizz-zu flies.” “What’s a zizz-zu fly?” “They hang around a horse’s rear.” “Are you calling me a horse’s rear?” “Oh no, sir,” comes the calm reply. “But you can’t fool them zizz-zu flies.”²²⁵

The second act of *One Hot Summer* intensifies Dayton’s retaliation against Mencken. Interested in meeting a local minister, he is taken to meet the Reverend Morgan. As he approaches Morgan’s house he asks his guide, “Are you sure this old man can read?” She responds, “These mountain folks talk slow, move slow, are not formally educated, but a lot of them are deep thinkers.” Rev. Morgan appears holding three Bibles, and Mencken asks him to read a few verses. Morgan opens to Genesis and begins to read: “*en archē epoiēsen ho theos ton ouranon kai tēn gēn.*” Mencken looks up, bewildered. “What was that?” His guide answers, “Greek, I think.” Morgan opens another and reads, “*bereshit bara elohim et ha’shamaim ve’et ha’aretz.*” “And, what was that?” “Hebrew, I recognize it.” Finally, Morgan turns to his third book and reads, “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.” Looking up at Mencken he comments, drily, “That last one was English.” Mencken soon walks away asking, “Where in hell did that uneducated hillbilly learn Greek and Hebrew?” “That hillbilly,” his guide replies, “might think you’re not well educated.”²²⁶ This brief encounter is a key moment in the play, and is based on a supposedly true story passed

²²⁵ Lipps, *One Hot Summer*, 8, 10, 11.

²²⁶ Lipps, *One Hot Summer*, 12-13.

down by Dayton musician Tom Morgan, a devoted festival participant and the grandson of the actual Reverend Morgan.²²⁷

A third way the festival's plays have challenged the popular narrative of the trial is by rehabilitating William Jennings Bryan. When Clarence Darrow arrived in Dayton in July of 1925 to defend John Scopes, Mencken advised him, "Nobody gives a damn about that yap schoolteacher. . . . make a fool out of Bryan."²²⁸ That is likewise what Darrow attempted, and precisely what Lawrence and Lee did in *Inherit the Wind*. In that play, Bryan's character (Matthew Brady) was the epitome of narrow-mindedness, proclaiming that "the way of scientism is the way of darkness," promising to use the Holy Bible "to test the steel of our Truth against the blasphemies of Science."²²⁹

Inherit the Wind reached its climax by retelling the most famous scene of the trial: on the seventh day, Clarence Darrow made the unorthodox move of calling Bryan to the witness stand as an expert on the Bible. Bryan accepted his challenge, and the two men spent the better part of two hours arguing about fundamentalist religious views. According to the traditional narrative, as told by Darrow and Mencken, and reported in the *New York Times* (among other papers), Darrow utterly defeated Bryan, exposing to the world once and for all just how ignorant he and his fundamentalists friends really were.

Inherit the Wind followed (and further established) this narrative. When Henry Drummond (Darrow) asks Brady his opinion of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, Brady replied, "I am not in the least interested in the pagan hypotheses of that book." "Never read it?"

²²⁷ Davis, interview.

²²⁸ Quoted in Vincent Fitzpatrick, *H.L. Mencken* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2004), 76.

²²⁹ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 23.

Drummond asked. “And I never will.”²³⁰ When Drummond asked him how old the earth is, Brady replied, “A fine Biblical scholar, Bishop Usher [sic], has determined for us the exact date and hour of the Creation. It occurred in the year 4004 B.C. . . . In fact, he determined that the Lord began the Creation on the 23rd of October in the year 4004 B.C. at—uh, at 9 A.M.!” Drummond sneered, “That Eastern Standard Time? Or Rocky Mountain Time?” The audience roared in laughter.²³¹

Brady later conceded that “it is . . . possible” that the days of creation could be interpreted figuratively as long periods of time. The real Bryan did profess this possibility, and his doing so has often been interpreted as an admission that the Bible need not be taken literally. Lawrence and Lee held to this interpretation, writing in the stage directions, “Drummond’s got him. And he knows it! This is the turning point. From here on, the tempo mounts.” Brady also claimed that sex “is considered ‘Original Sin’” and therefore condemned by God, a claim Drummond humorously challenges by asking why people in the Bible did so much “begetting.” Brady asserted that God spoke directly to him, telling him to “oppose the evil teachings” of Charles Darwin.²³² The William Jennings Bryan represented by *Inherit the Wind* was, in essence, “a political and religious fanatic who considers himself a spokesman for God, and who consequently will defend his beliefs even when they oppose the advancement of knowledge and harm other people.”²³³

²³⁰ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 86.

²³¹ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 95-96.

²³² Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind*, 92, 97, 99.

²³³ Kary Doyle Smout, *The Creation/Evolution Controversy: A Battle for Cultural Power* (Westport: Praeger, 1998), 83f.

The William Jennings Bryan of the Scopes festival plays is not this stereotype of fundamentalism, but a thoughtful, reasonable, even humorous gentleman. We discover that he opposes Darwin's theory not merely because he believes it contradicts the Bible, but also for more thoughtful reasons. Testifying about the errors of Darwinism, Bryan pulls out a copy of *The Descent of Man* (apparently his own) ready to pick apart Darwin's scientific arguments one page at a time.²³⁴ He then puts forward the then-popular argument that Darwin's theory of natural selection inevitably led to the kind of disrespect for human life as manifested in the excesses of capitalism and in the first World War.²³⁵ These arguments are scarcely the barely-coherent assertions of the "Bryan" of *Inherit the Wind*.

During Darrow's interrogation, Bryan holds his own much better than in the popular narrative. When asked about the age of the earth, Bryan makes no appeal to Bishop Ussher. He simply explains to Darrow that, in inspiring the creation account, God "may have used language that could be understood at that time."²³⁶ Thus, the "days" of creation quite possibly represented "millions of years."²³⁷ This view was widely accepted by fundamentalists in the 1920s.²³⁸ When Darrow demands that Bryan guess the age of the earth, Bryan replies, "I couldn't attempt to. I could possibly come as near as the scientists

²³⁴ Gale Johnson, *Monkey in the Middle* (unpublished), 28. In possession of author.

²³⁵ Johnson, *Monkey*, 29-30.

²³⁶ Frank Chapin, *Destiny in Dayton* (unpublished), 42. In possession of author.

²³⁷ Chapin, *Destiny*, 50.

²³⁸ For more on the then-popular "Day-Age" view of Genesis 1 held by many prominent fundamentalists of the early twentieth century, see Ronald L. Numbers, *Darwinism Comes to America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 76-91. Numbers shows that the dogmatic young-earth creationism popularized among fundamentalist and evangelical churches in the middle and late twentieth century was, generally speaking, popular only among Seventh-Day Adventists in Bryan's day.

do, but I had rather be more accurate before I give a guess.”²³⁹ This Bryan is not stumped and flustered by Darrow’s questions. He shrugs them off, happy to confess ignorance but through charm and wit defying anyone who might label him an uneducated bigot.²⁴⁰ As Dr. Cornelius put it, “I think Mr. Bryan does really, really well.”²⁴¹

Dayton’s desire to escape stereotypes about the trial is also evident by the manner in which the actors portray their characters onstage. In *Inherit the Wind*, Bryan’s character inevitably comes across as neurotic, arrogant, and long-winded, while Drummond’s is calm, personable, and intellectual. In Dayton’s plays, however Bryan and Darrow are portrayed fairly similarly. Neither loses his temper, and there is little emotion or shouting. Both seem calm and laid back, not unlike the Dayton residents who play them. If anyone comes across as irritable, however, it is Clarence Darrow.²⁴²

Indeed, Dayton’s plays are not only undramatic, they are very unlike typical dramas. *Inherit the Wind*, in spite of its historical shortcomings, contains all the aspects of high

²³⁹ Johnson, 40.

²⁴⁰ On this note *Destiny in Dayton* leaves the audience with a different impression than the other two. The latter plays gloss over this part of the discussion almost entirely, merely having Bryan admit that he doesn’t know the answer. In *Destiny*, Bryan states that the days of Genesis may be “millions of years” and these stage instructions follow: “At this point, if you have audience plants, there could be some quick intakes of breath, as this is probably the crucial line in the dialogue” (49). Indeed, many accounts of the trial (including Scopes’s autobiography and news articles) indicate that many in the audience were shocked that Bryan would deny the Bible’s literal interpretation at this point. While Ronald Numbers has shown that Bryan’s day-age view of Genesis 1 which accommodated old-earth geology was a quite common one among fundamentalists at this time, Edward Larson suggests that the locals in Dayton may not have been as familiar with this view and were thus surprised by Bryan (Numbers, *Darwinism Comes to America*; personal correspondence with Edward Larson). *Monkey in the Middle* and *One Hot Summer* avoid the question entirely by leaving these lines out. When Matthew Chapman asked Gale Johnson why she had left this part out of *Monkey in the Middle*, she claimed that it was so the play would flow better, not for polemic reasons (Chapman 240).

²⁴¹ Quoted in Larry Witham, “Scopes Trial Re-Enactments Show Controversies Linger,” *Washington Times*, 6 July 2000, A11.

²⁴² These comments are based on my own observations after attending the 2011 play and viewing Bryan College’s *Inherit the Truth* DVD.

drama: tension, conflict, a coherent plot, emotion, and character development. Dayton's plays tend to come across as abridgements of speeches, which is essentially what they are. *One Hot Summer* does contain original dialogue in its drug store scenes and in Mencken's visit to Rev. Morgan, through which it develops two themes in its first two acts: the reluctance of John Scopes to stand trial for teaching evolution, and H.L. Mencken's foolish stereotyping of the locals. But both of these themes are left hanging as the third act reverts to the trial transcripts, which begin right in the middle of Darrow's interrogation of Bryan.

High drama is, of course, not the purpose of the Scopes trial festival plays.²⁴³ They were written with the intent of correcting misconceptions about the Scopes trial, and their informational purpose thus comes across as greater than their attempt to entertain. As Tom Davis put it, the purpose of the plays is "to give them the facts and let them make their decision. If you don't like Bryan, that's your privilege. But dislike him because of what the reality is, not because of *Inherit the Wind*."²⁴⁴ This is not to say that the plays are not entertaining—the lively transcript provides plenty of instances of humor, and several audience members of the years have questioned whether the lines were actually from the transcript.²⁴⁵ The point here is simply that the basic plot and character elements needed to

²⁴³ Here we might distinguish between Frank Chapin's original aim in 1988, which was to provide the experience of watching the trial dramatically reenacted in the original courthouse, and that of later festival organizers and local playwrights, who were driven by somewhat different interests.

²⁴⁴ John Head, "Southern Almanac: Fest Brings Event to Life," *Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, 23 July 2000, 2M.

²⁴⁵ "The dialogue is often so compelling that some in the audience find it hard to believe it's not fiction, participants say. 'Several people have challenged me over the years, saying, "Oh, come on, this isn't real,'" Davis said. 'But if you don't believe it, read it for yourself.'" Emily Bregel, "Weekend," *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 14 July 2006, H16.

form a coherent narrative and highlight clear themes are less fundamental to these plays than contesting the traditional, unflattering, story of the Scopes trial.²⁴⁶

Over the past twenty-four years, the Scopes Trial Festival has provided the town of Dayton, Tennessee, with an opportunity to celebrate its heritage, attract tourists, and contribute to the national discussion about science and religion by offering its own narrative of the Scopes Trial. By explaining the trial's origins, identifying the prejudice of the media, and redeeming the character of William Jennings Bryan (to mention a few revisions), Dayton has been engaging in the same task as others in much different circles, including both historians (such as Edward Larson) and filmmakers (such as the makers of the 2011 film *Alleged*).

Some of these revisions are of course more faithful to the historical evidence than others. As one would expect, Dayton may be trying to restore its reputation a bit *too* well. Matthew Chapman helpfully noted that the plays should be considered a “re-interpretation,” not a “re-enactment.”²⁴⁷ Edward Larson (not making this linguistic distinction but in implicit agreement with it) observed, after attending the festival in 2000, the trial's seventy-fifth anniversary,

Under the watchful eye of Bryan College, Dayton's reenactment swims against the current of received wisdom flowing from *Inherit the Wind*. . . . Every word comes from the trial's long transcript, but through creative editing they present a self-assured Bryan besting the wily Darrow at every turn. . . . In this replay Bryan even holds his own on the witness stand under withering cross-examination by Darrow. . . . Bryan

²⁴⁶ The reactions I overheard from other audience members when I attended the 2011 performance of *One Hot Summer* confirmed my own feelings: “that was interesting! I hadn't known any of that!” and “I was hoping it was going to be more like *Law and Order*.” If the intent of the playwrights was more to inform than to entertain, they were successful.

²⁴⁷ Chapman, *Trials of the Monkey*, 240.

stands unbowed and all but converts the devilish Darrow, who shakes hands with him at the end. The audience cheers Bryan's best lines in response to pre-distributed cue sheets and bows its collective head during court prayers incorporated into the script.²⁴⁸

The people of Dayton had not been the first to retell the story of the Scopes trial using the trial transcripts, and the differences between their version and others did not go unnoticed. The day before he was in Dayton, Larson had attended a similar stage production at the University of Kansas hosted by the People for the American Way, starring Ed Asner. Larson called the two events, which reflected quite different attitudes toward the trial, a “study in contrasts.”²⁴⁹ It is clear from these and other dramatic productions based on trial transcripts (including Edgar Lustgarten’s “The Monkeyville Case,” 1976, and L.A. Theatre Works’ “The Great Tennessee Monkey Trial,” 1994) that inclusion or exclusion of portions of the transcript, choice of casting, stage directions, and the tone in which actors read their lines (among other factors), have shaped the message of these productions. But all things considered, each of these performances, including Dayton’s, have been by their nature considerably more similar to the recorded events of the trial than *Inherit the Wind*.

The Scopes “Monkey” Trial continues to figure prominently in American culture because the issues it raised still resonate in the twenty-first century. But the meaning it gives to those issues varies tremendously depending on the version of the story one hears. As long as Americans find themselves in the midst of these struggles, they will continue to turn to past events like the Scopes Trial in an effort to understand present controversies. To which

²⁴⁸ Larson, “Monkey Business,” 35-37.

²⁴⁹ Quoted in Larry Witham, *Where Darwin Meets the Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 261.

interpretation of the trial will they turn, and whose will prevail in the long run? The answer remains to be seen—but if the organizers of the Scopes trial festival have their way, we will leave behind *Inherit the Wind* and inherit a story much closer to the truth.

CHAPTER 4

Antievolutionists and the Memory of the Scopes Trial

As debates raged over whether and how creationism and evolution should be taught in America's public schools, all sides found it impossible to escape the context of the Scopes trial. Journalists began dozens (maybe hundreds) of articles about new controversies with the line, “___ years after the Scopes trial . . .” frequently discovering that recounting the events of the 1925 trial was considerably more interesting than writing about the details of the case before them. Evolutionists used the memory of the Scopes trial in a more polemical manner, tapping into images of backwardness and bigotry promoted by *Inherit the Wind* to malign their opponents and label any attempt to question evolution the equivalent of a trip backwards in time to the 1920s. At the same time, antievolutionists took advantage of the same memory in order to debunk it (along with evolution), or to argue that the situation had reversed itself and that they had become the new John Scopes, persecuted for their beliefs and standing up for academic freedom. Each of these groups—journalists, evolutionists, and antievolutionists—developed strategies for using the memory of the Scopes trial to their rhetorical advantage. In this chapter, we will focus on the strategies developed by the antievolutionists.

Antievolutionists in the second half of the twentieth century and early decades of the twenty-first were not at all unified in their perception of William Jennings Bryan and his role at the Scopes trial. Some remembered Bryan—who was, after all, their predecessor—as

heroic in character, and praised the town of Dayton as a place that stood up for the truth of the Bible. According to creationist biologist Bolton Davidheiser, Bryan was “the hero of the Scopes trial.” Despite being “repeatedly insulted and humiliated by Mr. Darrow, [he] did not complain or retaliate.” In fact, “he demonstrated that he had a better basic understanding of evolution and of the Bible than his detractors had.”²⁵⁰ One can also find positive allusions to the Scopes trial in newspapers. At a 2001 event at Bryan College, Tennessee Congressman Zach Wamp, asked rhetorically, “Is there a better county in Tennessee than Rhea County? Because this is the county that stood boldly on the word of God. In this county, people had the courage to stand with God.”²⁵¹ During a case involving the teaching of Bible classes in local public schools, a local attorney commented, “Rhea County is a place where they respect the Bible.”²⁵²

Others regretted the entire ordeal and were embarrassed by Bryan’s performance at the trial. Antievolutionists expressed two types of regrets. First, some thought that the Butler Act never should have been passed. “The antievolutionist crusade to control what is taught in the schools may not have been the answer,” one wrote, “and Bryan's own approach may have been too narrow.”²⁵³ According to Jerry Falwell, “whenever we, as 70 years ago at the—in Cleveland [sic], Tennessee at the Scopes trial, we were forcing—the government

²⁵⁰ Quoted in Numbers, *Darwinism Comes to America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 90. Numbers notes that Robert E. Kofahl and Bert Thompson took similar views (192, n.34).

²⁵¹ Quoted in Chris Shackleford, “Bryan College Dedicates New Buildings during Homecoming,” *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 8 Oct. 2001.

²⁵² Quoted in Kimberly Greuter, “Judge Weighs Fate of Bible Class in Rhea,” *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 23 Jan. 2002. For a scholarly rehabilitation of Bryan, see Gerald L. Priest, “William Jennings Bryan and the Scopes Trial: A Fundamentalist Perspective,” *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 4 (1999): 51-83.

²⁵³ Carol Iannone, “The Truth about *Inherit the Wind*,” *First Things*, Feb. 1997, <http://www.firstthings.com/article/2007/12/002-the-truth-about-inherit-the-wind--36>.

was forcing creation only on the children. We lost that one and should have.”²⁵⁴ Two Christian authors who wrote a book on the Scopes trial suggested that “the Butler Act was poorly drafted” and “the real issue . . . should have been addressed in other ways.”²⁵⁵

Second, young-earth creationists since George McGready Price had been furious at Bryan for conceding that the earth may be millions of years old.²⁵⁶ Henry M. Morris and his colleagues and successors at the Institute for Creation Research (ICR) have for decades considered Bryan’s compromise to have been the fundamental cause of fundamentalists’ supposed retreat from society and consequent secularizing of America.²⁵⁷ Creationist Ken Ham agreed, also regretting Bryan’s inability to adequately answer Darrow’s other questions, such as “Where did Cain get his wife?” Ham wrote on one occasion that if only Bryan had been able to attend an ICR seminar or familiarize himself with some of their books, his performance at the trial could have been a remarkable success.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁴ Wolf Blitzer, *Late Edition with Wolf Blitzer*, CNN, 22 Aug. 1999.

²⁵⁵ Marvin Olasky and John Perry, *Monkey Business* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2005), 238.

²⁵⁶ See Numbers, *Darwinism* 82-83 for a discussion of Price.

²⁵⁷ Henry M. Morris, *History of Modern Creationism* (San Diego: Master Book, 1984), 65-69; Henry M. Morris, “Recent Creation is a Vital Doctrine,” *Acts & Facts* (June 1984), <http://www.icr.org/articles/view/237/306/>, later reprinted in *Acts & Facts* 39.6 (2010), <http://www.icr.org/article/5360/>; Henry M. Morris III, “Darwin’s Dangerous Doctrine,” *Acts & Facts* 38.2 (2009), <http://www.icr.org/article/4337/>; Henry M. Morris III, “Guiding Lamp or Simply Luster,” Institute for Creation Research, no date, <http://www.icr.org/article/2713/>; John D. Morris, “The Creation Worldview and the Scopes Trial,” *Acts & Facts* 40.1 (2011), <http://www.icr.org/article/creation-worldview-scopes-trial/>; Aksionczyk 104-105.

²⁵⁸ Kenneth Ham, “Always Be Ready,” Institute for Creation Research, no date, <http://www.icr.org/always-be-ready/>. See also Ham’s video, *The Monkey Trial: The Scopes Trial and the Decline of the Church*, VHS (Florence, KY : Answers in Genesis, 1997). According to a display at Ham’s Creation Museum in Petersburg, Kentucky, Bryan’s admission marked “a turning point in American history. The world press saw that Christians and the church had compromised with the notion of millions of years, so Christians no longer had adequate answers to defend the Christian faith.” Kenneth Ham, *Journey through the Creation Museum* (Hebron, KY: Answers in Genesis: 2008). Also in display in the museum is a “Culture in Crisis” exhibit in which a church’s foundation is being smashed by a large model wrecking ball featuring the words “MILLIONS OF YEARS.” “Culture in Crisis,” Answers in Genesis, 1 Jan. 2007, <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v2/n1/culture-in-crisis>.

But even if antievolutionists could not agree about whether Bryan and the Scopes trial had been an example of their movement's best or worst tendencies, all realized the extraordinary power and influence that the trial's memory wielded over the way Americans perceived the creation-evolution conflict. Consequently, antievolutionists developed two major strategies for using it to their advantage. First, they sought to publicize the mythology that had grown up around the trial, consistently combining this debunking with a critique of evolution. Second, many antievolutionists sought to gain public sympathy by associating themselves with John Scopes, writing about "reverse Scopes trials" and appealing to the ideal of academic freedom as a justification for undermining dogmatic teaching of evolution in public schools.

Correcting Misconceptions

While Dayton's Scopes festival plays—organized primarily (if not entirely) by antievolutionists—retold the trial's story while stopping short of making explicit pronouncements about which side was actually right about science, other antievolutionists frequently retold the story within the context of arguing against evolution. Young-earth creationist David Menton—a professor of anatomy at Washington University School of Medicine who spent decades lecturing and debating, eventually becoming associated with the organization Answers in Genesis—wrote in the mid 1980s about *Inherit the Wind's* "substantive, intentional and systematic" inaccuracies.²⁵⁹ Menton later expanded the article

²⁵⁹ David N. Menton, "'Inherit the Wind': A Hollywood History of the Scopes Trial," *Bible-Science Newsletter* 23.1 (1985). Currently available at: <http://www.pathlights.com/topics/InherittheWind.htm>. Answers

into an hour-long lecture, delivered to creationist groups around the country and recorded by Answers in Genesis to sell as a DVD. Menton described how he obtained a VHS tape of the 1960 film, watching it over and over again while comparing it to the trial transcript.²⁶⁰ He concluded that the film “is actually perverse in its’[sic] intent” to slander Bible-believing Christians. He then contrasted the showdown between Bryan and Darrow with more recent debates between creationists and evolutionists, asserting that “Creationist scientists have held their own quite well in these debates, indeed, some evolutionists have conceded that creationists usually win these debates!” Menton’s lesson was not only that *Inherit the Wind* introduced historical inaccuracies into the story, but also that these inaccuracies clouded the truth that creationists were (by the late twentieth century) emerging triumphant over their evolutionist opponents.

In 1988, a year after the Supreme Court’s *Edwards vs. Aguillard* decision which struck down Louisiana’s “balanced treatment” act requiring creation science to be taught alongside evolution, Pastor D. James Kennedy hosted a video arguing in favor of creation science. *The Case for Creation*, filmed in part at the Rhea County Courthouse and featuring interviews of surviving witnesses and participants, as well as Scopes trial expert R.M. Cornelius of Bryan College, described how “popular histories of the trial have distorted the event.” Kennedy recounted the evidence for evolution presented at the Scopes trial (i.e. the

in Genesis, a group founded in 1994 by Ken Ham, has been described by Ronald Numbers as “the movement’s most robust institution.” For many years it enjoyed worldwide influence throughout Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the United Kingdom, Japan, and South Africa. Ronald L. Numbers, *The Creationists*, expanded ed. (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2006), 400-401.

²⁶⁰ Answers in Genesis also sells a 32 page booklet and 2’x3’ poster based on Menton’s writings that detail inaccuracies in *Inherit the Wind*, available on their website: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/PublicStore/>.

fossil record), and proceeded to contend that today, the scientific evidence points toward creationism, not evolution.²⁶¹

Unfortunately, in his narrative of the Scopes trial, Kennedy introduced a myth of his own. In the video (as well as an article he had recently penned for *Bible-Science Newsletter*), he claimed that one of the major proofs offered by the evolutionists was that of so-called Nebraska Man (*Hesperopithecus*): “Darrow brought in Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn of the American Museum of Natural History, the most respected palaeontologist in America at the time. He testified that just three years prior, in 1922, evidence of a whole race of men had been discovered to have lived in Nebraska a million years ago. Bryan was dumbfounded.” Kennedy recounted that it was later discovered that Nebraska Man was based on nothing more than a misidentified tooth of an extinct pig.²⁶² This story, however, is inconsistent with the actual events of the Scopes trial. First, it is clear that Bryan was already familiar with Nebraska man, having carried on an exchange with Osborn about it. (Osborn had even suggested naming it *Bryopithecus*, “after the most distinguished Primate which the State of Nebraska has thus far produced”).²⁶³ Second, Osborn was already having doubts about Nebraska man by the time the trial began and probably would not have used it as evidence at the trial. But most importantly, Osborn did not actually attend the trial. The only scientist to testify, Maynard Metcalf, never mentioned *Hesperopithecus*. Kennedy’s historical blunder

²⁶¹ D. James Kennedy, *The Case for Creation* VHS (Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.: Coral Ridge Ministries, 1988).

²⁶² D. James Kennedy. “Evolution’s Bloopers and Blunders,” *Bible-Science Newsletter*, March 1987, <http://www.cai.org/bible-studies/evolutions-bloopers-and-blunders>.

²⁶³ Quoted in John Wolf and James S. Mellett, “The Role of ‘Nebraska Man’ in the Creation-Evolution Debate,” *Creation Evolution Journal* 5.2 (Summer 1985), <http://ncse.com/cej/5/2/role-nebraska-man-creation-evolution-debate>.

was identified in *Creation Evolution Journal* by Michael Zimmerman, who was as unimpressed with Kennedy's account of the trial as Kennedy was with *Inherit the Wind*'s.²⁶⁴

One of the antievolutionist leaders to talk and write most extensively about the significance of the Scopes trial was Phillip E. Johnson, a Berkeley law professor whom Ronald Numbers has described as the “guru” of the Intelligent Design movement.²⁶⁵ Johnson rose to prominence in the early 1990s with the publication of *Darwin on Trial* (1991), in which he sought to undermine evolution by exposing its arbitrary naturalistic assumptions about science. In this book and others (including his book for high school and college students, *Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds*, 1997), Johnson explained to his readers the degree to which the memory of the Scopes trial had shaped all subsequent creation-evolution debates. Johnson had observed that antievolutionists were all too often “dismissed out of hand as religious fanatics” and that it was exceptionally “hard for reasoned criticism of biased teaching [on evolution] to get a hearing.” He attributed this difficulty to the stereotype of antievolutionists that had become so popularly through *Inherit the Wind*. He wrote, “*Inherit the Wind* is a bitter attack upon [conservative] Christianity . . . One would suppose from the play that Christianity has no program other than to teach hatred. At the surface level the play is a smear, although it smears an acceptable target and hence is considered suitable for use in public schools.”²⁶⁶ Johnson went on to debunk the mythology

²⁶⁴ Zimmerman deemed this example to be “a fair representation of the state of ‘creationist scholarship.” Michael Zimmerman, “Debunking New Myths,” *Creation Evolution Journal* 9.1 (Fall 1989), <http://ncse.com/cej/9/1/debunking-new-myths>.

²⁶⁵ Ronald L. Numbers, “Science without God,” in *When Science and Christianity Meet*, ed. David C. Lindberg and Ronald L. Numbers (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 283.

²⁶⁶ Phillip E. Johnson, *Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1997), 24, 30.

that surrounded the trial before moving on to his real argument: making the case for intelligent design. In a 2000 speech delivered at a church, he recommended that high school students be shown the film and in order to expose its “propaganda against Christianity,” thus making the students “protected, inoculated, vaccinated against the effects of this kind of thing.”²⁶⁷ Johnson also justified his antievolution strategy—chipping away at the scientific foundations of evolution while avoiding explicit references to religion—by appealing to the play: “For the present I recommend that we also put the Biblical issues to one side. The last thing we should want to do, or seem to want to do, is to threaten the freedom of scientific inquiry. Bringing the Bible anywhere near this issue just raises the ‘Inherit the Wind’ stereotype, and closes minds instead of opening them.”²⁶⁸

A slim, forty-eight page book first published by the Institute for Creation Research in 1995, *Scopes: Creation on Trial*, begins with a historical study of the Scopes trial and ends with an invitation to believe in Jesus.²⁶⁹ The first chapter is a revised version of a 1981 *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* article by Bryan College’s R.M. Cornelius on “A New Look at the Scopes Evolution Trial.” The article describes the way the memory of the trial was shaped by dishonest and shallow reporting, and narrates the usually-neglected details about

²⁶⁷ Quoted in Barbara Forrest and Paul R. Gross, *Creationism’s Trojan Horse: The Wedge of Intelligent Design* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 303.

²⁶⁸ Quoted in Forrest and Gross, *Creationism’s Trojan Horse*, 37-38.

²⁶⁹ R.M. Cornelius and John Morris, eds., *Scopes: Creation on Trial* (Green Forest, AR: Master Press, 1999). The booklet originally accompanied a cassette tape by the same title (El Cajon, Calif.: Institute for Creation Research, 1995). Interestingly, the Scopes trial has been said to embody both “Creation on Trial” (this book’s title) and “Evolution on Trial” (see books by Ellen Hansen and Kathiann M. Kowalski in chapter 2). The Institute for Creation Research, begun in 1986 by Henry Morris, has been described as “the most important messenger for bringing creationism to the public.” Christopher P. Toumey, *God’s Own Scientists: Creationists in a Secular World* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1994), 113. For more on the ICR see the surrounding pages in Toumey, as well as Numbers, *Creationists*, 315-320.

the trial for readers who are familiar only with the myth.²⁷⁰ The next chapter reprints an article William Jennings Bryan wrote for *Reader's Digest* shortly before his death in 1925, making a scientific case against evolution. Bryan never appeals to Scripture, but focuses on his belief that evolution was “an unproved hypothesis.”²⁷¹ This article clearly shows both Bryan’s high view of science (as he understood it), and his view that evolution is not scientific: “Give science a fact and it is invincible. But no one can guess more wildly than a scientist, when he has no compass but his imagination, and no purpose but to get away from God. Darwin uses the phrase ‘we may well suppose’ 800 times and wins for himself a high place among the unconscious humorists by his efforts to explain things that are not true.” As an example, he cites Darwin’s explanation that men developed brain power superior to females through fighting over mates, while men gradually lost their body hair through sexual selection. “The two explanations would be funny enough, even if each did not make the other impossible—the two sexes could not do the selecting at the same time.” The editors note that Bryan’s arguments “are as cogent today as they were then.”²⁷²

The next two chapters, written by John D. Morris (son of Henry M. Morris and successor to the leadership of ICR), interpret the Scopes trial as a key event “within a larger framework—the long war against God.”²⁷³ He then criticizes evolution’s weaknesses, citing the complexity of natural organisms, the lack of evidence for beneficial mutations, the impossibility of life originating from non-life, gaps in the fossil record, irreducible

²⁷⁰ R.M. Cornelius, “Their Stage Drew All the World: A New Look at the Scopes Evolution Trial,” in *Scopes*, ed. Cornelius and Morris, 5-24.

²⁷¹ William Jennings Bryan, “Mr. Bryan on Evolution,” in *Scopes*, ed. Cornelius and Morris, 25.

²⁷² Bryan, “Mr. Bryan on Evolution,” 27-28.

²⁷³ John D. Morris, “The Dayton Deception,” in *Scopes*, ed. Cornelius and Morris, 31

complexity, newly-discovered functions of vestigial organs and junk DNA, and criticism of embryonic recapitulation. His analysis is reminiscent of Bryan: “Scientists need to learn humility from the lesson of vestigial organs. Only the height of arrogance would lead a fallible scientist, operating from lack of data and understanding, to pass judgment on God’s design. How much better to acknowledge one’s own inadequacies and adopt a wait-and-see attitude toward the mysteries which remain.”²⁷⁴ Finally, he turns to a discussion of the supposed missing links. The fourth and final chapter, also by Morris, is entitled “The Effect of the Evolution ‘Victory.’” He describes how “The stakes are high” in questions over creation vs. evolution because the answer will determine one’s religious beliefs and consequent way of life. He closes by recounting Jesus’ conversation with Nicodemus, pleading with his reader to give up his potentially “sinful lifestyle” and believe in Jesus so he may be saved.²⁷⁵

Another book published by the Institute for Creation Research, *A Second Look at Fundamentalism, The Scopes Trial, and Inherit the Wind* (1999), contrasts *Inherit the Wind*, as well as the writings of H.L. Mencken, with the historical record of the Scopes trial. According to the foreword by Henry Morris, the trial had long been used “as a club against creationism in particular and Biblical Christianity in general”; but this book, which “is the most thoroughly document treatment yet published,” would “finally set . . . the record straight.”²⁷⁶ The author, Nicholas M. Aksionczyk, argued that Mencken and *Inherit the Wind*

²⁷⁴ Morris, “The Dayton Deception,” 37-38

²⁷⁵ John D. Morris, “The Effect of the Evolution ‘Victory,’” in *Scopes*, ed. Cornelius and Morris, 48.

²⁷⁶ Nicholas M Aksionczyk, *A Second Look at Fundamentalism, The Scopes Trial, and Inherit the Wind* (El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research, 1999), ix.

“used deceit to promote their black and white mentality of the trial. Every example and implication of Fundamentalism was bogus. To represent Fundamentalism they used straw men—religious fanatics and Bryan—as their examples of Fundamentalism.”²⁷⁷

Like other authors, Aksionczyk was interested in using his account to ultimately undermine evolutionary theory. But he did so not by showing the scientific rationale for creationism, but by arguing that “both theories . . . are unscientific.”²⁷⁸ The real issue of the trial, then, was not science vs. religion, nor was it even ultimately about science. Instead, “the controversy was an expression of the conflict between two philosophical worldviews—Theism and Humanism—over the question whether or not the Bible is the ultimate authority regarding truth.”²⁷⁹ He did not avoid the topic of science altogether. Elsewhere he asserted that “Darwinism has . . . been debunked by evolutionists” and that “science does not contradict” young-earth creationism.²⁸⁰ Nonetheless, his overall goal was to show that, contrary to the impressions left by *Inherit the Wind*, “The conflict at Dayton was between rational reason and irrational reason, between reasonable faith and unreasonable faith—and the antievolutionists were the ones with reason on their side.”²⁸¹

Another critique of *Inherit the Wind* published in the 1990s, “The Truth about *Inherit the Wind*,” was published in Richard John Neuhaus’s journal on religion and culture, *First*

²⁷⁷ Aksionczyk, *Second Look*, 94-95.

²⁷⁸ Aksionczyk, *Second Look*, 99.

²⁷⁹ Aksionczyk, *Second Look*, 12.

²⁸⁰ Aksionczyk, *Second Look*, 102, 105.

²⁸¹ Aksionczyk, *Second Look*, 106. Creationists had long disagreed about whether the best case could be made by considering creationism to be considered truly scientific, or whether to concede that it is outside the realm of science, but deeming evolution to be unscientific as well. See Numbers, *Creationists*, chapter 12: “Creation Science and Scientific Creationism.” For discussion of creationist claims about the religion of “humanism,” see Toumey, *God’s Own Scientists*, chapter five: “Evolution and Secular Humanism.”

Things. Carol Iannone, a professor at New York University's Gallatin School of Individualized Study, lamented that *Inherit the Wind* "flagrantly distorts the details" of the Scopes trial, "and neither the fictionalized names nor the cover of artistic license can excuse what amounts to an ideologically motivated hoax."²⁸² The "single, obvious end" of the alterations was "to ridicule Bryan and his followers for their backwardness and religious prejudice." Toward the end of the article, Iannone's historical revisionism morphed into an argument that Christianity and Darwinism are incompatible, and that the evidence for evolution has always been grossly deficient: "Nearly a century and a half after the publication of *On the Origin of Species*, the proof for Darwin's theory remains spotty, according to Phillip E. Johnson and others." She concluded,

a simple choice between bigotry and enlightenment is central to the contemporary liberal vision of which *Inherit the Wind* is a typical expression. But while it stands nominally for tolerance, latitude, and freedom of thought, the play is full of the self-righteous certainty that it deplores in the fundamentalist camp . . . The play reveals a great deal about a mentality that demands open-mindedness and excoriates dogmatism, only to advance its own certainties more insistently—that promotes tolerance and intellectual integrity but stoops to vilifying the opposition, falsifying reality, and distorting history in the service of its agenda. . . .

The truth is not that Bryan was wrong about the dangers of the philosophical materialism that Darwinism presupposes but that he was right, not that he was a once great man disfigured by fear of the future but that he was one of the few to see where a future devoid of the transcendent would lead . . . the real tragedy lies in the losing fight that he and others like him waged against a modernity increasingly deprived of spiritual foundations.²⁸³

The longest work that has combined a retelling of the Scopes trial with a critique of evolution has been Marvin Olasky's and John Perry's *Monkey Business: The True Story of the Scopes Trial*, published in 2005 by Broadman & Holman (publishing arm of the Southern

²⁸² Iannone, "Truth."

²⁸³ See also: Carol Iannone, "Wm. Jennings Bryan Was Right," *New York Press*, 8 May 2001.

Baptist Convention). Olasky, then a journalism professor at the University of Texas at Austin and editor-in-chief of the Christian news magazine *World*, had previously written about the bias of journalists at the Scopes trial.²⁸⁴ *Monkey Business* seems at first glance to be merely a history of the Scopes trial. But a quick skim through the book reveals that it has a Christian antievolutionist agenda, framing the trial within a broader context of the decline of morality and Bible-based Christianity in America. The trial, Olasky and Perry argued, was a visible manifestation of a general “assault on religion in public life” that eventually led to a “fog of relativism” which led to “an explosion in pornography, illegitimacy, divorce, and a revolution in entertainment standards,” as well as abortion and same-sex marriage.²⁸⁵ While Bryan (of whom they wrote quite favorably)²⁸⁶ was able to do little to stop this decline and assault, Christian leaders of the next generations had, thankfully arisen to fight against secularization and evolution. Among these “brave pro-creation voices” and “Christian rebels” were John Whitcomb, Henry Morris, Phillip Johnson, Michael Behe, William Dembski, and Kurt Wise.²⁸⁷ The retelling of the Scopes trial (and correction of the errors of

²⁸⁴ Marvin Olasky, “When Worldviews Collide: Journalists and the Great Monkey Trial,” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (Norman, OK, August 3-6, 1986); Marvin Olasky, *Telling the Truth: How to Revitalize Christian Journalism* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1996).

²⁸⁵ Olasky and Perry, *Monkey Business*, 143, 230-231

²⁸⁶ Even Bryan’s performance on the witness stand was commendable: “Though Bryan had given credible answers to every question he knew and honestly admitted those he didn’t, the Great Commoner failed to land the knockout blow he doubtless expected to score when he took the stand. Darrow hadn’t tripped up Bryan or tricked him into making extrabiblical claims, nor had he backed him into a corner. . . . But Bryan holding his own seemed somehow insufficient. Accustomed to his flights to the oratorical heights before spellbound (and friendly) audience, many of the thousands present no doubt saw Bryan on the defensive debating an articulate and informed opponent for the first time.” Olasky and Perry, *Monkey Business*, 152-3.

²⁸⁷ Olasky and Perry, *Monkey Business*, 143, 180. Olasky and Perry were also optimistic about broader trends toward cultural renewal. Here, they discuss “signs people have had enough,” including the evangelical organization Promise Keepers, Bill Cosby, George W. Bush, the Boy Scouts, and the conservative stances of the Southern Baptists and the Presbyterian Church of America (231).

Inherit the Wind) is followed by six chapters explaining the arguments for intelligent design and how Christians ought to engage in debates over evolution.

Olasky and Perry concluded by offering advice on how to surmount the kinds of stereotypes promoted by the *Inherit the Wind* view of Christianity. These stereotypes include:

1. Christians try to impose biblical views and morals on the entire population.
2. Christians blindly follow leaders like Bryan.
3. Christians want to legislate morality from the top down.
4. Christians are opposed to educational choice.
5. Christians oppose the First Amendment's guarantee of religious freedom.
6. Christians demand conformity.
7. Christians don't prize liberty.²⁸⁸

Americans ought to “learn from the Dayton debacle and avoid both the stereotypes and the reality”:

No group should try to impose its will on a diverse population and demand that its view and no others should be taught in public schools. . . . we should teach the debate and not demand conformity to either biblical or atheistic understandings . . . Many Christians learned from the Scopes trial and its aftermath that students should become aware of views other than those presented in church. But some Darwinists learned that they should seize the opportunity to exclude religious viewpoints, and both students and the cause of free inquiry have suffered. . . . Only truth, unburdened at last of politics and preconceptions, will ultimately resolve the conflict.²⁸⁹

The 344 page book concludes with four appendices, including a 2000 NPR *Science Friday* interview with Edward Larson, Michael Behe, and Kenneth Miller, an imaginative 2004 article from *World* entitled, “The View from 2025: How Design Beat Darwin,” the text of defense attorney Dudley Malone’s most famous trial speech, and Bryan’s proposed address which he was unable to deliver the last day of the trial.

²⁸⁸ Olasky and Perry, *Monkey Business*, 235-241.

²⁸⁹ Olasky and Perry, *Monkey Business*, 243.

Since at least the 1980s, antievolutionists from young-earth creationists to intelligent design strategists have made their case against evolution within the context of correcting the historical record by identifying the myths perpetuated by *Inherit the Wind*.²⁹⁰ As Barbara Forrest and Paul Gross have observed, “Disparagement of *Inherit the Wind* is a regular [antievolutionist] activity.”²⁹¹ Their desire to do so is not surprising, given the degree to which the play slanders them; nor should anyone be surprised by the ease with which they were able to take apart the play, given its frequent and obvious departures from the actual events of the trial. Their innovation was to revise the story within the context of a case for creation. “If they’ve been lying to you about the Scopes trial,” the subtext goes, “what else have they been lying about? Now, let’s discuss the truth about science.”

“Scopes in Reverse”

For those who were left unconvinced by scientific arguments for creationism, the antievolutionists employed another strategy intended to provoke public sympathy. After the Supreme Court’s 1968 *Epperson* decision, which declared it unconstitutional for states to ban the teaching of evolution, creationists began asking for both evolution and creation to be

²⁹⁰ Edward Larson also cites a much earlier article that I have not seen: Euphemia Van Rensselaer Wyatt, “Theater,” *Catholic World* 181 (1955): 226. Edward J. Larson, *Summer for the Gods* (New York: Basic Books, 2006), 314n54.

I have found one noteworthy exception to the tendency to retell the story while making the case against evolution. In 1997, *Christianity Today*’s sister publication, *Christian History*, featured an issue dedicated to “The Monkey Trial and the Rise of Fundamentalism” (16.3). The issue discussed the trial at length but showed no interest in resolving the question of evolution vs. creationism. This decision seems to be due partly to its nature as a magazine about history, but also due to *Christianity Today*’s tendency, as a moderate evangelical publication, to offer diverse views about evolution and creation without ever taking a clear position. See Toumey, *God’s Own Scientists*, 65-67.

²⁹¹ Forrest and Gross, *Creationism’s Trojan Horse*, 303.

given equal time in public school science classrooms.²⁹² It soon became clear that the situation of 1925 had reversed itself, with the evolutionists having the upper hand and the creationists taking the status of underdog. Thus began a rhetorical strategy described by Duane Gish in a 1977 article, “The Scopes Trial in Reverse”:

In the fifty years or so since the Scopes trial in 1925, events have taken a 180-degree turn . . . Those who were pleading so eloquently in 1925 that teachers have a constitutionally guaranteed right to teach both creation and evolution theories are now insisting that only evolution be taught in public schools. . . . Humanists have cast themselves in the bigoted, narrow position of denying academic and religious freedoms to those who dissent from their position.²⁹³

Gish’s article is the earliest one I have found that refers to the “reverse Scopes” strategy. I believe the idea caught on at some point during the mid to late 1970s, because it is glaringly absent in a 1970 story in which it would have been easy to employ. Clifford L. Burdick, a Ph.D. student at the University of Arizona, sued the school for denying him his degree, allegedly because he believed that the story of Noah and the flood really happened. When a journalist asked how his case related to the Scopes trial, Burdick stated that he saw no comparison. Had the “reverse Scopes” theme caught on by that time, one would have expected him to immediately invoke it, as would many in the following decades.²⁹⁴

Evolutionists quickly caught on to this tactic and were not impressed. In 1980, Frederick Edwords wrote an article entitled “Why Creationism Should Not Be Taught in Schools,” published in the first issue of *Creation Evolution Journal*:

²⁹² See Edward J. Larson, *Trial and Error: The American Controversy over Creation and Evolution*, 3rd ed. (New York Oxford University Press, 2003), especially chapter 5, “Legislating Equal Time, 1970-1981.”

²⁹³ Duane T. Gish, “The Scopes Trial in Reverse,” *The Humanist* 37.6 (Nov./Dec. 1977), 50.

²⁹⁴ Gene Varn, “‘Noah’s Ark’ Suit Filed Against UA,” *Tucson Daily Citizen*, 16 July 1970, 31. For more on Burdick and his academic troubles, see Numbers, *Creationists*, 286-296.

So, their new tactic is to declare creationism scientific, then join in with the majority and espouse the virtues of the times in their own name. In this way they can pose as latter-day Galileos being persecuted by “orthodox” science. They can become the champions for fairness fighting against the “dogmatic” evolutionists who have hauled them into the “Scopes trial in reverse.” In fact, they can even declare themselves Jeffersonian fighters for church-state separation against “the religion of evolutionary humanism” in the public schools, as well as revolutionaries for progress bringing new truths into play against “the establishment.”²⁹⁵

By the late 1980s, Tom McIver had observed that “The ‘Scopes trial in reverse’ motif” had become “extremely popular.”²⁹⁶

Antievolutionists applied this theme to every possible situation. While journalists or evolutionists often preferred to deem creation-evolution legal conflicts “Scopes II” (there were, significantly, never any “Scopes III” or “Scopes IV” cases), antievolutionists who perceived any hint of persecution involved would declare it to be “Scopes in Reverse.” A high school teacher who wanted to teach creationism, a legislator introducing a bill stipulating the need for equal time for creation and evolution, or a state school board considering a measure that would encourage students to question the theory of evolution became champions of academic freedom. When they looked back at the Scopes trial, antievolutionists had no desire to associate themselves with their intellectual forebear, William Jennings Bryan. Their new hero had become John Scopes.

It is not difficult to find “Scopes in reverse” or “reverse Scopes trial” applied to nearly every major creation-evolution controversy affecting schools. The phrase appears in stories about attempts to promote creationism/ID or detract from evolution in Indiana,

²⁹⁵ Frederick Edwords, “Why Creationism Should Not Be Taught as Science,” *Creation Evolution Journal* 1.1 (Summer 1980), <http://ncse.com/cej/1/1/why-creationism-should-not-be-taught-as-science>.

²⁹⁶ Tom McIver, “Creationist Misquotation of Darrow,” *Creation Evolution Journal* 8.2 (Spring 1988), <http://ncse.com/cej/8/2/creationist-misquotation-darrow>.

California, Colorado, Arkansas, Kansas, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee. It also appears in a 1982 incident in which Jerry Falwell's Liberty Baptist College nearly lost its ability to provide graduates with state-approved teacher certification because they were being taught creationism. It appears in cases in Illinois, California, Washington, and Michigan in which three junior high teachers, two high school teachers, and a college professor were forced to stop the various ways in which they were casting doubt on evolution.²⁹⁷

A number of antievolutionists wrote explicitly about the advantages of employing this “reverse Scopes” strategy. Phillip Johnson frequently discussed *Inherit the Wind* not only to debunk it, but also to encourage antievolutionists to understand that today, the roles have been reversed. “If you speak out about the teaching of evolution at a public hearing,” he wrote, “audience and reporters will be placing your words in the context of *Inherit the Wind*. Whether you know it or not, you are playing a role in a play. The question is, which role in the story will be yours?”²⁹⁸ Johnson recounted a time when he had gone to see *Inherit the Wind* at a theater packed with students from Harvard University. The students, in his

²⁹⁷ Bill Hendrick, *Associated Press*, 15 Feb. 1977; *World News Tonight*, ABC, March 2, 1981; David Crary. “Colorado Senate Committee Kills Creationism Bill,” *Associated Press*, 24 March 1981; “‘Monkey Trial’ in Reverse Opens in Arkansas Court,” *Christian Science Monitor*, December 8, 1981; William Rusher, “Do You Believe in Accidentalism?” Human Events Online, 31 Aug. 2005, <http://www.humanevents.com/2005/08/31/do-you-believe-in-accidentalism/>; David Fowler, “Making John Scopes Proud—Finally,” *The Chattanooga.com*, 21 Feb. 2011, <http://www.chattanooga.com/2011/2/21/195128/David-Fowler-Making-John-Scopes-Proud.aspx>; “New Briefs,” *Creation Evolution Journal* 3.4 (Fall 1982), <http://ncse.com/cej/3/4/news-briefs>; Charmain Kosek, “Educator Banned from Teaching Creation Science,” *United Press International*, 9 Nov. 1990; Stephen C. Meyer, “Danger: Indoctrination: A Scopes Trial for the ‘90s,” *Wall Street Journal*, 6 Dec. 1993; Dan Fromkin, “Instructor Sues to Teach Creationism,” *Orange County Register*, 1 Oct. 1991; Paul Greenberg, “Inherit the Wind,” *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, 22 April 2001; “Lawsuit Threatened Over Confiscation of Science Books on Intelligent Design, Order that Teachers Teach Evolution as a Fact,” *U.S. Newswire*, 21 April 2005; Mary Beth Marklein, “School Debate Evolves to Put Scopes’ Foes on Defense,” *USA Today*, 19 July 2000; Nancy Pearcey, “Scopes in Reverse,” *Washington Times*, 24 July 2000; Doug Cowan, “Foster Critical Thinking in Schools,” *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, 10 Oct. 2005.

²⁹⁸ Johnson, *Defeating Darwinism*, 25.

opinion, demonstrated that some time in the preceding decades, a reversal of opinion and conduct had taken place:

The demonstrative student audience freely jeered at the rubes of Hillsboro, whooped with delight at every wisecrack from Hornbeck or Drummond, and reveled in Brady's humiliation. It occurred to me that the Harvard students were reacting much like the worst of the Hillsboro citizens in the movie. They thought they were showing how smart they were by aping the prejudices of their teachers and by being cruel to the ghost of William Jennings Bryan—who was probably a much better man than any of them. Maybe Hillsboro isn't just Dayton, Tennessee. Maybe sometimes it's Harvard, or Berkeley.²⁹⁹

Johnson presses the reversal-of-roles analogy by comparing Bert Cates (Scopes in the play) with Jesus, who was also persecuted and destroyed by powerful people who persecuted him. Christians today who stand up against dogmatic evolutionary teaching are, similarly, in the place of Jesus/Cates/Scopes, as it is the evolutionists who have gained the upper hand and become the closed-minded persecutors and Pharisees.³⁰⁰

As an example, Johnson tells the story of Danny Phillips, a fifteen year old student in the Denver area who watched a *NOVA* program in class that presented evolution as a fact, then wrote a lengthy paper criticizing it as propaganda. The school administrators tentatively decided to withdraw the program, which “set off a media firestorm.” In the account that follows, young Danny takes on the role of John Scopes, asking for nothing more than open-mindedness and academic freedom.³⁰¹

²⁹⁹ Johnson, *Defeating Darwinism*, 30-31.

³⁰⁰ Johnson, *Defeating Darwinism*, 31-32.

³⁰¹ Johnson, *Defeating Darwinism*: see chapter 2: “Inherit the Wind: The Play's the Thing.” Danny wrote a letter to the school board in which he compared himself to Scopes (available at <http://www.rae.org/danny.html>). For further thoughts by Johnson on fighting evolution within the context of the Scopes legacy, see Phillip E. Johnson, “How to Sink a Battleship: A Call to Separate Materialist Philosophy from Empirical Science,” Leadership U, no date, <http://www.leaderu.com/real/ri9602/johnson.html>.

In 2000, in the midst of controversy over Kansas's educational standards, journalist Gregg Easterbrook addressed what he called "The New Fundamentalism" in a *Wall Street Journal* article:

If John Scopes were alive today, he might be arrested for speaking against evolution in a public school, rather than in favor of it . . . today the pendulum has swung in the opposite direction, with everyone from the Supreme Court to establishment media holding that students should hear only Darwin's side of the debate. This situation is just as preposterous as the situation in Tennessee in 1925—and just as bad for freedom of thought. Once you weren't supposed to question God. Now you're not supposed to question the head of the biology department. . . .

The obvious solution is to teach the controversy. Present students with the arguments for and against natural and supernatural explanations of life, and then let them enter into this engaging, fertile debate. Yet many school systems are steering away from teaching intelligent design, believing it to be an impermissible idea under the Supreme Court ruling. Editorials and columnists prefer not to mention the new theory, hoping to tar all non-Darwinian ideas as mere creationism. This isn't freedom of thought—it's the reverse.³⁰²

"Where is the new Scopes," he asked, "who will expose the new dogma as being just as bad as the old?" A similar article by Jay Homnick appeared in *Jewish World Review* a few years later.³⁰³

In 2007, looking back on the past four decades of creation-evolution controversies, theologian/philosopher Norman Geisler still held out hope that some day an antievolutionist public school science teacher would effectively replay the role of John Scopes. Previous cases had not turned out favorably ("because of the bias of the court," he believed), but if all of the conditions were right, it just might work:

Find a public school science teacher who on his own, apart from state or school board mandate, teaches both evolution and creation from a strictly scientific point of view.

³⁰² Greg Easterbrook, "The New Fundamentalism," *Wall Street Journal*, 8 Aug. 2000.

³⁰³ Jay D. Homnick. "Dare to Win," *Jewish World Review*, 26 Jan. 2005, http://www.jewishworldreview.com/0105/homnick_evolution.php3.

Then, let a lawsuit be leveled against him. Of course, what he is teaching must be clear of religious connotations, and he must be free of actual statements or of implications about religious motivation. Ideally, he should be a highly respected, award-winning, and well-liked teacher. Let this case go to court and let us find out once and for all how biased the court will be about anything that smacks of an intelligent cause. At least then we will know for sure whether our tactics must shift to arenas other than the courts.³⁰⁴

Borrowing Quotations

“It is bigotry for public schools to teach only one theory of origins.”

- Clarence Darrow

“For God’s sake let the children have their minds kept open—close no doors to their knowledge; shut no door from them. Make the distinction between theology and science. Let them have both. Let them both be taught.”

- Dudley Field Malone

“Education, you know, means broadening, advancing, and if you limit a teacher to only one side of anything the whole country will eventually have only one thought, be one individual. I believe in teaching every aspect of every problem or theory.”

- John Scopes

Besides labeling particular cases as instances of “Scopes in reverse,” a complementary strategy has been to quote the words of John Scopes, Clarence Darrow, and Dudley Malone to demonstrate a shared belief in academic freedom. By appealing to these quotes, antievolutionists have been ready to label their adversaries as hypocrites for abandoning the apparent tolerance of Darrow, Malone, and Scopes for the exclusivism championed by Bryan. Unfortunately, one of these quotes is almost certainly fabricated, and

³⁰⁴ Norman L. Geisler, *Creation & the Courts: Eighty Years of Conflict in the Classroom and the Courtroom* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2007), 311-12.

another was often altered to change its meaning, leaving only one that was usually applied genuinely.

Darrow

The Darrow quote was debunked in 1988 by Tom McIver, then a doctoral candidate in anthropology at UCLA. In “Creationist Misquotation of Darrow,” published in *Creation Evolution Journal*, he gave numerous examples of creationists who used the Darrow quote: “It appears in dozens of articles and books and was quoted in news reports of the Supreme Court hearing of the Louisiana creation-science law.”³⁰⁵ Elmer B. Sachs used the quote in an antievolution booklet, *Who Fathered “Mother” Nature?*: “It is bigotry for American schools to be permitted to teach a ‘OneSided’ theory on the origins of life and species, to the utter exclusion of another theory.” Pastor D. James Kennedy and columnist Cal Thomas also used it.³⁰⁶ Bill Keith, the Louisiana Senator who introduced the equal time bill that led to *Edwards v. Aguillard*, wrote in his book, *Scopes II*, “Darrow, who performed with great skill, said during the trial that teaching only one theory of origins is sheer bigotry.”³⁰⁷

Since the original source of this quote was never cited by any of these writers, and it did not appear in the trial transcript, McIver determined to track down its origin. He discovered that it had been initially popularized in Wendell Bird’s “Freedom of Religion and Science Instruction in the Public Schools” (*Yale Law Review*, 1978), which was commonly

³⁰⁵ McIver, “Creationist Misquotation.”

³⁰⁶ Sachs, Kennedy, and Thomas are cited in McIver, “Creationist Misquotation.”

³⁰⁷ Bill Keith, *Scopes II: The Great Debate* (Shreveport, Louisiana: Huntington House, 1982), vii-viii. Ronald Numbers lists further sources in *Darwinism*, p.192 fn35.

cited as a source for the quote. Bird had written, “Similarly addition of scientific creationism to a biology course that exclusively teaches the general theory [of evolution] has the secular legislative purpose of presenting more than one nonreligious explanation of the origin of the world and life. Even Clarence Darrow of *Scopes* trial fame remarked that it is ‘bigotry for public schools to teach only one theory of origins.’” For this quote Bird cited “R. O’Bannon, ‘Creation, Evolution, and Public Education 5,’ Dayton Symposium on Tennessee’s Evolution Laws (May 18, 1974).” McIver wrote, “It is from Bird’s influential and authoritative article that all recent use of the quote derives. This, then—though Bird is often not cited and his source of O’Bannon even less—is the origin of the widespread use today of the quote by creationists.”³⁰⁸

McIver attempted to track down a copy of O’Bannon’s piece from the Dayton Symposium, but it was only available from Bryan College. When he contacted the college and was finally sent a copy by Richard Cornelius, he discovered that O’Bannon did not cite a source for the quote. Upon contacting O’Bannon directly, he was given the citation, “J.F. Griggs, *Science and Scripture*, 4, 26 (1974).” McIver found the article and discovered that it contained no source. He contacted Griggs and asked him where he had found the quote:

Griggs modestly volunteered that his *Science and Scripture* article was a ‘trivial essay’ that he had not intended as a scholarly reference. The Darrow quote was written from memory, without the aid of a written source. For this reason, he said, he intended the quote as a paraphrase, not a direct quote. He had heard it orally from a Baptist preacher in Denver who died some years ago. . . . The preacher himself got it from a Dayton newspaper account around the time of the trial, he thinks. Griggs

³⁰⁸ Bird would use the quote elsewhere, for instance, in an ICR *Impact* article, “Evolution in Public Schools and Creation in Students’ Homes: What Creationists Can Do” (1979) and in the preface to Jerry Bergman’s 1984 book, *The Criterion: Religious Discrimination in America* (for a discussion of *The Criterion*, see Numbers, *The Creationists*, 297-301).

believes the reporter probably heard Darrow say it before the actual court proceedings, though he is not sure whether it was a public statement or something said during an interview.

McIver had reached an end of the trail. He wrote,

Of course, the quote could have originated in a local newspaper account around the time of the trial, but I seriously doubt it. And even if it did, I would question its accuracy. Unless it was uttered in some strange context, it makes no sense for Darrow to have said any such thing. Edward Larson . . . told me that he has seen no evidence of such a statement by Darrow, although he himself tried to track it down. More importantly, Larson points out that it goes against Darrow's trial strategy and entire record. The issue at the time was whether or not evolution should be taught in the public schools. Larson notes that "biblical creationism was not (and according to Darrow's opponent William Jennings Bryan should not be) taught in public schools." . . . As Larson wrote in a letter to me: "Why then would Darrow say that it was bigotry to teach only one view of origins? The Dayton public schools were only teaching one view—evolution—and that was what Darrow was trying to defend." Darrow defended the teaching of evolution in public school science classrooms because evolution is scientific. The biblical account of creation is not scientific, he argued, and he did not want it taught as science.³⁰⁹

In a subsequent issue of *Creation Evolution Journal*, creationist Norman Geisler, who frequently used the Darrow quote,³¹⁰ commended McIver "for exposing" its "questionable authenticity." He would, however, not let go of it quite so easily. Geisler used the trial transcripts to show that "bigot" was one of Darrow's favorite aspersions, for he used the term over and over again to describe his opponents. Geisler concluded by accusing the evolutionists of both "definitional bigotry" and "epistemological bigotry" for arguing "that

³⁰⁹ McIver, "Creationist Misquotation." Ronald Numbers briefly mentions the quote in *Darwinism Comes to America*, writing that Bird gave a new citation for it in a 1989 book (*Origin of Species Revisited*), saying the reference came from Adell Thompson, *Biology, Zoology, and Genetics: Evolution Model vs. Creation Model* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1983), p.271. However, the book has no page 271. On page 127 it does give a paraphrase of Darrow: "Scopes would have difficulty recognizing the battlelines of today. Creationists are now espousing one of the arguments of Clarence Darrow's ardent defense of Scopes: that the theory of the beginning should not be taught to the exclusion of another. In short, perhaps creationism should be considered along with the evolutionary theory" (127).

³¹⁰ Norman L. Geisler, *The Creator in the Courtroom: "Scopes II"* (Milford, Mich.: Mott Media, 1982), 11.

we can allow public school science teachers to speculate only about possible natural causes but not about possible intelligent causes.” He wrote: “Maybe Darrow did not say it, but in view of this I will: ‘It is bigotry for public schools to teach only one theory of origins!’”³¹¹

In the years that followed, Geisler continued to use the quote without explicitly attributing it to Darrow. In 1997 he wrote,

The irony is that creationists were called “bigots” many times at the Trial. But let not the kettle call the pot black. If it was bigotry in 1925 when only creation was taught in schools, then it is still bigotry in 2007 when only evolution is being taught. . . . We believe that if it was bigotry in 1925 to teach only one view of origins in public schools when only creation was taught, then it is still bigotry today to teach only one view of origins when only evolution is being taught.³¹²

And in 2007 he wrote, regarding his testifying in *McLean*,

I argued, as did the ACLU at the 1925 *Scopes* trial, that it is “bigotry” for public schools to teach only one theory of origins. . . . And if it was bigotry to teach only one view when only creation was being taught, then why is it not still bigotry when only evolution is being taught?

If the ACLU wanted both evolution and creation to be taught at "Scopes I" in 1925 when only creation was being taught, then why in 1981 at "Scopes II," at a time when only evolution was being taught, did the ACLU argue only *that* one view should be taught? If it was "bigotry" (a word the ACLU used repeatedly of creationists at the *Scopes* trial) in 1925 when only creation was being taught, why was it not bigotry in 1981 (and today) when only evolution is being taught?³¹³

Most creationists, of course, never read Tom McIver’s article, so the quote’s attribution to Darrow continued to circulate. Duane Gish wrote in *Teaching Creation Science in Public Schools* (1995), “During the *Scopes* Trial . . . Clarence Darrow thundered

³¹¹ Norman L. Geisler, “Was Clarence Darrow a Bigot?” *Creation Evolution Journal* 9.1 (Fall 1989), <http://ncse.com/cej/9/1/was-clarence-darrow-bigot>.

³¹² Norman L. Geisler, “The Conservative Agenda: Its Basis and Basics,” Dr. Norman L. Geisler, 1997, <http://www.normgeisler.com/articles/political/TheConservativeAgendaBasisAndBasics.htm>.

³¹³ Geisler, *Creation*, 124, 277.

that it was bigotry to teach only one theory of origins. We are now about 70 years after the Scopes Trial, and the situation has been essentially turned around 180 degrees. . . . We believe, along with Darrow, that to teach only one theory of origins is bigotry.”³¹⁴ In a 2005 book, D. James Kennedy and Jerry Newcombe wrote:

Do you remember the Scopes Trial in 1925? At that time, the only thing that was allowed to be taught was creationism, and the evolutionists, led by atheist Clarence Darrow and the ACLU—which could be called the Anti-Christian Liberty Union—went to court to overthrow that law. Darrow said, “[I]t is bigotry for public schools to teach only one theory of origins.” Well, well, now isn’t that interesting? . . . It seems the bigotry is now on the other foot.³¹⁵

In one article published by the ICR, the quote was given and described as “The main argument of the ACLU at the Scopes Trial”; however, although it was put in quotation marks, it was not attributed to anyone in particular.³¹⁶ The quote continues to surface in newspapers, mostly in letters to the editor.³¹⁷

³¹⁴ Duane T. Gish, *Teaching Creation Science in Public Schools* (El Cajon, Calif.: Institute for Creation Research, 1995), v-vi.

³¹⁵ D. James Kennedy and Jerry Newcombe, *Lord of All: Developing a Christian World-and-Life View* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway Books, 2005), 35. The quote had long been a favorite of Kennedy, who also used it in *The Case for Creation*: “You know, I agree with him. But today, it is the creationists who are being discriminated against, and now, the bigotry is on the side of the evolutionists.”

³¹⁶ Robert L. Simonds, “Teachers Can Teach Creation Science in the Classroom,” *Impact* (Oct. 1989), <http://www.icr.org/article/teachers-can-teach-creation-science-classroom/>.

³¹⁷ Self-published Christian books that include the quote include: James Dove, *All Their Graves are Occupied! His Tomb is Empty!: The Controversial Reality* (Lincoln: Writers Club Press, 2001), 205; Glen Beyeler, *Beyond Superficiality with God* (Infinity Publishing, 2007).

Letters to the editor with the quote, usually attributed to Darrow: David Tomaselli, “Just Where is the Proof?” *Houston Chronicle*, 8 Oct. 1993; Jerry E. Davis, “Intelligent Design: Origin Education Shouldn’t Be Limited to Evolution Theory,” *Charleston Gazette*, 1 Feb. 2003; Tom Carpenter, “A Defeat for Science,” *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, 17 Jan. 2005; William Slater, “Forensic Evidence Supports Both Ideas,” *Chicago Daily Herald*, 30 July 2005; J.D. Barnett, “Bigotry Now OK,” *Tulsa World*, 28 Aug. 2005.

Ken Connor, a 1994 Republican candidate for the governor of Florida, who was reported to have had a framed picture of William Jennings Bryan and Clarence Darrow on his office wall, advocated equal time for creationism and also used this quote in interviews. Ellen Debenport, “He Keeps the Faith atop His Agenda,” *St. Petersburg Times*, 7 July 1994; *Crossfire*, CNN, 29 May 2002, <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0205/29/cf.00.html>.

Malone

If the Darrow quote was fabricated, what of the idea behind it? Was the ACLU really arguing that both sides should be taught? To answer this question in the affirmative, creationists have frequently (and increasingly) turned to defense attorney Dudley Field Malone, who said at the trial, “For God’s sake let the children have their minds kept open—close no doors to their knowledge; shut no door from them. Make the distinction between theology and science. Let them have both. Let them both be taught.” This quote is authentic, having come straight from the trial transcript.³¹⁸

McIver discussed this quote briefly in “Creationist Misquotation of Darrow.” He noted that creationists sometimes subtly changed the words. In a 1983 ICR video, *Origins—Two Models: Evolution or Creation*, Darrow (not Malone) is said to have cried out, “For God’s sake, let the children have their minds open! Close no doors to their knowledge; shut no door to them. Let them have both evolution *and* creation! The truth will win out in the end.” In fact, Malone said not “let them have both evolution and creation” but “make the distinction between theology and science”—two quite different notions. Malone was arguing that creationism fit into the former, not the latter category, and was therefore inappropriate for science classrooms. But McIver found multiple instances in which “evolution and creation” were the words put into Malone’s mouth.³¹⁹

³¹⁸ *The World’s Most Famous Court Trial: Tennessee Evolution Case* (Union, N.J.: The Lawbook Exchange, 1997), 187.

³¹⁹ See also Paul Bartz, “The Shocking Truth About the Scopes Trial,” *Bible Science Newsletter* (1984) and Richard B. Bliss, “Evolutionary Indoctrination and Decision-Making in Schools,” *Impact* (June 1983), <http://www.icr.org/article/evolutionary-indoctrination-decision-making-school/>. The quote continues to be misworded and/or attributed to Darrow, especially in letters to the editor: see Walt Sivertsen, “Creationism Ruling

Norman Geisler was conspicuously silent about the Malone quote in his *Creation Evolution Journal* response to McIver. He did, however, continue to use the quote, sometimes in full, and sometimes inserting ellipses where convenient: “ACLU attorney Malone pled: ‘For God’s sake, let the children have their minds be kept open—close no doors to their knowledge; shut no door from them. . . . Let them have both. Let them both be taught’” [ellipses original].³²⁰ Apparently, Geisler did not find it consequential whether Malone said “creation and evolution” or “science and theology.” He wrote in a footnote—perhaps anticipating criticism—“It matters not that the attorney called creation ‘theology.’ Whatever the name, he still wanted it taught in the public schools alongside evolution.”³²¹

Scopes

A third quotation, also popular among creationists, is from John Scopes himself: “Education, you know, means broadening, advancing, and if you limit a teacher to only one side of anything the whole country will eventually have only one thought, be one individual. I believe in teaching every aspect of every problem or theory.” This quote can be found in the writings of Wendell Bird, Norman Geisler, and other antievolutionists.³²²

is Misunderstood,” *Daily Herald*, 16 March 2011, <http://www.dailyherald.com/article/20110316/discuss/703169801/print/>.

³²⁰ Geisler. “Conservative Agenda.” The ellipses appear the same way in *Creation & the Courts*, 124 and 308, though the quote is given in full on pages 59 and 277.

³²¹ Geisler, *Creation & the Courts*, 277n59. On another occasion, he (and/or co-author Frank Turek) misattributed it to Darrow: Norman Geisler and Frank Turek, *Legislating Morality: Is It Wise? Is It Legal? Is It Possible?* (Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1998), 66.

³²² Wendell R. Bird, *Origin of Species Revisited* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1989), 9, 15. Geisler. *Creation & the Courts* 277, 308, 346 and “Conservative Agenda.” See also Geisler’s March 19, 1982 article in *Christianity Today* (quoted in Geisler, *Creator*, 205) and Geisler and Turek, *Legislating Morality*, 65-66.

This quote also appeared in the Intelligent-Design science textbook *Of Pandas and People*. In an introductory “Note to Teachers,” written by Stephen C. Meyer and Mark Hartwig, the Scopes quote concludes a discussion of the importance of teaching both sides of every issue:

Teaching a variety of scientific theories about the origins of humankind to schoolchildren might be validly done with the clear secular intent of enhancing the effectiveness of science instruction.

This is not only consistent with good science, it is consistent with the highest ideals of a democratic society. As John Scopes, who was tried in the 1920s for teaching evolution, said at his own trial, “Education, you know, means broadening, advancing, and if you limit a teacher to only one side of anything the whole country will eventually have only one thought, be one individual. I believe in teaching every aspect of every problem or theory.”³²³

Likewise, Danny Phillips, the fifteen year old from Denver discussed by Johnson, used the quote in a speech he prepared to deliver to the Jefferson County School Board. He said,

As some of you are aware, the 1920’s hosted the very famous “Monkey Trial” in Dayton, Tennessee. A substitute biology teacher, by the name of John Scopes, volunteered to help the ACLU challenge a Tennessee statute forbidding the teaching of anything other than biblical creation in the public schools. The defense for Scopes argued that the statute opposed freedom of education and science. At the trial, Scopes said, “Education, you know, means broadening, advancing, and if you limit a teacher to only one side of anything the whole country will eventually have only one thought, be one individual. I believe in teaching every aspect of every problem or theory.”

Scopes believed in teaching science, not the philosophical viewpoints of others. I agree with him that evolution should not be outlawed from the schools. However, today it is obvious that the tides have turned and now instead of outlawing evolution and teaching creationism, the schools teach evolution dogmatically and outlaw any information that might discredit that so-called theory. To this, I do object.³²⁴

³²³ P. William Davis, Dean H. Kenyon, and Charles B. Thaxton, *Of Pandas and People* (Dallas: Haughton Pub. Co. 1993), 61. Meyer also used the quote in a *USA Today* article. John Angus Campbell and Stephen C. Meyer, “Evolution: Debate It,” *USA Today*, 14 Aug. 2005, http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/2005-08-14-evolution-debate_x.htm.

³²⁴ Quoted in David Buckna and Danny Phillips, “In the Beginning...Were the Facts: What Happened CBS?” *Revolution Against Evolution*, no date, <http://www.rae.org/danny.html>.

Ironically, Phillips (and other antievolutionists) were appealing to a memory of John Scopes that owed more to *Inherit the Wind* than to the actual character of the mild mannered and reluctant teacher.

The Scopes quote is obviously widespread and serves the same purpose as the Darrow and Malone ones: it shows that Scopes (if not his attorneys) believed in the same sort of academic freedom that ought to allow the teaching of creationism or intelligent design in public schools. Is it genuine? MacIver never discussed the quote, and antievolutionists have never (to my knowledge) cited a primary source in support of the quote.³²⁵ However, the quote is in fact genuine, and may be found in a 1925 issue of the *New York Times*. John Scopes had travelled to New York the month before the trial, and gave a brief speech before a crowd one evening in which he spoke the words attributed to him.³²⁶

It is clear that neither Darrow nor Malone had proposed that creation and evolution be taught side by side in a science class. What of Scopes? His statement is somewhat ambiguous. Teachers should not be limited to “only one side of anything,” and “every aspect of every problem or theory” should be taught. But was he suggesting that a science classroom is the appropriate place for creation? Or, like Malone, would he have wanted a distinction to be made between science and theology? Perhaps the twenty-four year old teacher—likely nervous at the prospect of giving a speech before an audience in New York which he may or may not have written himself—was simply saying what he was expected to

³²⁵ Geisler and Meyer/Hartwig cited it as being quoted in P. William Davies and Eldra Pearl Solomon, *The World of Biology* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1974).

³²⁶ “Scopes Dined, Says Fight is for Liberty,” *New York Times*, 11 June 1925, p.1-2.

say by taking a stand for academic freedom. Whether his words were carefully chosen or written in haste is not clear. Furthermore, it is not insignificant that the statements made by his experienced attorneys were considerably more shrewd. But what is clear is that antievolutionists of later generations have been delighted to adopt his words for their own cause.

Observations

The antievolutionist impulse to become associated with John Scopes may be further understood through a 1997 article by Judith Anderson and John Weister about “Dealing with the Media in the Science Textbook Controversy”:

How can we change the focus of the debate from retrying Scopes to what is good science education? First we must educate the media . . . Be savvy when dealing with the media. Do not discuss your religious views. Be aware that the reporter needs outrageous sound bites and that your comments may be heavily edited. Be interested in his point of view: does he want the truth, or has he been told to rewrite Scopes? Stress that your concern is the censorship of unsolved problems, and the shell games played with terms (like evolution) to protect Darwinian ideology. Don't give the media the opportunity to stereotype you as a Bible-thumping fanatic who is trying to suppress academic freedom. If the reporter can see you as the reasonable party, he will be more inclined to understand and communicate your point of view.³²⁷

As Anderson and Weister (and Johnson, as described earlier) note, creation-evolution controversies in America are simply always compared to the Scopes trial. *Inherit the Wind* has shaped how Americans understand these debates, and there is simply no getting around it. Antievolutionists would ignore Scopes at their peril. Thus, the first necessary step in presenting one's case against evolution is to distance oneself as far as possible from William

³²⁷ Judith Anderson and John Weister, “Dealing with the Media in the Science Textbook Controversy,” Access Research Network, 1997, <http://www.arn.org/docs/pc1110.htm>.

Jennings Bryan. An advisable second step is to go so far that one finds oneself on the side of the defense, where one can appeal to the “heroes” of the story such as Darrow and Scopes.

Why do Americans so revere John Scopes? From 1925, when the media first made him into a legend, to the present day, when most Americans know him only through *Inherit the Wind*, Scopes has been held up as “a youthful hero . . . a champion for the modern version of the American identity: the urban, modern, scientific, and secular . . . He is the perfect American hero of the century, another Lindbergh . . . [he is] another hero in whom [Americans may] reassert their faith in humanity.”³²⁸ In a trial that has come to symbolize the perennial struggles between freedom and oppression and intellectual curiosity and closed-minded tradition, John Scopes was, as the phrase goes, “on the right side of history.” Therefore, to take his words (or those of his attorneys Darrow and Malone) and turn them on today’s evolutionists, accusing *them* of bigotry, is to attempt to reclaim the American ideals he has come to represent and show that today’s heirs of Scopes have dishonored his legacy.

Furthermore, as Larry A. Witham has noted, creationists and evolutionists found it profitable to compete for the status of underdog. He observed, “Great cultural arguments often produce a perceived underdog. It is a sympathetic status that evolutionists and creationists as causes and as people both may claim—depending on the circumstances.” Evolutionists lamented that their ideas are rejected by the majority of the public, while creationists pointed to powerful judges, ACLU attorneys, and other members of the cultural elite as evidence that evolution now has the upper hand. “What underdog status produces

³²⁸ L. Maren Wood, “The Monkey Trial Myth: Popular Culture Representations of the Scopes Trial,” *Canadian Review of American Studies* 32.2 (2002): 158.

most in a democracy is public sympathy, which if broad enough can decide the social standing of an American institution.” Evolutionist Eugenie Scott agreed: “America loves the underdog . . . It’s a very useful metaphor for both of us [creationists and evolutionists] . . . They claim it as consciously as we do. There is truth on both sides.”³²⁹

How effectively has this rhetorical strategy served antievolutionists? Public opinion may not be easy to measure, but it is clear that judges sympathetic to the “Scopes in reverse” strategy have been in the minority. In *Edwards v. Aguillard* (1987), a case challenging Louisiana’s equal-time law, Judge Thomas Gibb Gee had dissented from the case’s appeals court ruling, noting, “The *Scopes* court upheld William Jennings Bryan’s view that states could constitutionally forbid teaching the scientific evidence for the theory of evolution . . . By requiring that the whole truth be taught, Louisiana aligned itself with Darrow; striking down this requirement, the panel holding aligns us with Bryan.”³³⁰ Antonin Scalia, likewise, rebuked his fellow Supreme Court justices in a dissent from *Edwards*, suggesting that they had been duped by *Inherit the Wind* and that they had failed to see that the roles were now reversed:

We have, moreover, no adequate basis for disbelieving the secular purpose set forth in the Act itself, or for concluding that it is a sham enacted to conceal the legislators’ violation of their oaths of office. I am astonished by the Court’s unprecedented readiness to reach such a conclusion, which I can only attribute to an intellectual predisposition created by the facts and the legend of *Scopes v. State, 154 Tenn. 105, 289 S. W. 363 (1927)*—an instinctive reaction that any governmentally imposed requirements bearing upon the teaching of evolution must be a manifestation of

³²⁹ Larry A. Witham, *Where Darwin Meets the Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 269-270. One antievolutionist author wrote sarcastically, “Perhaps if Bryan becomes enough of a victim, someone will eventually produce a remake of *Inherit the Wind* in which he is portrayed sympathetically.” Larry Schweikart, *48 Liberal Lies about American History* (New York: Sentinel, 2008), 129.

³³⁰ Quoted in Larson, *Summer*, 259.

Christian fundamentalist repression. In this case, however, it seems to me the Court's position is the repressive one.

The people of Louisiana, including those who are Christian fundamentalists, are quite entitled, as a secular matter, to have whatever scientific evidence there may be against evolution presented in their schools, just as Mr. Scopes was entitled to present whatever scientific evidence there was for it.

Over a decade later, when the Court refused to review a ruling over disclaimers about evolution in Louisiana, he wrote, “Today we permit a Court of Appeals to push the much beloved secular legend of the Monkey Trial one step further . . . We stand by in silence while [it] bars a school district from even suggesting to students that other theories besides evolution . . . are worthy of their consideration.”³³¹

Nonetheless, the vast majority of courts were considerably less sympathetic to antievolutionists than Judge Gee and Justice Scalia. Noting the way most other judges used the memory of the trial to make the opposite case, Larson wrote, “These clashing applications of the Scopes legend illustrate its broad appeal as folklore. Brennan [who wrote the majority opinion in *Edwards*] could just as easily invoke it to support freedom from religious establishment as Scalia could use it to support academic freedom to teach alternative theories.”³³² Nor has the mainstream media been receptive to this strategy. Larson attributes this failure to fundamental differences between recent cases and the original Scopes trial:

Unlike in Scopes, all these trials lost without fanfare, and other pretenders to the role face a similar fate. Parallels fail in substance and style. The anti-evolution law challenged by John Scopes flew in the face of scientific orthodoxy; restrictions

³³¹ Quoted in Larson, *Trial and Error*, 207.

³³² Larson, *Summer*, 260.

against “teaching the controversy” do not. Furthermore, the Scopes of legend was largely a media construct, and the media rarely lionize creationists.³³³

Indeed, the consistent setbacks that antievolutionists have met in courts show that success would require significantly more than casting oneself as a hero of academic freedom or victim of oppression. Teaching both sides of a scientific debate is only deemed legitimate when both sides are considered scientific. The verdict in every relevant court case has demonstrated that it is the perceived scientific illegitimacy of the ideas of antievolutionists that have set them apart from John Scopes. In *Kitzmiller v. Dover* (2005), for instance, which tested whether Intelligent Design could be taught in public schools without violating the separation of church and state, Judge John E. Jones III wrote in his opinion, “After a searching review of the record and applicable case law, we find that while ID arguments may be true, a proposition on which the Court takes no position, ID is not science.”³³⁴ Jones’s verdict echoed the court cases of the 1980s (*McLean* and *Edwards*) in which the same conclusion was drawn about creation science. Cries of academic freedom notwithstanding, until antievolutionists are able to persuade the courts and the public that their beliefs are genuinely scientific, they will likely continue to find the legacy of John Scopes to be of little assistance.

³³³ Larson, *Summer*, 206.

³³⁴ Quoted in Larson, *Summer*, 277.

CHAPTER 5

The Scopes Trial in America's Culture Wars

When Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee wrote *Inherit the Wind* in the 1950s, they intended it to be a parable, a story whose truths shed light on other more timely subjects. Creation and evolution were not being debated that decade; instead, “their concern was the McCarthy-era blacklisting of writers and actors.” As Lee put it, “I was very concerned when laws were passed, when legislation limits our freedom to speak; silence is a dangerous thing.”³³⁵ The playwrights wrote in the preface to *Inherit the Wind* that the issues raised at the Scopes trial had “acquired new dimension and meaning” in the intervening years. “It is not 1925. The stage directions set the time as ‘Not too long ago.’ It might have been yesterday. It could be tomorrow.”³³⁶

Throughout the decades that followed the writing of *Inherit the Wind*, journalists and politicians found dozens of occasions to compose similar parables, drawing their own connections between contemporary events and the Scopes trial. By the late twentieth century, the memory of the Scopes trial imprinted in the minds of Americans by *Inherit the Wind* had become a rich source of imagery for those interested in provoking ideas and emotions in their arguments. Alongside words such as “patriotism,” “racism,” “freedom,” or “hate,” the saying “it’s just like the Scopes trial” had become a way to cue up feelings about freedom, intolerance, ignorance, and other themes from the story.

³³⁵ Edward J. Larson, *Summer for the Gods* (New York: Basic Books, 2006), 240.

³³⁶ Lawrence and Lee, *Inherit the Wind* (New York: Bantam, 1955), n.p.

A study of how the memory of the Scopes trial was used in American magazines, newspapers, television news shows, and popular blogs shows how the trial has had the “ability to serve so many compelling interests.”³³⁷ We will focus on the way it was used to comment on controversies surrounding presidential politics, global climate-change, same-sex marriage, and similar issues. Through this study, it becomes clear that by the late twentieth century memory of the Scopes trial had indeed become a weapon in the hand of America’s culture warriors. But it was a weapon wielded by both sides with a variety of tactics and skills.³³⁸

Early Allusions to Scopes in the 1970s

After Lawrence and Lee interpreted McCarthyism through the lens of Scopes (and, one might add, vice versa), the earliest instance that I have found in which the Scopes trial is compared to a contemporary event is in a March, 1975 issue of *Newsweek*. In the article “Abortion and the Law,” the author discussed the recent trial of Kenneth C. Edelin, a physician who was found guilty of manslaughter for performing an abortion on a woman who was twenty weeks pregnant. A medical professor from Harvard, Dr. Kenneth J. Ryan, compared the controversy to the Scopes trial, stating, “The issue in the Scopes trial was solved eventually through discussion and consensus . . . although I’m sure there are still some

³³⁷ Ronald L. Numbers, *Darwinism Comes to America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988), 76.

³³⁸ The research for this chapter was performed primarily through Lexis-Nexis and is therefore limited to the sources available through that program. As will become clear, the majority of the sources mentioned go back no further than the 1990s. I have a hunch, however, that due to the polarization of politics along religious lines which approximately began with the 1980 election, the memory of Scopes was appealed to much less frequently before the election of Ronald Reagan.

people who don't believe in teaching evolution. Discussion and consensus is what I would like to see happen here.”³³⁹ Compared to later allusions to Scopes, this particular reference to the trial is unusual. Dr. Ryan apparently understood the teaching of evolution in public schools—the dominant controversy of the Scopes trial—to be a public controversy that had, by the 1970s, been settled by the legal system. He may have been thinking of the Supreme Court’s *Epperson* decision banning the prohibition of the teaching of evolution, decided only seven years earlier. But his choice of words would not be repeated in later years, when it would become clear that the term “consensus” could scarcely apply to Americans’ beliefs about the teaching of evolution. Still, this article represents an early instance of a trend to draw a connection (for one of many possible reasons) between a contemporary controversial moral issue—abortion—and the Scopes trial.

In October of the same year, a *New York Daily News* article appeared about Karen Ann Quinlan, a twenty-one year old hospitalized girl who was being kept alive on a ventilator and whose parents requested she be taken off so she could die. When the doctors refused the parents’ request, they sought out legal support and naturally captured the attention of the media. “The curtain rises,” the author wrote, “on one of the most compelling dramas since the Scopes trial sought to establish the roots of human life.”³⁴⁰ Once again, a dramatic moral issue presenting itself in America’s courtrooms drew up memories of the famous 1925 trial over evolution.

³³⁹ David M. Alpern, “Abortion and the Law,” *Newsweek*, 3 March 1975.

³⁴⁰ Peter Coutros, “It Is Only a Matter of Life and Death,” *New York Daily News*, 21 Oct. 1975, quoted in Jill Lepore, *The Mansion of Happiness: A History of Life and Death* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012), 158.

The 1980 Presidential Election

When in 1980 Ronald Reagan became the first recent presidential candidate to publicly express doubts about evolution, his critics began a tradition of Scopes comparisons that has continued into the twenty-first century. Reagan had said that evolution

is a theory, it is a scientific theory only, and it has in recent years been challenged in the world of science and is not yet believed in the scientific community to be as infallible as it once was believed. But if it was going to be taught in the schools, then I think that also the Biblical theory of creation, which is not a theory but the Biblical story of creation, should also be taught. . . . I have a great many questions about [evolution.] I think that recent discoveries down through the years have pointed up great flaws in it.”³⁴¹

Reagan’s critics were dumbstruck that a candidate for the highest office in America would doubt what they considered to be an unquestionable scientific theory, thus associating himself with the creationism movement that wanted “both sides” taught. As was reported in the *Washington Post*,

When somebody asked [Liz] Carpenter [Assistant Secretary of Education] what Reagan meant with he told a convention of evangelists in Texas last weekend that if Darwin's theory of evolution is taught in public schools, so should the biblical explanation, Carpenter's jaw dropped in astonishment. It revived memories of the Scopes monkey trial except nobody could think of the defense lawyer's name. That is until Education Secretary Shirley Hufstedler walked up.

“Clarence Darrow,” she said, and without knowing anything about the preceding conversation, went on to say that “people are surprised to find that history repeats itself—some people are surprised it's 1980.”³⁴²

Mark Shields, editorial writer for the same newspaper, doubted that Reagan’s speech would win him any votes in swing states where the Democrats’ “target voters are strongly Catholic and Jewish. They do vote, and they are not particularly comfortable with events

³⁴¹ Quoted in Toumey, *God's Own Scientists*, 39.

³⁴² Donnie Radcliffe, “The Southern Touch,” *Washington Post*, 26 Aug. 1980.

like the one in Dallas. A check of our polls reveals no groundswell on the part of undecided voters anywhere for reopening the Scopes Trial.”³⁴³ In a column entitled, “Creation vs. Evolution: The Battle Resumes in Public Schools,” Philip J. Hilts recounted,

In the hot summer of 1925, when William Jennings Bryan defended the old-time religion in the celebrated Scopes “monkey trial,” fundamentalist politics was a powerful force. The “creationists” who believed in the literal accuracy of Genesis swept the teaching of evolution out of America’s public schools. Now, 55 years later Ronald Reagan has latched onto the issue again, with his recent endorsement of the modern fundamentalists and their revived creationist movement.³⁴⁴

In *Newsweek*, Peter Goldman could not understand why Reagan would want to “profess some misgivings about the theory of evolution—a controversy most Presidential politicians have presumed dead and buried since the Scopes trial.”³⁴⁵

Reagan’s critics cited the Scopes trial in an effort to contend that the candidate’s beliefs were antiquated, and they showed both amusement and shock that he did not share their presumption that the issue of which he spoke had been settled for over half a century. Following the traditional narrative, they thought that the Scopes trial had been a turning point after which no one seriously endorsed creationism. Yet they also realized that in 1980 a previously-silent constituency, “modern fundamentalists and their revived creationist movement,” had suddenly gained significant influence. Although this would be the first and last time Reagan would directly speak in public about creationism in schools, “fundamentalist politics” had come to stay—and had brought with it memories of 1925.

³⁴³ Mark Shields, “Memo to Ronald Reagan,” *Washington Post*, 29 Aug. 1980.

³⁴⁴ Philip J. Hilts, “Creation vs. Evolution: The Battle Resumes in Public Schools.” *Washington Post*, 13 Sept. 1980.

³⁴⁵ Peter Goldman, “The Battle of the Button,” *Newsweek*, 1 Sept. 1980.

The 1996 Presidential Election

Although the creation-evolution controversy continued to rage throughout the 1980s and 1990s, it did not directly enter presidential politics again until Pat Buchanan campaigned for the Republican nomination in 1996. Buchanan, a Roman Catholic, had served as an advisor to Nixon, Ford, and Reagan, and worked as a syndicated columnist since the 1970s. In a televised interview with ABC he told Sam Donaldson, “I believe you’re a creature of God. . . . I think [parents] have a right to insist that Godless evolution not be taught to their children or their children not be indoctrinated in it.”³⁴⁶

As with Reagan, his critics did not hesitate to make a monkey out of him for publicly questioning evolution. Jim Dwyer wrote in the *New York Daily News*,

Very, very few conservative Catholics, no matter how much they think the world has gone to hell in a handbag, actually morph into Southern Baptists, vintage 1923. But that is where Pat Buchanan has landed. . . . Any day now, Buchanan could be auditioning for the next Scopes monkey trial. . . . He shows about the same regard for genetics as the jurors did in the O.J. Simpson case.³⁴⁷

From Australia, the *Sydney Morning Herald* was even less kind to Buchanan:

Buchanan has been likened to William Jennings Bryan, a populist who three times ran for president. Bryan, a renegade Democrat, prosecuted at the famous “Monkey Trial” in Tennessee in 1925. Buchanan doesn't buy Darwin's line on evolution either. He's also against abortion, immigration, Martin Luther King, homosexuality and acronyms—particularly GATT, NAFTA and the UN. There's also a hint he may not be too fond of blacks or Jews. He's for isolationism, guns, prayers and the good old days.³⁴⁸

³⁴⁶ Quoted in Michael D. Lemonick and Andrea Dorfman, “Dumping on Darwin,” *Time*, 18 March 1996, 81.

³⁴⁷ Jim Dwyer, “Foes Making It D-Day For Dole; Preachin’ Pat Makes Monkey out of Truth,” *New York Daily News*, 20 Feb. 1996.

³⁴⁸ Les Carlyon, “It’s Time to Put Some Perspective into Politics,” *Sydney Morning Herald (Australia)*, 29 Feb. 1996.

In the *Buffalo News*, Jeff Simon decried “the Goblins of Bigotry” and wondered, “who’d have thought that in the ‘90s there would be a viable candidate who would actually come down on the side against Darwin in the Scopes Trial?”³⁴⁹

The timing of Buchanan’s comments was certainly not to his advantage. A production of *Inherit the Wind* was playing that year at Boston’s Royale Theatre. Theatergoers attending the play, which starred George C. Scott as William Jennings Bryan, were greeted by a large banner, quoting Buchanan’s words, draped across the theater’s entrance.³⁵⁰

Bill Clinton’s Impeachment (1999)

In 1999 President Bill Clinton became the topic of Scopes trial comparisons, though not over his views of evolution (which were scientifically orthodox). It was the Lewinsky scandal, during which he was impeached by the House of Representatives for perjury before being acquitted by the Senate, that provoked the notion that Americans were living through a new “trial of the century.” Frank Rich wrote in the *New York Times*,

In a riveting book, “Summer for the Gods,” which won last year’s Pulitzer Prize in History, Edward J. Larson argues that only the 1925 Scopes trial, about the teaching of evolution, “fully lives up to its billing by continuing to echo through the century.” Though Mr. Larson was writing pre-Monica—and was referring to such echoes as the continuing fight over religion in public schools—Monicagate has now not only ratified his view but has led us to a plausible potential Scopes II.

Embedded in the battle between Clarence Darrow and William Jennings Bryan was a debate over values—a culture war that pitted modernists against fundamentalists. This is roughly how the religious right of our day, impeachment’s most dogged proponents, defines the debate now; it’s what Tom DeLay means when

³⁴⁹ Jeff Simon, “In the Media and at Home, the Goblins of Bigotry,” *Buffalo News*, 10 March 1996.

³⁵⁰ *The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer*, PBS, 31 May 1996.

he sees the battle as that of “relativism versus absolute truth.” And it’s this culture war that remains the main event. Whether the lame-duck Bill Clinton is acquitted or convicted, his fate is as secondary to the dynamic of his trial as the preordained conviction of John Scopes, the biology teacher who challenged state and biblical law, was to his own media circus.³⁵¹

Although a few of Rich’s statements are unclear (how did “Monicagate” at once “ratify” Larson’s labeling Scopes as the trial of the century but also potentially become its sequel?), his apparently recent reading of *Summer for the Gods* gave him a perspective on the Scopes trial that exceeded other journalists who had perhaps only seen *Inherit the Wind*. He tapped into the meaning behind the Scopes trial, which he understood to be not simply a battle between science and ignorant religion but “a debate over values.” Furthermore, he argued that Clinton, like Scopes, was nothing more than a symbol in that greater debate, a comparison that suggested the image of Clinton as an innocent bystander caught in cultural crossfire (it is not clear whether Rich, like Mr. Scopes, considered the allegedly-broken law in question to be “unjust”).

Rich’s widely-read column provoked a concurring editorial in the *Charleston Gazette* critical of the Republicans’ “totally political” rejection of “objective justice” in their impeachment of the president:

Frank Rich of *The New York Times* likened today’s Republican sex impeachment to the 1920s Scopes “Monkey Trial” . . . But the culture war will continue. And it will be fascinating to watch America’s reaction to it, over the next year. Will puritanism rise—or will most Americans be revulsed by the GOP sex hunt and hand Democrats an even-bigger victory in the 2000 election? We hope it’s the latter.³⁵²

³⁵¹ Frank Rich, “Journal; Inherit the Wind,” *New York Times*, 20 Jan. 1999, <http://www.nytimes.com/1999/01/20/opinion/journal-inherit-the-wind.html>. Oddly enough, publisher Basic Books made this article into a de facto book review, placing Rich’s statement “A riveting book” on the cover of the 2006 revision of *Summer for the Gods*.

³⁵² “Travesty \$40 Million Attack,” *Charleston Gazette*, 28 Jan. 1999, 4A.

But readers less sympathetic to the president questioned whether Rich's comparison was appropriate. Five days after Rich's column appeared, the *New York Times* published a letter to the editor that retained the Scopes analogy but cleverly turned its meaning on its head:

In the Scopes trial, William Jennings Bryan, the victor, defended the Bible by citing scientifically impossible events and an evolutionary timetable that defied logic. Clarence Darrow exposed the fallacy without legal success.

Likewise, Mr. Clinton supports his case with contrived definitions, subjective states of mind and illogical explanations. Reminiscent of Clarence Darrow, the House managers have exposed a defense that abounds in a factual lack of logic.

We might do well to consider the possibility that cultural relativism may win the battle only to lose the war.³⁵³

In the *Weekly Standard*, a more prominent critic of the president, Charles Krauthammer, described the "major political-cultural event" that Clinton's trial had become, dismissing Rich's application of Scopes as propaganda. He wrote,

like the Hiss and O. J. trials, it will have the effect of dividing the country ideologically. The Clinton trial is entering cultural mythology as the modern equivalent of the Scopes trial: the forces of tolerance, worldly wisdom, and modernity vs. an inquisition of vengeful prurience and moralism. Clinton's acquittal will be made to stand for the triumph of the forces of, if not light, then reason.³⁵⁴

Not all, however, took the Scopes analogy seriously. Writing in the *Washington Post* about Clinton, Peter Carlson listed the Scopes trial alongside a number of other previous contenders for "trial of the century." He noted that it was "not surprising" that Clinton's trial would become a new candidate for the title. He went on to say, with tongue in cheek, "Americans love 'the trial of the century.' That's why we have one every few years. We're overdue now.

³⁵³ Michael J. Butler, "Has President Clinton Really Suffered Enough?" *New York Times*, 25 Jan. 1999.

³⁵⁴ Charles Krauthammer, "The Clinton Kulturkampf," *Weekly Standard*, 22 Feb. 1999.

We haven't had a good trial of the century since O.J. was acquitted—and that was more than three years ago. It's high time for another one. Or two.”³⁵⁵

This discussion of President Clinton’s trial as a new “trial of the century” comparable to the Scopes trial is significant not only because it is an interesting comparison with real culture wars. It also is an instance in which a variety of memories of the trial were presented in order to draw differing conclusions. Was the Scopes trial an appropriate analogy because it represented a broad culture war over modernist vs. fundamentalist values, as Rich claimed? Or was the mention of Scopes an opportunity to pass judgment on the president’s rhetorical trickery, thus ironically putting him on the side of the fundamentalists, as the letter to the editor suggested? Or was the comparison, as Krauthammer argued, little more than an effort to advance a certain “mythology” palatable to the president’s political allies? Or was the whole discussion little more than the same kind of media sensationalism that surrounded the original Scopes trial, as Carlson wrote? Clearly, the Scopes trial’s ability to shed light on the Clinton controversy depended entirely on the aspect of the trial to which one decided to appeal.

The 2004 Presidential Election and Its Aftermath

The 2004 presidential election, in which Senator John Kerry unsuccessfully challenged incumbent George W. Bush, stirred many journalists to invoke images of the

³⁵⁵ Peter Carlson, “(The Last) Trial of the Century!; Will Bill Clinton's Day in Court Live Up to Its Billing? Let’s Look at the Legal Precedent,” *Washington Post*, 4 Jan. 1999.

1920s. But as was becoming typical, these comparisons served differing and sometimes contradictory rhetorical strategies.

Two days after Bush defeated Kerry, historian Gary Wills threw up his hands in despair in a *New York Times* column, “The Day the Enlightenment Went Out.” Citing the victory of President Bush, as well as the eleven states who voted to ban same-sex marriage, Wills lamented that the election signaled the progress of the Enlightenment had come to a screeching halt. After all, “many more Americans believe in the Virgin Birth than in Darwin's theory of evolution . . . Can a people that believes more fervently in the Virgin Birth than in evolution still be called an Enlightened nation?” Turning to the Scopes trial, an event he credited for conservative Christians’ withdrawal from politics, he wrote,

This might be called Bryan's revenge for the Scopes trial of 1925, in which William Jennings Bryan’s fundamentalist assault on the concept of evolution was discredited. Disillusionment with that decision led many evangelicals to withdraw from direct engagement in politics. But they came roaring back into the arena out of anger at other court decisions—on prayer in school, abortion, protection of the flag and, now, gay marriage . . . The moral zealots will, I predict, give some cause for dismay even to nonfundamentalist Republicans. Jihads are scary things. It is not too early to start yearning back toward the Enlightenment.³⁵⁶

The next day’s issue of the *New York Times* featured a column by Maureen Dowd, who was equally despondent about the election results but who appealed to a quite different image of William Jennings Bryan. Her article began with the same theme that Wills used, casting Bush and his supporters as anti-progressive:

W.’s presidency rushes backward, stifling possibilities, stirring intolerance, confusing church with state, blowing off the world, replacing science with religion, and facts with faith. We're entering another dark age, more creationist than cutting edge, more premodern than postmodern. Instead of leading America to an exciting new reality,

³⁵⁶ Gary Wills, “The Day the Enlightenment Went Out,” *New York Times*, 4 Nov. 2004.

the Bushies cocoon in a scary, paranoid, regressive reality. Their new health care plan will probably be a return to leeches.

Having asserted the Republicans' "isolationism, nativism, chauvinism, puritanism and religious fanaticism," she then turned to the religious conservatives of the early twentieth century for a comparison. But rather than taking the line that nothing had changed, she argued that modern conservatives were *worse* than their predecessors. As a case in point, she appealed to Bryan:

When William Jennings Bryan took up combating the theory of evolution, he did it because he despised the social Darwinists who used the theory to justify the "survival of the fittest" in capitalism. Bryan hated anything that justified an economic system that crushed poor workers and farmers, and he hated that the elites would claim there was scientific basis for keeping society divided and unequal.

The new evangelicals challenge science because they've been stirred up to object to social engineering on behalf of society's most vulnerable: the poor, the sick, the sexually different.³⁵⁷

Here we find a surprising and unusual appeal, and perhaps one of the only instances in the history of the *New York Times* in which a columnist praised an aspect of William Jennings Bryan's antievolutionism (that is, one of his underlying motives). Dowd knew, of course, that none of her readers would confuse her point and think she was endorsing antievolution; her polemic, rather, was against the president and his evangelical supporters who had rejected Bryan's progressivism for Bush's brand of bloodthirsty "compassionate" conservatism.

Historian Robert Dallek wrote a more emotionally detached column for the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* about the "cultural split" that was "reminiscent of the bitter conflict in the 1920s between urban modernists and rural fundamentalists . . . Somewhat like the 2000 and

³⁵⁷ Maureen Dowd, "Rove's Revenge," *New York Times*, 7 Nov. 2004.

2004 elections, Scopes was a clash of the coasts and big cities in the upper Midwest on one hand, and the millions of generally less educated, white Protestants in the South and prairie states, on the other.”³⁵⁸ Historian Thomas Winpenny would come to the same conclusion in a lecture he would give the following January.³⁵⁹

David Brooks, however, expressed skepticism at these sorts of comparisons. The moderate-conservative *New York Times* columnist sought to expose what he called “The Value-Voters Myth,” asserting that simplistic explanations about voter allegiance and motivations would simply not do:

I’ve spent the past four years traveling to 36 states and writing millions of words trying to understand this values divide, and I can tell you there is no one explanation. It’s ridiculous to say, as some liberals have this week, that we are perpetually refighting the Scopes trial, with the metro forces of enlightenment and reason arrayed against the retro forces of dogma and reaction.³⁶⁰

Dismissing Scopes trial comparisons as fabrications offered “to reassure liberals that they are morally superior to the people who just defeated them,” he asserted that the fundamental issue in election was in fact over whether or not people approved of Bush’s measures to fight terrorism, not their religious views.

President Bush’s second term provoked further memories of the Scopes trial in the years that followed his reelection. Kevin Phillips, a former Republican who had once worked for Richard Nixon’s campaign and in recent years become a vocal critic of Bush, published a *New York Times* bestseller, *American Theocracy: The Perils and Politics of*

³⁵⁸ Robert Dallek, “Bush Has Chance to Redeem His First Term,” *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, 7 Nov. 2004.

³⁵⁹ Larry Alexander, “79 Years Later, It’s Still ‘Red’ States Versus ‘Blue,’” *Intelligencer Journal*, 22 Jan. 2005.

³⁶⁰ David Brooks, “The Values-Vote Myth,” *New York Times*, 6 Nov. 2004.

Radical Religion, Oil, and Borrowed Money in the 21st Century, in 2006. In a selection of the book reprinted in the *Washington Post*, Phillips argued that “the Republican Party has become the first religious party in U.S. history.” Although North America had previously known “small-scale theocracies” in places like New England and Utah, the United States as a whole was “approach[ing] theocracy” through the Republicans’ alliance with conservative Christians guided by “a White House that adopts agendas seemingly animated by biblical worldviews.”³⁶¹

One of the alleged trends that most troubled Phillips was that “the Republican coalition has also seeded half a dozen controversies in the realm of science.” Lumping together a wide-ranging array of topics, he included among these controversies: “Bible-based disbelief in Darwinian theories of evolution, dismissal of global warming, disagreement with geological explanations of fossil-fuel depletion, religious rejection of global population planning, derogation of women’s rights and opposition to stem cell research.” Where would these controversies lead? The United States, he wrote, “may again be heading for a defining controversy such as the Scopes trial of 1925. That embarrassment chastened fundamentalism for a generation, but the outcome of the eventual 21st century test is hardly assured.”³⁶²

A similar book published during Bush’s second term was liberal talk radio host Bill Press’s *How the Republicans Stole Christmas: The Republican Party’s Declared Monopoly*

³⁶¹ Kevin Phillips, “How the GOP Became God’s Own Party,” *Washington Post*, 2 April 2006; Kevin Phillips, *American Theocracy: The Perils and Politics of Radical Religion, Oil, and Borrowed Money in the 21st Century* (New York: Viking, 2006).

³⁶² Phillips, “How the GOP Became God’s Own Party.” For another *NY Times* bestseller criticizing the Republicans for similar reasons (but without directly invoking the Scopes trial), see Chris Mooney, *The Republican War on Science* (New York: Basic Books, 2005).

on *Religion and what Democrats Can Do to Take It Back*. Addressing controversial political-religious issues such as the death penalty, abortion, and stem cell research, he also weighed in on the Republicans' push for what he called "Not So Intelligent Design," described as "religion, masqueraded as science." As was common in such critiques, Press expressed disbelief that debates over evolution in America had not ended in 1925: "I don't know about you, but I thought the debate over evolution was over a long time ago—eighty years ago, in fact, when the Scopes trial took place."³⁶³

Although critical of the early twentieth century antievolutionists, Press echoed Dowd's sentiments by expressing respect for Bryan's progressive, anti-capitalist tendencies in order to contrast them with the views of Bryan's religious descendents: Bryan "feared what he called social Darwinism, whereby *conservatives* would apply the rules of evolution to government by banning all programs to help the poor on the theory that only 'the fittest' would survive" [emphasis mine].³⁶⁴

According to Press, the Scopes trial ought to have put an end to such debates. Conversely, "it was one of the first battles in a cultural war that continues today, over the identical issues." Turning on Bryan, Press then depicted both him and contemporary antievolutionists as advocating strict biblical literalism and six-day creation, rejecting any

³⁶³ Bill Press, *How the Republicans Stole Christmas: The Republican Party's Declared Monopoly on Religion and what Democrats Can Do to Take It Back* (New York: Doubleday, 2005), 192-195.

³⁶⁴ Press, *How the Republicans Stole Christmas*, 193.

other view as “wrong, immoral, and the end of religion as we know it,” thus advocating “the same mind-set . . . that condemned the teachings of Galileo as heretical.”³⁶⁵

Twenty-first century liberals, however, did not hold a monopoly on using the Scopes trial to take shots at their opponents. Ann Coulter, the conservative pundit and bestselling author (who, incidentally, attended the same law school as Clarence Darrow), attacked liberals in her fifth book, *Godless: The Church of Liberalism* (2006). In it, she argued that “liberalism is a religion,” a belief system that masquerades as rationalistic while in fact being based on faith. Repudiating the idea that conservatives were an anti-science party, she made the opposite accusation, “Liberals hate science and react badly to it. They will literally run from the room, lightheaded and nauseated, when told of data” that contradict their beliefs about gender differences, AIDS, sexual orientation, IQ, nuclear power, or breast implants.³⁶⁶ And, according to Coulter, one of liberals’ favorite beliefs was Darwinism.

In a chapter entitled “The Scientific Method of Stoning and Burning,” Coulter summarized the arguments of Intelligent Design advocates Michael Behe, William Dembski, and Phillip Johnson, claiming that evolutionists (associated here with “liberals” and referred to as “Darwiniacs”) had been so distressed by the scientific arguments for ID that their only recourse had been mockery and censorship. This trend, she noted, was not new, but could be traced back to the Scopes trial and *Inherit the Wind*. She went on to explain the real story of the trial (based mostly on Larson’s *Summer for the Gods*), highlighting the distortions that

³⁶⁵ Press, *How the Republicans Stole Christmas*, 193. After mistakenly identifying Bryan as insisting upon six day creation, Press then accused him of inconsistency for admitting the earth may be millions of years old.

³⁶⁶ Ann Coulter, *Godless: The Church of Liberalism* (New York: Crown, 2006), 1-3.

developed in the story as yet another example of liberal lies and “slander” (the title of another of her books).³⁶⁷ In telling the story, she took as many opportunities as possible to insert her characteristic jabs at her political and cultural foes:

Cowardly people who run from the room crying at the idea that men and women could have different abilities in science like to play-act that they are John Scopes speaking truth to power against hate-filled fundamentalist Christians (“truth” being defined as “a discredited scientific theory from the Victorian age”). They are like geeks playing air guitar in front of a mirror pretending to be Keith Richards. Except there really is a Keith Richards. (In fact, some scientists argue that Keith Richards is actually the missing link.) The John Scopes of liberal imaginations never existed . . .

Even in Tennessee, teaching evolution was only a misdemeanor offense, punishable by a nominal fine, much like drowning a girl in Massachusetts if your last name is “Kennedy.” The Scopes trial is, as Larson says, “the most widely publicized misdemeanor case in U.S. History.” . . .

The prosecution objected to the sideshow, but keeping Bryan from taking the stand would be like keeping Chuck Schumer from a microphone.³⁶⁸

In Coulter’s retelling, “liberals” were to blame for all that went wrong at the Scopes trial, while the fundamentalists were the reasonable ones. Even Bryan’s testimony at the hands of Darrow did not go so badly. The trial itself was “a scheme cooked up in New York [by the ACLU] and pawned off on the good citizens of Dayton, much like *Cats*.” The underlying argument, of course, was that the writers of *Inherit the Wind*, evolutionists, and modern democrats should all be grouped together as “godless” adherents to the “church of liberalism.” An exposure of the Scopes myth was intended to prove that its perpetrators—“liberals”—were simply not to be trusted.

Two years later, another politically conservative (though less incendiary) book was published by Larry Schweikart, professor of history at the University of Dayton: *48 Liberal*

³⁶⁷ Ann Coulter, *Slander: Liberal Lies about the American Right* (New York: Crown, 2002).

³⁶⁸ Coulter, *Godless*, 256-261.

Lies about American History (That You Probably Learned in School). Between the first and forty-eighth alleged lies (“The first presidents intended for the United States to be isolationist” and “History textbooks used in schools are unbiased and not politically correct”), Schweikart listed “Lie #25”: “The Scopes trial proved that Darwin was correct and Christians were backward.” Schweikart stood on solid historical ground by challenging the accuracy of this statement and in subsequently revealing the errors in *Inherit the Wind*. He also defended Bryan by pointing out that Darrow also made ignorant and foolish-sounding statements at the trial, such as referring to the nonexistent “book of Buddha” and biblical book of Elijah.³⁶⁹

However, Schweikart’s argument turned conspiratorial as he accused American history textbook authors of maligning the fundamentalist movement by “cleverly arrang[ing] the Scopes trial before, or immediately after, such social maladies as the Ku Klux Klan . . . or Al Capone.” As a case in point he offered *Unto a Good Land: A History of the American People*, which “presents Scopes immediately prior to ‘Nativist Fears and Immigration Restrictions,’ and opposite a spooky-looking picture of evangelist Aimee Semple McPherson sporting a Klan-type robe with her hands outstretched and eyes uplifted.”³⁷⁰ Unfortunately, Schweikart seems to have been unaware that one of the chief editors of the textbook, David Edwin Harrell, Jr., was in fact a Christian minister in one of the most conservative branches of the typically antievolutionist Churches of Christ, and therefore not likely to contribute to

³⁶⁹ Larry Schweikart, *48 Liberal Lies about American History (That You Probably Learned in School)* (New York: Penguin, 2008), 127. His source for his critique of Darrow is Burt W. Folsom, “The Scopes Trial Reconsidered.” *Continuity* 12 (1988): 103-127.

³⁷⁰ Schweikart, *48 Liberal Lies*, 125.

the claim that “Darwin was correct and Christians were backward.”³⁷¹ Furthermore, he ignored the actual description of the trial found in the book, which included the observation that the trial was a spectacle “perfectly calculated to *caricature* fundamentalism” [emphasis mine] and that although “many felt that both Bryan and the fundamentalist movement had been crushed,” it was in fact “far from dead.”³⁷² He also seemed to be unaware that the textbook itself had been marketed by its religious publisher, Eerdmans, as “a new history text that takes religion seriously.”³⁷³ While Schweikart was certainly correct in noting that history textbooks have often mischaracterized the Scopes trial (as historians such as Larson and Numbers have also noted), his suspicion of liberal bias during a time of intense political strife seems to have led him to exaggerate the implications of his evidence.³⁷⁴

Although President Bush provided plenty of fuel for his critics through his politics and his religious views, he caused a fresh uproar in August, 2005—the month before *Kitzmiller v. Dover* went to trial—when he voiced support for teaching intelligent design in public schools. Reluctantly answering a question at a press conference about whether intelligent design was an appropriate subject in science classrooms, he responded, “Very interesting question. . . . Both sides ought to be properly taught . . . so people can understand what the debate is about . . . Part of education is to expose people to different schools of

³⁷¹ For background on Harrell see David Edwin Harrell, Jr., “Recovering the Underside of Southern Religion” in *Autobiographical Reflections on Southern Religious Historians*, ed. John B. Boles (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 2001): 39-52 and David Edwin Harrell, Jr., *The Churches of Christ in the 20th Century: Homer Hailey’s Personal Journey of Faith* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2000).

³⁷² David Edwin Harrell, et al, *Unto a Good Land: A History of the American People* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2005), 746.

³⁷³ <http://www.untoagoodland.com>.

³⁷⁴ For an example of a Christian author whose book juxtaposes images of the Scopes trial with a KKK cross burning, see Justo L. González’s college/seminary text, *The Story of Christianity*, vol. 2 (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984), 374-375.

thought. . . . You're asking me whether or not people ought to be exposed to different ideas, and the answer is yes."³⁷⁵ One of the first newspapers to respond was the *Sacramento Bee*:

If you thought the debate over teaching creationism in public schools was settled in the 1920s, think again. Eighty years after the famous Scopes Trial in Tennessee, President Bush believes public schools should teach "intelligent design" (the new euphemism for creationism) alongside evolution. . . . Bush doesn't go as far as three-time presidential candidate William Jennings Bryan, who in the 1920s supported a constitutional amendment banning public schools from teaching evolution. . . . This 1920s debate isn't going away and the president, unfortunately, is playing a part in keeping it alive.³⁷⁶

While the paper's reference to Bryan's support for a constitutional amendment seems to have been fabricated (it would have gone against his belief in local control of schools), the overall point was a clear and familiar refrain: the president had not noticed that the evolution-creation debate was supposed to end at the Scopes trial.

Other journalists followed the same line. Jonathan Alter wrote in *Newsweek* that "Eighty years after the Scopes 'monkey trial,'" President Bush had become a "willing tool" of "sophisticated branding experts and polemical Ph.D.s."³⁷⁷ Across the Atlantic, George Monbiot of *The Guardian* wailed that the president and his fellow "Christian Taliban" members "are gaining on us."³⁷⁸ A *York Dispatch* editorial expressed the sentiment this way:

It's a bit scary being caught in President Bush's time warp . . . Can it really be 1925 and we're trapped in a replay of the Scopes trial where science itself is the devil

³⁷⁵ Peter Baker and Peter Slevin, "Bush Remarks on 'Intelligent Design' Theory Fuel Debate," *Washington Post*, 3 August 2005, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/08/02/AR2005080201686.html>.

³⁷⁶ "Bush Is Trying to Force Politics into Schools with Stance on 'Intelligent Design,'" *Duluth News-Tribune*, 5 Aug. 2005.

³⁷⁷ Jonathan Alter, "Monkey See, Monkey Do," *Newsweek*, 15 Aug. 2005, 27.

³⁷⁸ George Monbiot, "A Life with No Purpose," *The Guardian* (London), 15 Aug. 2005, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2005/aug/16/religion.science>. London's *Independent* found it "astonishing that this struggle is still going on 80 years after the Scopes Monkey trial." "Mythology in the White House," *Independent* (London), 4 Aug. 2005.

incarnate? . . . The president's view on intelligent design would, no doubt, warm the heart of William Jennings Bryan, the three-time presidential candidate and anti-evolution champion in the Scopes trial who saw Darwin's theory as heralding the end of western civilization.³⁷⁹

One *Richmond Times Dispatch* column suggested that Bush ought to have followed the example of another conservative Republican, President Calvin Coolidge (1923-1929), who never publicly spoke about evolution. The article contrasted “Silent Cal” with Bush, who was using his “bully pulpit” to “sway opinion on every hot button issue—abortion, gay marriage, stem cell research, and, now, evolution.”³⁸⁰ Other journalists similarly expressed fear that the president (who, one should recall, had not actually planned to bring up the issue, and seems to have done so only with reluctance) was actively pushing an antievolution agenda. *The Village Voice* attributed Bush’s comments to “an indication of confidence” and a sign that he was “back to being his old cocky self.” He was earning the title that H.L. Mencken’s had bestowed upon William Jennings Bryan, “fundamentalist pope,” and it would be but matter of time before the president would begin taking away federal funds from schools that did not include lessons on ID. The article ended with a lengthy quotation from Mencken’s final analysis of the Scopes trial, in which he warned, “Neanderthal man is organizing in these forlorn backwaters of the land, led by a fanatic, rid of sense and devoid of conscience. . . . There are other States that had better look to their arsenals before the Hun is at their gates.” For Mencken, this “fanatic” was of course William Jennings Bryan; but for liberal journalists writing during the second term of George W. Bush, the description seemed

³⁷⁹ “Bush’s Push on ID Scary, Embarrassing,” Editorial, *York Dispatch* (York, Penn.), 3 Aug. 2005.

³⁸⁰ Marsha Mercer, “Unintelligent Design,” *Richmond Times Dispatch*, 7 Aug. 2005, E-4.

equally appropriate for Bryan's latest incarnation, who—to their dismay—happened to live in the White House.³⁸¹

The 2008 Presidential Election

With Republican presidential candidates Ronald Reagan, Pat Buchanan, and George W. Bush having set a precedent for questioning the scientific soundness of evolution, it was inevitable that the question would arise during the 2008 primaries and election. In a May 2007 Republican debate, when asked whether they believed in evolution, Tom Tancredo, Sam Brownback, and Mike Huckabee indicated that they did not. This provoked the well-established anti-progress line from journalists: “let’s do the time warp again,” wrote Dan Gerstein of Politico. In expressing their doubts about evolution, “the all-white, all-male debaters seemed to yearn for the simpler times of 1925—the year of the Scopes Trial.”³⁸²

Former Baptist minister Mike Huckabee, who had enjoyed a brief ride as the Republican front-runner after winning January’s Iowa caucus, was one of the more outspoken candidates about his beliefs. He was consequently rebuked by Chris Matthews of MSNBC, who appeared astonished at Huckabee’s antievolutionism:

Well, here we are back in the Scopes trial, the monkey trial. He did lay it out there, even though he talked a lot about the way most of us look at things, somewhere between the literal interpretation and the—and the imagery or rhetoric or whatever, the way people talked back in the Old Testament. . . . I’m giggling, because . . . I think it’s fascinating that, in the 21st century, we’re having the monkey trial all over

³⁸¹ James Ridgeway, “Making Monkeys of Us,” *Village Voice*, 2 Aug. 2005, <http://www.villagevoice.com/2005-08-02/news/making-monkeys-of-us/>

³⁸² Dan Gerstein, “The Republican Devolution,” Politico, 18 May 2007, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0507/4075.html>.

again. And I still think it's weird. It [*Inherit the Wind*] is on Broadway right now.³⁸³

Matthews employed the same metaphor the following week when he had the opportunity to interview Huckabee. After inaccurately accusing the candidate of pushing for a literal interpretation of Genesis to be taught in public school science classes, Matthews concluded, "In 2007 we're fighting the monkey trial all over again," then cut to a commercial break.³⁸⁴

Although John McCain, the Republicans' eventual nominee, accepted evolution, his vice presidential pick did not. Sarah Palin, a conservative evangelical, had supported equal time for teaching creation science and evolution during her term as governor of Alaska. Jonathan Eisen, a professor of evolutionary biology at UC-Davis who had formerly praised McCain for his adherence to evolution, now accused him of regressing to "an anti-science agenda."³⁸⁵ As Palin's unpopularity soared among liberals, critics made statements like the following letter to the editor of the Connecticut Post Online:

Where are all the moderate Republicans? I know they are out there. . . . Do Republican women really want Sarah Palin to lead us forward into the 21st century? . . .

She believes creationism should be taught in science classes, but sex education shouldn't be taught in the schools at all. . . .

Palin would take us back to the worst days of the last century, with the censoring of books, no stem cell research, evolution relegated back to the Scopes trial days, no freedom of choice for women and no equal pay for equal work.³⁸⁶

³⁸³ *Hardball*, MSNBC, 6 June 2007.

³⁸⁴ *Hardball*, MSNBC, 11 June 2007.

³⁸⁵ Jonathan Eisen, "Sarah Palin on Evolution/Creationism," The Tree of Life Blog, 29 Aug. 2008, <http://phylogenomics.blogspot.com/2008/08/sarah-palin-on-evolution-creationism.html>. On July 3 Eisen had written, "it is good to know that at least one (and maybe only one) of the possible Republican candidates for president is not as anti-science as the core of the party seems to be these days." Jonathan Eisen, "John McCain on Evolution," The Tree of Life Blog, 3 July 2006, <http://phylogenomics.blogspot.com/2006/07/john-mccain-on-evolution.html>.

³⁸⁶ Jean Weicker, "Weighing Options for November Vote," Connecticut Post Online, 24 Sept. 2008. *BusinessWorld*, a newspaper based in the Philippines, published a story calling Palin "a throwback from the days of the Scopes Monkey Trials who denies the validity of the theory of evolution and believes in teaching

Even after McCain and Palin lost the election, Palin's views of science continued to make the news. In a discussion of her views on global warming, Chris Matthews returned to his Scopes trial comparison to criticize her allegedly-outdated beliefs on a host of topics:

Here's the point, internationally, is there a world laughing at us for being still back in the Scopes trial, the monkey trial back in Tennessee in the 1920s? Are we still back—perceived in the world to be back there, not believing in any kind of Darwinism, any kind of science, anything, Keynesian economics? Are we just being laughed at, as opposed—as people who just don't learn, who hate knowledge? What is it? What's our perception?³⁸⁷

While no prominent papers or magazines carried articles by conservatives explicitly challenging this Scopes reference, Amy Sullivan of *Time* later insightfully identified such “elitist ridicule” as “fuel” for Palin's supporters, noting that it confirmed their suspicions about the antireligious bias of the media in a way reminiscent of the 1920s. In Sullivan's telling, the roots of the resentment that conservative evangelicals were feeling toward “mainstream elites and culture . . . go back nearly 100 years to a court case that captivated the nation.”³⁸⁸

The fundamentalists of the 1920s were not surprised when people disagreed about religious matters, Sullivan wrote. But they were not used to being made fools of. The humiliation brought upon them by Darrow, Mencken, and the like were something new. “The bitterness and distrust sown among evangelicals and fundamentalists during the Scopes trial never faded. If anything, the gulf between religious conservatives and mainstream

creationism in US schools.” Luis V. Teodoro, “Vantage Point: Sleepless in Somalia,” *BusinessWorld*, 19 Sept. 2008 S1/4.

³⁸⁷ *Hardball*, MSNBC, 9 Dec. 2009.

³⁸⁸ Amy Sullivan, “Elitist Ridicule Fuels Palin's Faithful Base,” *USA Today*, 11 April 2011.

society widened.” In light of this cultural divide, Sullivan found it “not terribly surprising that Palin spends much of her time in a fighting stance.” In the 1920s it became clear to conservative evangelicals that the elite media had turned against them, and Palin’s treatment in 2008 gave their cultural descendents no reason to think things had changed. Fortunately for Palin, every media attack merely provided more “ammunition” for her to “attract evangelical voters to her victimized everywoman candidacy.”³⁸⁹

The 2012 Presidential Election

Although Sarah Palin did not run for the Republican presidential nomination in 2012, as many had anticipated, journalists and television pundits had little trouble criticizing the “anti-science” views of the new batch of candidates. Minnesotan Congresswoman Michele Bachmann, for instance, had previously come out in support of teaching intelligent design in public schools. Bob Schrum, a political strategist who had worked with nearly every democratic presidential candidate since 1988, tore into her on MSNBC’s *Hardball*, accusing her of “flat-earth” ideology and wanting “to vindicate the idea in the Bible that the world was created in seven literal days a few thousand years ago.” He recounted William Jennings Bryan’s famous statement at the Scopes trial, “I am more interested in the Rock of Ages than the age of rocks,” then concluded, “And that’s what’s going on here. You have that—a kind of coup in the Republican Party of people of that kind taking over.”³⁹⁰

³⁸⁹ Sullivan, “Elitist Ridicule.”

³⁹⁰ *Hardball*, MSNBC, 24 June 2011.

As news circulated about other candidates, including Texas Governor Rick Perry, Texas Representative Ron Paul, and Rick Santorum expressing doubts over Darwin's theory, criticism continued.³⁹¹ "Here we are in 2011, and we are still daily relitigating the Scopes Monkey Trial," Alex Pareene wrote at Salon.com. "Your Republican 2012 contenders—with one lone, unelectable exception—choose God over facts."³⁹² Leonard Steinhorn, a professor of communication at American University and blogger for the Huffington Post, labeled the GOP "the Anti-Science Party," attributing Republicans' doubts over evolution to an irrational adherence to the Bible: "To them, science is yet another tool in the secular assault on their religiosity. Unlike the good book, it is not to be trusted. The Scopes Trial remains very much alive for them."³⁹³

Steven Pearlstein of the *Washington Post* suggested that a bumper sticker ought to be made describing the Republican candidates' platform featuring the lines: "Repeal the 20th Century. Vote GOP." Most of the candidates, he wrote, wanted to "turn the clock back" on a host of proven beliefs and policies, including Medicare and Medicaid, Keynesian economics, the 16th and 17th amendments, and "Darwin's theory of evolution, which has been

³⁹¹ As a U.S. Senator, Santorum had introduced an amendment to the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act critical of evolution. See Edward J. Larson, *Trial and Error*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 208.

³⁹² Alex Pareene, "The GOP Candidates Have No Time for Your 'Science,' Scientists," Salon.com, 19 Aug. 2011. The "lone" exception to which he referred was former governor of Utah Jon Huntsman—however, former Representative Newt Gingrich and former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney had on other occasions stated their adherence to evolution. Gingrich had said, in an interview with *Discover*, that in public schools "evolution should be taught as science, and intelligent design should be taught as philosophy." Francis Wilkinson, "Discover Interview: Newt Gingrich," Oct. 2006, <http://discovermagazine.com/2006/oct/discover-interview-newt-gingrich/>. Romney had described evolution as "most likely the process [God] used to create the human body," stating a view identical to Gingrich's about the appropriate classes for evolution and intelligent design. Michael Luo, "Romney Elaborates on Evolution," New York Times Blog, 11 May 2007, <http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/05/11/romney-elaborates-on-evolution/>.

³⁹³ Leonard Steinhorn, "How the GOP Became the Anti-Science Party," Huffington Post, 21 Sept., 2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/leonard-steinhorn/how-the-gop-became-the-an_b_970410.html.

widely accepted since the Scopes Trial of the 1920s . . . What's next—repeal of quantum physics?”³⁹⁴ In the *Washington Times*, Joseph Curl asked, “What century is this? How did the 2012 Republican nomination race morph back to 1925 to replay the Scopes trial?”³⁹⁵

Many conservative writers jumped to the candidates’ defense, and Rich Lowry, editor of *National Review*, explicitly questioned the Scopes rhetoric. In a defense of Rick Perry written in August 2011, Lowry had predicted the tactics the governor’s critics would use to make Perry “a byword for Red State simplemindedness in the *New York Times* and an object of derision for self-appointed cultural sophisticates everywhere”:

It’d be almost impossible to come up with a background and cluster of affiliations so provocative. Texas has all the negative charge for liberals that Massachusetts does for conservatives. Perry will be branded as a backward, dimwitted, heartless neo-Confederate. A walking, talking threat to the separation of church and state who doesn’t realize people like him were supposed to slink away after the Scopes trial nearly 90 years ago.³⁹⁶

One of the more curious conservative articles to appear during the 2012 primary was written by Pat Buchanan, who failed to attain the 1992 and 1996 Republican nominations, ran an unsuccessfully third-party candidacy in 2000, and had returned to journalism. Discussing recent remarks Rick Santorum had made about the gulf between President Obama’s allegedly secular worldview and Santorum’s own genuine Christianity, Buchanan endeavored to trace the history of the cultural conflict represented by the president and the former senator. Skewing a few of the facts, he wrote,

³⁹⁴ Steven Pearlstein, “The Republicans’ Magical Thinking,” *Washington Post*, 11 Sept. 2011.

³⁹⁵ Joseph Curl, “Political Theater: GOP Field Not Exactly the Fab Four,” *Washington Times*, 20 Feb. 2012.

³⁹⁶ Rich Lowry, “Let the Perry Bashing Begin,” *National Review Online*, 16 Aug. 2011, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/274725/let-perry-hatred-begin-rich-lowry>.

An early triumph of secularism came with the Scopes trial in 1923 [sic] in Dayton, Tenn. Clarence Darrow, defending a teacher who had violated state law by introducing Darwin's theory of evolution into the classroom, mocked the Old Testament teachings of the evangelical Christians, to the merriment of the establishment.

From that day on, Darwinism was taught in our schools, first as theory, then as fact, then as higher truth. With the Darwinian tenet – we evolved, we were not created – established truth in the public schools, secularism set about driving its enemy, Christianity, out completely.³⁹⁷

Although it was by no means uncommon for journalists to mistakenly portray Darrow as the legal victor in the Scopes trial in a passing but inconsequential reference, Buchanan's error formed a crucial part of his narrative of what had gone wrong with America. According to his retelling, the Scopes trial marked the beginning of the end of Christianity in America by leading to the teaching of evolution, which coincided with the rise of secularism. Subsequent judicial decisions in the 1950s and 1960s such as removing prayer from schools, contributed to this trend. The final symbol of religious decline was President Obama himself, who had explicitly denied that America is a Christian nation. Buchanan's narrative, which made the teaching of evolution into a key event, closely paralleled the one described in Christopher P. Toumey's study of "Evolution and Secular Humanism" in *God's Own Scientists*.³⁹⁸ In an ironic sense, Buchanan's narrative confirmed what his liberal critics had accused him of all along: rejecting the "progress" of the twentieth century and yearning for a return to the 1920s.

³⁹⁷ Pat Buchanan, "Santorums' Theology Gamble," *WND*, 2 Feb. 2012, <http://www.wnd.com/2012/02/santorums-theology-gamble/>.

³⁹⁸ Christopher P. Toumey, *God's Own Scientists: Creationists in a Secular World* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1994), 77-99. See also Jay Croft and Joel Engelhart, "Hearts, Not Minds, Target of Campaign," *Palm Beach Post*, 8 Jan. 1995 for a statement by a Christian Coalition leader who attributed societal decline (eventually leading to the gay rights movement) to the Scopes trial.

Global Warming and the Scopes Trial

When global climate change became America's most prominent science controversy in the 1990s and 2000s, it was perhaps inevitable that global warming "deniers" would be cast as the new antievolutionists (especially since they were often the same people). I have been unable, however, to find any articles before 2005 linking global warming denial to the Scopes trial. It is surprising that the analogy did not catch on sooner, given the linkage of the Scopes trial to "anti-science" politics. By 2009, however, the claimed parallel had become much more common, thanks largely to an unfortunate affair involving the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

In 2005, President Bush's "policy of politicizing science" came under the scrutiny of *Newsweek's* Jonathan Alter in a scathing article, "Monkey See, Monkey Do." After expressing astonishment that the president had failed to notice that it was now "Eighty years after the Scopes 'monkey trial,'" Alter lamented that Bush was "retreating from the field of facts and evidence on everything from evolution to global warming to the number of cell lines available to justify his 2001 stem-cell compromise." Bush's doubts about evolution were inextricably bound up in his denial of global warming, both of which stemmed from ignoring the "facts" of science and summoned up images of William Jennings Bryan and his fellow Bible thumpers.

The most prominent politician on the other side of the global warming debate during this period was Al Gore, Bush's 2000 rival and a long-time promoter of climate-change science. If Bush was destined to be William Jennings Bryan's successor, it was only natural

that Gore be Clarence Darrow's. In March 2007, only months after the release of his documentary *An Inconvenient Truth*, Gore flew to Washington, D.C. to appear before House and Senate committees to testify about the dangers of global climate change. A fawning Dana Milbank covered the story for the *Washington Post*, describing it thus: "the former vice president found himself playing the Clarence Darrow character in 'Inherit the Wind.'" Among his rivals were Republicans Joe Barton and James Inhofe. "It was," Milbank wrote, "in many ways, a 21st-century version of the Scopes trial":

Only this time, Gore, like William Jennings Bryan a failed Democratic presidential nominee, was playing Darrow, champion of scientific thought. Inhofe was playing the Bryan character, defending his beliefs against the encroachments of foes such as the National Academy of Sciences, the United Nations and the Oscar-hoisting former vice president.³⁹⁹

Milbank's article read much like the script to *Inherit the Wind*. Congressman Barton came out swinging at the modern Darrow's views—"But this was no match for Gore," who proceeded to answer all questions intelligently and in good humor, charming the audience and provoking laughter at his opponents. When the long-winded Senator Inhofe "declared that Gore could not answer any questions until Inhofe had finished his allotted time," committee chair Barbara Boxer interrupted, quipping, "You're not making the rules . . . You used to when you had this," raising the gavel to a hall that filled with applause. The episode ended when Boxer gave Gore enough time for a rebuttal, to the supposed dismay of Senator Inhofe. Milbank concluded: "The audience laughed. Boxer smiled. Inhofe did not. He left

³⁹⁹ Dana Milbank, "Some Heated Words for Mr. Global Warming," *Washington Post*, 22 March 2007, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/03/21/AR2007032102060.html>

the show early.”⁴⁰⁰ Clarence Darrow, reincarnated as a former Vice President from Tennessee, had once again triumphed over the forces of ignorance and superstition. A letter to the editor in the *Tulsa World* a couple months later would, without reference to Milbank, also employ the Scopes analogy against Senator Inhofe”: I must question his political agenda and moral conscience. . . . His attitude smacks of the total lack of reason and religious fanaticism demonstrated by creationists during the 1925 Scopes trial.”⁴⁰¹

However, Milbank’s Scopes analogy was not left unchallenged. Jonah Goldberg, writing for National Review Online, reframed the Scopes analogy to present a politically conservative take on the event:

Covering Gore's congressional testimony, *The Washington Post*'s Dana Milbank portrayed Gore as a man of science versus a bunch of creationist nutjobs. Milbank wrote: “. . . instead of giving another screening of *An Inconvenient Truth*, the former vice president found himself playing the Clarence Darrow character in *Inherit the Wind*.” It’s an unintentionally accurate comparison, because the movie completely distorted the reality of the Scopes trial. The real Clarence Darrow contentedly lost the open-and-shut case after a nine-minute jury deliberation. The movie was about something bigger than the facts. So is Al Gore. And that’s why his fans love him.⁴⁰²

Once again, the Scopes analogy had the potential to cut both ways. This was, in fact, not the first time it had been used against Gore. During the 2000 campaign, a dismal series of speeches that Gore gave led James L. Martin of the *Washington Times* to write, “The speeches, Mr. Gore’s first since the long count of 2000, were long and eagerly awaited.

⁴⁰⁰ Milbank, “Some Heated Words for Mr. Global Warming.”

⁴⁰¹ “Senator’s Twaddle,” *Tulsa World*, 16 April 2007. London’s *Independent*, likewise, defended Gore’s claims against a British High Court Judge who had required nine alleged errors in *An Inconvenient Truth* be identified when the film was shown to school children: “This verdict was celebrated by global warming deniers across the world as their Scopes Trial, a moment when the judicial system smacked down science in favour of their dogmas.” Johann Hari, “Gore Tells the Truth. His Enemies Smear Him,” *Independent* (London), 15 Oct. 2007.

⁴⁰² Jonah Goldberg, “Turning Up the Heat on Gore,” National Review Online, 23 March 2007, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/220394/turning-heat-gore/jonah-goldberg>.

When delivered, however, they sounded angry, resentful, vindictive and mired in the quicksands of past glory—like William Jennings Bryan’s farewell performance at the Scopes Monkey Trial.^{»403}

Throughout the following years, global warming was linked with the Scopes trial on other occasions. Richard Cizek, a prominent leader in the National Association of Evangelicals who had come out in support of public policies combating global warming, expressed frustration that so many of his fellow evangelicals had yet to abandon the “anti-science and anti-intellectual bent [that was] reflected in the Scopes monkey trial of 1925.”^{»404} In Montana in 2008, a high school principal disinvited an ecology professor from the University of Montana who was supposed to speak about global warming, citing the topic as having been too controversial and “critical of agriculture, the economic lifeblood of the community.” The incident stirred an editorial from the *Denver Post* calling the incident “reminiscent of the Scopes Monkey Trial.”^{»405}

The most extensive discussion of global warming and the Scopes trial resulted from a poorly-chosen analogy used by the United States Chamber of Commerce in August, 2009. The Chamber of Commerce had, up to this time, periodically expressed skepticism about the effects of man-made climate change, developing a rivalry with the Environmental Protection Agency, whose policies the chamber had often found unreasonable and unwarranted. “They don’t have the science to support [their policies],” explained William Kovacs, the chamber's

⁴⁰³ James L. Martin, “Time to Chill Out,” *Washington Times*, 21 Feb. 2004, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2004/feb/20/20040220-100116-1946r/?page=all>.

⁴⁰⁴ Margaret Kriz, “Science Can Be Our Ally,” *National Journal*, 10 March 2007. See also interview on Krista Tippett, *Speaking of Faith*, NPR, 12 April 2007.

⁴⁰⁵ “Silencing Science Won’t Prevent Global Warming,” *Denver Post*, 25 Jan. 2008.

vice president for environment, and regulatory affairs. “We can’t just take their word for it.”⁴⁰⁶

Kovacs proposed that the best way to settle the matter would be to put “the science of climate change on trial” by holding “the Scopes monkey trial of the 21st century.” “It would be evolution versus creationism” all over again, he exclaimed, apparently impressed with his analogy but oblivious to the unintentional images and emotions he was triggering.⁴⁰⁷ It is not entirely clear how Kovacs was using the Scopes analogy. He seems to have been unaware that creation and evolution were scarcely even debated at the Scopes trial, thanks to Judge Raulston’s refusal to hear from the defense’s expert witnesses. And to which side was he expressing sympathy? Had he known anything about the trial, would he not have realized how counterproductive it would have been to align himself with William Jennings Bryan? Or was he, then, comparing the fundamentalists to modern-day climate change scientists? Or was he simply trying to invoke an atmosphere of excitement and importance without suggesting anything deeper? He was not actually the first to call for a Scopes trial on global warming. A year and a half previously, Chris Horner, author of *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Global Warming and Environmentalism*, told Glenn Beck, “We need a Scopes monkey trial to get that out of the classroom.” Horner’s version of the analogy—in which global warming alarmists were proponents of “ecofundamentalism”—did not strictly fit the

⁴⁰⁶ Michael Burnham, “Chamber Threatens Lawsuit if EPA Rejects Climate Science ‘Trial,’” *New York Times*, 25 Aug. 2009.

⁴⁰⁷ Jim Tankersley, “U.S. Chamber of Commerce Seeks Trial on Global Warming,” *Los Angeles Times*, 25 Aug. 2009, <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/aug/25/nation/na-climate-trial25>.

narrative of the trial, since the fundamentalists in fact won the case.⁴⁰⁸ Whether Kovacs was familiar with Horner's sentiments, or coming up with the analogy himself, is not clear.

Whatever Kovacs meant to suggest, for those already inclined to label climate change deniers as anti-science, the meaning was crystal clear: just as the ignorant fundamentalists had denied the proven science of evolution, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce was now denying the indisputable science of climate change. Headlines and articles soon appeared describing the image the chamber had unwittingly provided for itself. "U.S. Chamber is a Dinosaur on Climate Change," ran an editorial from the *San Jose Mercury News*.⁴⁰⁹ Author Joe Romm, a prominent environmentalist who headed the blog climateprogress.org, wondered,

What's the next step for the Chamber — calling for a law banning the teaching of climate science comparable to the 1925 Tennessee law banning the teaching of human evolution that was the basis for the Scopes trial? . . . Apparently global warming denial is the new creationism. . . . This is what the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in the 21st century wants to associate itself with. Apparently climate science denial isn't Luddite enough for them in 2009. Now they want to join the Anti-Evolution League.⁴¹⁰

Romm wondered whether it was time to start boycotting companies associated with the chamber. Another critic, Brenda Ekwurzel of the Union of Concerned Scientists, suggested

⁴⁰⁸ Glenn Beck, *Glenn Beck*, CNN, 18 Feb. 2008. For yet another use of the analogy, see Jim Pedersen, "'Global Warming' is Alarmism," *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, 29 Jan. 2008: "Both sides claim to love truth, so in an ecumenical spirit, why not hold a grand examination for discovery and come up with an agreement on beliefs that both sides can hold in common? On the contested beliefs, why not hold a debate where reputable scientists contend against reputable scientists like a 21st-century monkey trial?"

⁴⁰⁹ "U.S. Chamber is a Dinosaur on Climate Change," *San Jose Mercury News*, 2 Oct. 2009.

⁴¹⁰ Joe Romm, "Memo to Alcoa, Kodak, IBM, Nike, Toyota et al.: Luddite U.S. Chamber of Commerce seeks 'the Scopes Monkey Trial of the 21st Century' on Global Warming," thinkprogress.com, 25 Aug. 2009, <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2009/08/25/204545/memo-to-alcoa-kodak-ibm-nike-pepsi-toyota-luddite-chamber-of-commerce-seeks-the-scopes-monkey-trial-global-warming/?mobile=nc>.

an even stranger analogy: the proposal, she said, “brings to mind for me the Salem witch trials.”⁴¹¹

Bestselling author and *New York Times* columnist Thomas Friedman accused the chamber of “having sold its soul to the old coal and oil industries, us[ing] its influence to prevent Congress from passing legislation to really spur renewable. . . . All shareholders in America should ask their C.E.O.’s why they still belong to the chamber.”⁴¹² Even Al Gore chimed in: “Ha! The Scopes trial happened in my home state, and I can tell you, one was quite enough.”⁴¹³ He wrote on his blog,

I know a lot about the Scopes Trial, because it was held in my home state of Tennessee, and I have visited the courtroom where it took place. It divided our country in the early part of the 20th century and became a national embarrassment. The fact the Chamber of Commerce would openly call for a repeat of the Scopes Trial should be an embarrassment to every business leader still belonging to the organization and every American who believes that we should guide America’s destiny on the basis of truth and scientific fact, rather than ideologically driven propaganda

Not only has the Chamber spent decades denying the existence of the climate crisis, now it is dedicating a significant quantity of resources and money attempting prevent Congress from taking action. It’s time they stop letting conservative ideology get in the way of policy that will ultimately be good for American businesses and consumers.⁴¹⁴

A number of journalists analyzed the appropriateness of the Scopes analogy to the present situation. As the *L.A. Times* noted in an editorial, “Courts and judges are for resolving questions of law, not of science. Though the 1926 [sic] Scopes trial is often

⁴¹¹ Quoted in Tankersley, “U.S. Chamber of Commerce Seeks Trial on Global Warming.”

⁴¹² Thomas L. Friedman, “The New Sputnik,” *New York Times*, 26 Sept. 2009.

⁴¹³ Oliver Burkeman, “Civil Disobedience Has a Role to Play,” *The Guardian* (London), 6 Nov. 2009, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/nov/07/al-gore-interview-climate-change>.

⁴¹⁴ Al Gore, “The Chamber of Commerce and the Climate Crisis,” 8 Oct. 2009, http://blog.algore.com/2009/10/the_chamber_of_commerce_and_th.html.

remembered as a contest between evolution and creationism, it actually concerned the legality of a Tennessee law forbidding the teaching of Charles Darwin's theory.”⁴¹⁵

Keith Johnson of the *Wall Street Journal* wrote,

But the lessons of the Scopes trial shouldn't necessarily cheer environmentalists, who apparently told the L.A. Times that “the scientists won in the end.” They didn't—John Scopes was found guilty of violating state law by teaching evolution, and his conviction was upheld on appeal. His salvation came on a legal technicality hinging on the dollar amount of the fine he was given, after he'd already abandoned the classroom. In the long run, of course, scientists did win, after Tennessee changed its laws and the U.S. Supreme Court struck down similar anti-evolution laws.⁴¹⁶

Josh Rosneau of the National Center for Science Education wondered,

I don't know why they would compare their position to that of Bryan in the Scopes trial, trying to disprove established science. Bryan lost that argument, and made sure that a sympathetic judge excluded scientific testimony wherever possible. And of course, those who worked so hard to put science on trial ultimately experienced the backlash when examination showed them to be ill-informed on the science, appealing to anti-intellectualism rather than evidence. . . .

Instead, the Chamber is out to make themselves look bad, analogizing themselves to the anti-science Bible-thumpers of the early days of fundamentalism, and to delay a policy which would ultimately help their members.⁴¹⁷

Alex Koppelman wrote on Salon.com,

It's an interesting concept, but the Chamber and its supporters might want to pick a better analogy. The evolution side of things may have lost—indeed, they asked to lose—at the initial Scopes trial, but they won in the court of public opinion and, eventually, in court. Plus, five days after the conclusion of the original trial, prosecutor William Jennings Bryan, who'd been embarrassed during an unusual sort of cross-examination by defense attorney Clarence Darrow, died. Maybe not the best precedent for whoever ends up representing the Chamber to follow.⁴¹⁸

⁴¹⁵ “Global Warming on Trial?” *Los Angeles Times*, 26 Aug. 26 2009.

⁴¹⁶ Keith Johnson, “Inherit the Wind? A Scopes Trial for Climate Change?” *Wall Street Journal* Blogs, 25 Aug. 2009, <http://blogs.wsj.com/environmentalcapital/2009/08/25/inherit-the-wind-a-scopes-trial-for-climate-change/>.

⁴¹⁷ Joshua Rosenau, “Chamber of Commerce Plans a Monkey Trial,” *Thoughts from Kansas*, 24 Aug. 2009, <http://scienceblogs.com/tfk/2009/08/24/chamber-of-commerce-plans-a-mo/>.

⁴¹⁸ Alex Koppelman, “A Scopes Trial for Global Warming?” *Salon.com*, 25 Aug. 2009, <http://www.salon.com/2009/08/25/scopes/>.

The chamber's comments provoked enough outrage and confusion that Kovacs soon rescinded his Scopes metaphor. "My 'Scopes monkey' analogy was inappropriate," he wrote, "and detracted from my ability to effectively convey the Chamber's position on this important issue." He reiterated that his intent was not to question climate change science, as his critics had claimed, but to question whether the EPA's policies were appropriate in regard to the science itself.⁴¹⁹

Withdrawing his analogy did little good. The chamber's opponents would not so easily give up such effective public relations ammunition. Carl Pope, former chairman and executive director of the Sierra Club, insisted that Kovacs had been right to use his Scopes analogy all along and attempted to retell the story of the trial. In so doing, he misstated a number of facts. He wrote,

only a Scopes trial – a bogus exercise in which science is suppressed—would serve the Chambers' goals. . . .

The Chamber seems to have conveniently forgotten that the Scopes trial was not an effort to ensure that there was scientific peer review of Darwin's theory—it was an effort to overturn a Tennessee law which prohibited the teaching of evolution not as bad science, but as a threat to religion. . . .

William Jennings Bryan, who prosecuted Scopes, argued that evidence about the scientific validity of evolution was irrelevant because teaching it was immoral and challenged the Bible

Even though the jury was skeptical that the law was constitutional, they followed the judge's instructions and found Scopes guilty

As Darrow put it, his purpose during the trial was "of preventing bigots and ignoramuses from controlling the education of the United States." Unfortunately, it appears that the Chamber of Commerce has allowed itself to be hijacked for the purpose of ensuring that ignoramuses can continue to control US energy and climate policy for at least a few more years

⁴¹⁹ Bill Kovacs, comment on "Should EPA Bow to Chamber's Demand?" Energy Experts Blog, nationaljournal.com, 31 Aug. 2009, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2009/08/should-epa-bow-to-chambers-dem.php>.

One monkey trial was enough. It is now the Chamber that is making a fool of itself, much as Williams Jennings Bryan did eighty years ago. It's [sic] members should rescue their organization's reputation by publicly burying this idea before it does them more harm.⁴²⁰

It is clear from Pope's response—which erroneously characterized Bryan's reason for opposing the introduction of expert testimony at the trial, and misrepresented the jury's skepticism toward the constitutionality of the law (it had none)—that Kovacs's clarification did little to appease the chamber's critics. Kovacs's clarification was also found unsatisfactory by affiliated businesses who were concerned about the chamber's ostensible stance against climate change science. In the weeks that followed, Pacific Gas & Electric, Public Service Company of New Mexico, Exelon, and Apple severed ties with the chamber, while Nike stepped down from the chamber's board of directors, citing the call to put climate change on trial as their deciding factor. That call was, according to these groups, “beyond the pale in terms of aggressiveness” (Nike) and represented “extreme rhetoric and obstructionist tactics” (PG&E).⁴²¹

The furor eventually died down, but the damage had been done. As Andrew Leonard summarized on Salon.com, “The slings and arrows of a cacophony of online critics, mocking

⁴²⁰ Carl Pope, comment on “Should EPA Bow to Chamber's Demand?” Energy Experts Blog, nationaljournal.com, 31 Aug. 2009, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2009/08/should-epa-bow-to-chambers-dem.php>. Also posted as “A Second Scopes Trial?” at Carl Pope, “A Second Scopes Trial?” Huffington Post, 31 Aug. 2009, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/carl-pope/a-second-scopes-trial_b_273058.html.

⁴²¹ Andrew S. Ross, “PG&E dumping the U.S. Chamber,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, 23 Sept. 2009; Peter A. Darbee, letter to Thomas Donohue, 18 Sept. 2009, http://www.eenews.net/public/25/12516/features/documents/2009/09/22/document_pm_03.pdf; Clifford Krauss and Kate Galbraith, “Climate Bill Splits Exelon and Chamber Of Commerce,” *New York Times*, 29 Sept. 2009; Dana Hull, “Apple Quits U.S. Chamber of Commerce over Global Warming Views,” *San Jose Mercury News*, 5 Oct. 2009; Anne C. Mulkern, “Lobbying: ‘Hot button’ Climate Issue Spotlights how U.S. Chamber Sets Policy,” *Greenwire*, 6 Oct. 2009; Janet Whitman, “Corporate America Fights Back; Chamber of Commerce Goes to Bat for Capitalism,” *National Post's Financial Post & FP Investing*, 15 Oct. 2009.

its August call for a Scopes Monkey Trial of the 21st century to disprove the science of human-caused global warming, have been relentless.”⁴²² But while the Chamber of Commerce attempted to move beyond its Scopes fiasco, climate change denial was becoming even more firmly entrenched as analogous to the Scopes trial. When Virginia’s attorney general, for instance, filed a petition requesting that the EPA re-evaluate its position that global warming poses a genuine threat, the director of Virginia’s Sierra Club accused him of wanting “to bring the Scopes monkey trial to Virginia.”⁴²³

In South Dakota, the legislature passed a resolution in 2010 “calling for a balanced approach for instruction in the public schools relating to global climatic change.” In its unrevised form, it was considerably similar to antievolution legislation of previous decades. The version that passed the House stated that schools should teach:

- (1) That global warming is a scientific theory rather than a proven fact;
- (2) That there are a variety of climatological, meteorological, astrological [sic], thermological [sic], cosmological, and ecological dynamics that can effect world weather phenomena and that the significance and interrelativity of these factors is largely speculative; and
- (3) That the debate on global warming has subsumed political and philosophical viewpoints which have complicated and prejudiced the scientific

⁴²² Andrew Leonard, “The Chamber of Commerce is Mad as Hell,” Salon.com, 27 Oct. 2009, http://www.salon.com/2009/10/27/chamber_of_commerce_sues_the_yes_men/.

⁴²³ Rex Springston, “Va. Challenges EPA’s Stance on Global Warming,” *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, 17 Feb. 2010, http://www2.timesdispatch.com/news/2010/feb/17/cucc17_20100216-222005-ar-8276/. A subsequent editorial questioned this analogy, asserting that the Scopes trial was about Biblical religion vs. science, while the climate change debate was purely a scientific matter. “Not Scopes,” Editorial, *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, 22 Feb. 2010. A letter to the editor of the *Roanoke Times*, however, expressed agreement with the Sierra Club: “Stay tuned for the 21st century version of Tennessee’s Scopes Monkey Trial – Virginia v. Mann, Gore, Scientific Inquiry, Academic Freedom, et al.” Mark McClain, “Voices of the Valleys,” *Roanoke Times*, 23 May 2010.

investigation of global warming phenomena.⁴²⁴

The text was edited by the Senate before being passed (including the removal of “astrological” and “thermological” dynamics), but the resolution provoked the headline: “Climate Change Preps for Its Scopes Trial: State Legislatures Take Up the Assault on Science.”⁴²⁵

In 2012, the North Carolina state legislature, newly dominated by Republicans, passed legislation which, according to the *News and Observer*, “restrict[ed] local planning agencies’ abilities to use climate change science to predict sea-level rise in 20 coastal counties.” One reader wrote in to the paper, “What’s next? The prohibition of teaching evolution in the schools? A Scopes Monkey Trial here in North Carolina? Amendment One and now this. Shameful!”⁴²⁶

Of all the recent controversies to be compared to the Scopes trial, skepticism over global climate change may have been both the most natural and the most ironic. It was the most natural because it involved the questioning of a mainstream scientific theory, had the potential to become a battle to be fought in the courts, and became a controversy in the country’s schools. Climate change skepticism was not usually based upon religious convictions, but liberal politicians and journalists associated the corporate greed supposedly at its root with the same conservative politics to which religious conservatives tended to

⁴²⁴ House Concurrent Resolution No. 1009, 85th sess.
<http://legis.state.sd.us/sessions/2010/Bill.aspx?File=HCR1009P.htm>.

⁴²⁵ Joshua Rosenau, “Climate Change Preps for Its Scopes Trial: State Legislatures Take Up the Assault on Science” *scienceprogress.org*, 26 Feb. 2010, <http://scienceprogress.org/2010/02/climate-change-scopes-trial/>.

⁴²⁶ Jud Lawrie, “Monkeys Galore,” *News & Observer* (Raleigh), 13 June 2012, <http://www.newsobserver.com/2012/06/13/2132054/jud-lawrie-monkeys-galore.html>. Amendment One, passed by voters in May, 2012, had amended the state’s constitution to prohibit same-sex marriage.

adhere. But this comparison was also ironic, for the chief critic of greedy businessmen in the 1920s was not the scientists, but William Jennings Bryan, who blamed Darwinism for problems purportedly wrought by the excesses of unrestrained capitalism. Bryan's progressive politics, however, had been all but forgotten by most Americans by the time climate change science had become an issue, and the traditional narrative of the Scopes trial as a simplistic conflict about accepting or rejecting science made it all the more natural for climate change denial to be reduced to nothing more than a throwback to the fundamentalism of the 1920s.⁴²⁷

Gay Rights, Same-Sex Marriage, and the Scopes Trial

Popular rhetoric linking the Scopes trial to opposition to gay rights and same-sex marriage seems to have begun with a curious incident that took place in Rhea County in March, 2004. On the national scene, the debate over same-sex marriage was raging: a small handful of states had recently passed measures prohibiting it, while the Supreme Court of Massachusetts was just weeks away from declaring same-sex marriage a constitutional right. The U.S. Congress had passed the Defense of Marriage Act in 1996, defining marriage as exclusively heterosexual according to federal law, and early on in Bush's first term Congress had begun to debate a Federal Marriage Amendment to the United States constitution that would require states to follow suit.

⁴²⁷ For an explanation by the National Center for Science, see Steven Newton, "Voices: Defending Science: The Link between Creationism and Climate Change," *Earth Magazine*, 30 April 2012, <http://www.earthmagazine.org/article/voices-defending-science-link-between-creationism-and-climate-change>.

In March, 2004, the Tennessee legislature’s Senate Judiciary Committee voted in favor of a bill prohibiting the state from recognizing same-sex civil unions or domestic partnerships. Shortly thereafter, the commissioners of Rhea County, Tennessee, passed a measure intended to express their support for such efforts. The measure, however, went much further than merely banning gay marriages or civil unions. It banned homosexuals from the county altogether. “Those kind of people cannot live in Rhea County, or abide in Rhea County,” it stated. “If caught, they should be tried for crimes against nature.”⁴²⁸ Commissioner J.C. Fugate introduced the motion because, he declared, “we need to keep them out of here.”⁴²⁹

The next day the story became national news, and cries condemning Rhea County’s intolerance quickly resonated throughout the country. What made the story all the more intriguing was, of course, that the measure had been passed in the county of the Scopes trial—even within the walls the very courthouse in which the high school science teacher had been tried. The *Associated Press* story, reprinted in newspapers throughout the country the day after the measure passed, drew attention to this fact in its first sentence: “The county that was the site of the Scopes ‘Monkey Trial’ . . .”⁴³⁰ Whatever national progress the town of Dayton might have made over the previous decades in overcoming its reputation for backwardness came to a jarring halt. Newspaper editorials declared, “Folks there still see

⁴²⁸ Ellen Barry, “County Rescinds Vote to Ban Gay Residents,” *Los Angeles Times*, 19 March 2004, <http://articles.latimes.com/2004/mar/19/nation/na-gayban19>.

⁴²⁹ “Tenn. County Wants to Charge Homosexuals,” *Associated Press*, 17 March 2004.

⁴³⁰ “Tenn. County Wants to Charge Homosexuals.” The next day’s *AP* story reporting that the measure had been repealed began with an identical phrase. “Tenn. County Retreats from Gay Ban,” *Associated Press*, 18 March 2004.

things much as they did almost 80 years ago” and “old habits die hard in the Dayton, Tenn. courthouse . . . Dayton should consider a ban on bans.”⁴³¹ The *Los Angeles Times* more subtly observed, “The last 48 hours had brought a sense of deja vu to this Bible Belt city of front-porch swings and towering magnolias.”⁴³² It took the county commissioners less than two days to retract their resolution, a concession made after receiving advice from their attorney that the ban could never be legally enforced. Still, the image of Dayton as “monkey town” had returned to the nation’s consciousness. On CNN, clips from *Inherit the Wind* were spliced into coverage of the story.⁴³³

The Rhea County Courthouse had served as the backdrop to this drama, with reporters capturing photographs of protestors marching on the courthouse lawn on the day the commissioners reconvened to retract the resolution.⁴³⁴ In response to the county commissioner’s resolution, an activist group applied for a permit to hold a Rhea County Gay Day, featuring a parade through Dayton and culminating in a festival outside the courthouse. The county, citing space concerns and a conflict with Bryan College’s graduation, would not allow a festival at the courthouse, but instead approved a permit at a nearby park, where the festival was held a few weeks later.⁴³⁵ The county did, however, allow a small group of out-of-town independent Baptist ministers to lead a march of about thirty people to the

⁴³¹ *Times-Herald* (Forrest City, Ark.), quoted in “Arkansas Editorial Roundup,” *Associated Press*, 23 March 2004; “Briefly Put...” *Roanoke Times*, 22 March 2004.

⁴³² Ellen Barry, “County Rescinds Vote to Ban Gay Residents,” *Los Angeles Times*, 19 March 2004, <http://articles.latimes.com/2004/mar/19/nation/na-gayban19>.

⁴³³ *CNN Live Saturday*, CNN, March 20, 2004.

⁴³⁴ Chris Shackelford, “County Rescinds Gay Marriage Ban,” *Herald-News* (Dayton, Tenn.), n.d, <http://rheaheraldnews.com/story/5798>. Oddly, this particular article, published by Dayton’s local paper, carried a headline referring to the resolution as a “gay marriage,” even though the text that followed explained the real intent of the resolution.

⁴³⁵ Bill Poovey, “Tenn. County’s Vote to Ban Gays Protested,” *Associated Press Online*, 8 May 2004.

courthouse, where they spent four hours preaching to curious crowds. It was a scene reminiscent of 1925, with homosexuality having transcended evolution as the moral concern of the day.⁴³⁶ It was also considerably different, for the town of Dayton was much more divided about banning homosexuality than it had been on prohibiting the teaching of evolution. A number of Christians (including several Bryan College professors) strongly opposed the vote, and a local church youth group handed out free bottles of water at the gay pride rally in an effort to circumvent accusations of homophobia.⁴³⁷

Although the Rhea country episode came and went as a small interest piece in the national news cycle, a more enduring and consequential controversy over gay rights took place in California four years later. The California Supreme Court ruled in 2008 that the state could not discriminate against same-sex marriage. In response, conservatives in the legislature put on November's ballot an initiative, Proposition 8, that would supersede the court's ruling by amending the state's constitution. The proposition passed, inciting a lawsuit against it the following year which challenged the amendment as contradicting the federal constitution. This lawsuit, *Perry v. Schwarzenegger* (later *Perry v. Brown*), quickly became a legal battle between conflicting cultural values reminiscent of the Scopes trial.

Linda Hirshman, a former professor of philosophy and women's studies at Brandeis University, wrote an article for the popular online news website The Daily Beast in which

⁴³⁶ Sean McCombs, "Outside Ministers Converge on Dayton," *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 8 May 2004. The group returned the following year. Sean McCombs, "Anti-Gay Preachers Congregate in Rhea," *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 7 May 2005.

⁴³⁷ Rachel Held Evans, *Evolving in Monkey Town: How a Girl Who Knew All the Answers Learned to Ask the Questions* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 62-63. Evans, who went to high school in Dayton and attended Bryan College, is a popular blogger at <http://rachelheldevans.com>.

she called the *Perry* case “the most important battle between tradition and modernity since the *Scopes* trial.” She described both trials as contests “between religion and secularism, between revelation and reasoned proof, prejudice and a free social contract.” She continued,

the challenge to California’s prohibition on gay marriage reveals a fissure that runs throughout American history: Are we modern or are we medieval? Do Americans live together in a social contract for our material well-being, or are we following ancient traditions of how to live, because tradition is a better teacher than reason? This issue does not surface often in the United States, but it did most powerfully almost 90 years ago in *Scopes vs. the State of Tennessee*, the “monkey trial.” And it did so again this week.⁴³⁸

Hirshman suggested two similarities between the trials. First, she claimed, those advocating the traditional view based their beliefs on the Bible. Proposition 8 “clearly rests on a version of a Christian religious belief about marriage,” just as the Butler Act had been based upon a Christian view of Genesis. Their challengers, on the other hand, based their views purely on secular reasoning. Second, supporters of both Proposition 8 and 1920s antievolution laws had argued that their legislation was necessary to protect children from immoral influences, whether that they had descended from monkeys or that homosexuality was a legitimate lifestyle. Overall, the traditionalists of both episodes did little more than appeal to “the ancient ways of doing things.” Hirshman recognized that “*Scopes* lost the case in 1926 [sic] and the prohibition against teaching evolution remained in force,” but hoped that the federal courts would eventually come through on her side just as they had done for the evolutionists in *Epperson*. Hirshman relied heavily on the popular memory of the trial, suggesting that the Tennessee classrooms had been teaching the Biblical account (they were not—at least not

⁴³⁸ Linda Hirshman, “Gay Marriage’s Great Hope,” *The Daily Beast*, 6 Jan. 2010, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2010/01/14/gay-marriages-great-hope.html>.

officially) and that the judge and prosecutors at the Scopes trial cared about nothing outside the teachings of the Bible.

A legal news magazine, *Lawdragon*, published a story about the *Perry* trial comparing it to Scopes. “The California trial to legalize same-sex marriage was a Scopes trial redux,” it declared, “pitting science against religion. . . . Eighty-five years later, we are still torn between faith and knowledge.” The author worked the science-religion theme into the article by rejecting as anti-scientific the claims that homosexuality was merely a choice, that homosexuals were more likely to molest children, and that children would be harmed if they were to grow up without a father and mother. In recounting the scene at the trial, attorney David Boies’ cross-examination of Proposition 8 supporter Hak Shing William Tam evoked images of Darrow’s withering questioning of Bryan.⁴³⁹

Another similarity between *Perry* and *Scopes* arose when the plaintiffs and sympathetic judge attempted to have the trial filmed and broadcast, as had been done fifteen years earlier in the murder trial of O.J. Simpson. When this move was blocked by the U.S. Supreme Court, a disappointed NYU law professor, Barry Friedman, wrote in the *Los Angeles Times* that it ought to have been broadcast just as the Scopes trial had been broadcast over the radio. He argued that the case’s cultural significance would have made it all the more important for the public to watch it on television:

Like the Scopes “monkey trial” with which it is sometimes compared, *Perry* is not a legal case in the strict sense. It is a morality play aimed at all of us, speaking in a sense for all of us, and we should get to hear it. . . . Scopes became a stage play reflecting a brewing public debate between fundamentalist Christian values and

⁴³⁹ Katrina Dewey, “The Romantics,” *Lawdragon*, 5 Jan. 2012, http://www.lawdragon.com/images/uploads/pdf/The_Romantics_Prop_8.pdf

enlightenment scientific positions. The trial was covered by hordes of print journalists and was the first to be broadcast nationally by radio, and countless Americans tuned in. . . . The parallels with the Perry trial are telling. It too is peopled by star lawyers, most notably David Boies and Theodore Olson, who faced off in *Bush vs. Gore* and have now joined hands in support of gay marriage. The issue is equally fundamental. . . . Perry, like *Scopes*, is no ordinary trial.⁴⁴⁰

Others agreed about *Perry*'s significance, but rejected the idea that it ought to be broadcast for that very reason. Such an effort, according to Edward Whalen of National Review Online, was but another step by the plaintiffs "to turn the lawsuit into a high-profile, culture-transforming, history-making, *Scopes*-style show trial of Proposition 8's sponsors." Media circuses, he reminded his readers, were scarcely conducive to serious legal matters.⁴⁴¹

Although the public would not be able to watch the trial through their television sets, Proposition 8 opponents who regretted this prohibition found a creative way for the public to visually experience it: through readings of the trial transcripts, recorded online or performed onstage. The first of such efforts came from filmmakers John Ireland and John Ainsworth, who registered the website www.marriagetrial.com and recruited actors to read the lines of the transcripts each day they were released. They filmed the reenactment on a set designed to look like the actual courtroom, and posted each day's recording online through YouTube. It is not clear how many people actually watched the dozens of hours of recordings. "It isn't 'Inherit the Wind' . . . so far the real thing was a bit more dramatic," wrote one

⁴⁴⁰ Barry Friedman, "Prop. 8, the Trial that Should Be Seen," *Los Angeles Times*, 15 January, 2010, <http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jan/15/opinion/la-oe-friedman15-2010jan15>. Perry's attorney had apparently also argued that the trial should be televised because of its similarity to *Scopes*. Ted Johnson, "Savvy Marketing Surrounds Prop. 8 Trial," *Variety*, 18 Jan 2010, <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1118013934?refcatid=22&printerfriendly=true>.

⁴⁴¹ Edward Whalen, "Staging a Show Trial on Same-Sex Marriage," National Review Online, 4 Jan. 2010, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/228895/staging-show-trial-same-sex-marriage/edward-whelan>.

commentator.⁴⁴² Indeed, *The New Yorker* described the real event as a “judicial tug-of-war that harked back to the Scopes trial.”⁴⁴³

A more accessible and popular version of the trial was devised by Dustin Lance Black, who enlisted a cast of Hollywood celebrities to participate in a dramatic reading of an abridged trial transcript. Debuting on Broadway in September, 2010 before touring the country, *8* featured a cast that at times included Brad Pitt, George Clooney, Jamie Lee Curtis, Martin Sheen, Morgan Freeman, John Lithgow, and other actors and actresses eager to attach themselves to the cause of gay rights. The highly successful production was naturally compared to *Inherit the Wind*. The *Wall Street Journal* asked, “Is the legal battle over Proposition 8 turning into the Scopes Trial for the 2010s? Like in dramatic portrayals of the Scopes Trial, which tackled evolution, Black focused the ‘8’ narrative on some of the thornier issues raised in the gay marriage debate — whether sexual orientation is an immutable characteristic and the impact of homophobia on gay and lesbian people.”⁴⁴⁴ An article in the *Examiner* proclaimed, “‘8’ does for gay hate and bigotry that [sic] ‘Inherit the Wind’ did for communism,” describing both trials as having been largely about “prejudice and fear.”⁴⁴⁵ An elated Linda Hirshman continued her Scopes comparison on Slate.com, where she wrote about *8*:

⁴⁴² Ted Johnson, “Prop 8 Trial, The Reenactment,” *Variety*, 2 Feb. 2010, <http://www.wilshireandwashington.com/2010/02/prop-8-trial-the-reenactment.html>.

⁴⁴³ Michael Schulman, “Do-Over,” *The New Yorker*, 3 Oct. 2011, http://www.newyorker.com/talk/2011/10/03/111003ta_talk_schulman.

⁴⁴⁴ Geoffrey A. Fowler, “Broadway Tackles Gay Marriage Trial in ‘8,’” *Wall Street Journal Law Blog*, 20 Sept. 2011, http://blogs.wsj.com/law/2011/09/20/broadway-tackles-gay-marriage-trial-in-8/?mod=google_news_blog.

⁴⁴⁵ Kevin Thomas, “Proposition 8 Play Transcends the Stage,” *examiner.com*, March 11, 2012, <http://www.examiner.com/article/proposition-8-play-transcends-the-stage>.

Sometimes a trial is just as valuable for the drama it creates as for the rulings it engenders. Because the legal system puts a high premium on reasoned argument and demonstrable evidence, the appeals to religion and other nonfalsifiable moral beliefs that drive the enactment of laws like Tennessee's Monkey law and California's Proposition 8 sound weird in a courtroom. It is possible that "8" . . . will be the biggest payoff the movement gets from the gay marriage case.

She concluded that 8 had much more potential to sway opinions than a televised trial ever would have had, thanks to its brevity (under two hours) and the transcripts' skillful abridgement at the hands of Dunstin Lance Black.⁴⁴⁶

Overall, the *Perry* trial provided same-sex marriage advocates with a rhetorical advantage by lending them an easy comparison to the infamous Monkey trial. By pointing out the similarities between the trials—religiously-informed motives, the question of what ought to be taught in public schools, alleged trampling on individual rights, and the testimony of scientific experts—opponents of Proposition 8 who tapped into this strategy were able to articulate their case by framing it beside a narrative with which Americans were already familiar.

Observations

Throughout the late-twentieth and early-twenty-first centuries, the Scopes trial became an increasingly common symbol for a cultural struggle that emerged not only in the creation-evolution debates, but also in controversies over electoral politics, global warming,

⁴⁴⁶ Linda Hirshman, "In Lance Black's '8' Drama Overrules the Courts," Salon.com, 20 Sept. 2011, <http://www.salon.com/2011/09/20/play8/>.

and same-sex marriage, to name just a few.⁴⁴⁷ A range of other topics have also appeared over the years, including applications of Scopes to the trial of former Senator John Edwards, evangelical football star Tim Tebow, the Senate confirmation hearings of John Roberts, abstinence education, and a court case in the early 1980s involving families in Tennessee who objected to what their children were being assigned to read in public school.⁴⁴⁸ Some comparisons were substantial and enlightening; others were merely convenient rhetoric.⁴⁴⁹ It

⁴⁴⁷ In the dozens of *Inherit the Wind* theater reviews I have read, nearly every one remarks upon the continuing relevance of the play, often citing both creation-evolution debates and broader social issues.

⁴⁴⁸ John Edwards: John A. Farrell, “Edwards Can Look to Darrow’s Case,” *Politico*, 6 June 2011, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0611/56287.html>; DeWayne Wickham, “John Edwards the Victim of Political Puritanism,” *USA Today*, April 30, 2012, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/story/2012-05-01/john-edwards-trial-campaign-affair/54647934/1>.

Tim Tebow: Alan Shipnuck, “Tim Tebow’s Wild Ride,” *Sports Illustrated*, 28 Nov. 2011, <http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/vault/article/magazine/MAG1192439/3/index.htm>; Linda Kenney Baden, “Tim Tebow, the Fans and the Disbelievers,” *Huffington Post*, 30 Nov. 2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/linda-kenney-baden/tim-tebow_b_1120871.html; “Tim Tebow is Football’s Clarence Darrow” Says *Huffington Post*, Andrew E. Kersten’s Blog, 1 Dec. 2011, <http://www.andrewekersten.com.vhost.zerolog.com/2011/12/01/tim-tebow-is-footballs-clarence-darrow-says-huffington-post/>.

John Roberts: Daniel S. Brown, “The Evolving Lesson of the Scopes Trial,” *Crosswalk.com*, 22 July 2005, <http://www.crosswalk.com/1341835/>.

Abstinence education: “Just like Scopes Trial,” *Salt Lake Tribune*, March 2, 2012, <http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/opinion/53605027-82/education-sex-utah-wright.html.csp>.

The 1980s textbook controversy, which newspapers called “Scopes II”: See Stephen Bates. *Battleground: One Mother’s Crusade, the Religious Right, and the Struggle for Control of Our Classrooms* (New York: Poseidon Press, 1993).

⁴⁴⁹ Sometimes the usage has been both substantial and symbolic, such as in the work of controversial amateur historian David Barton. In 2001, Barton, a Christian and political conservative, wrote an article in which he contextualized the Scopes trial within his broader argument about America’s founding as a Christian nation with theism officially established by the United States’ founding documents. “Evolution and the Law: A Death Struggle Between Two Civilizations” was a lengthy article touching on a multitude of topics from the history of evolutionary thought to Thomas Paine’s criticism of France’s atheistic education system to Peter Singer’s writings on animal rights and infanticide. Barton’s central argument was that Tennessee’s Butler Act, which prohibited teachers from promoting “any theory that denies the story of the divine creation of man” was consistent with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution because the writers of these documents established belief in a God who had endowed mankind with inalienable rights. Showing that the concept of atheistic evolution was around even in the days of America’s founders, Barton wrote, “Clearly, then, it was not in the absence of knowledge about the debate over evolution, but rather in its presence, that our framers made the decision to incorporate in our governing documents the principle of a creator.” Whatever later scientists may have begun to claim about God’s non-existence, “Under our founding documents . . . the judiciary can no more disallow theism than it can disallow republicanism or separation of powers.” The court that upheld the

was evident, at any rate, that power of the trial's memory could be tapped in various ways. For liberals (who referred to it the most), the Scopes trial continued to be (as it had been for Darrow, and for Lawrence and Lee) a symbol of ignorance and bigotry, forces which they claimed to see at work in their political opponents. Conservatives, on the other hand, challenged such rhetoric and occasionally used the *Inherit the Wind* mythology as an example of liberal bias.

A study such as this one is admittedly sporadic: a few dozen references to the Scopes trial over a period of a few decades in various newspapers, books, television programs, and websites can only prove so much about how Americans understood and used the Scopes trial. But two conclusions are certain. First, a sufficiently clear (though not necessarily accurate) memory or image of the Scopes trial existed in the minds of Americans that columnists and reporters felt confident that alluding to it in any given context would conjure up notions that would advance their argument. Second, while most Americans' knowledge of the Scopes trial presumably depended primarily on high school and college history classes and viewings of *Inherit the Wind*, it must not be overlooked that those who used the Scopes trial to advance their political arguments were not only tapping into a certain memory, but also *reinforcing* one. Americans may never look at global warming or same-sex marriage the same way once

Butler Act had therefore acted with more respect to the Constitution than later courts that overturned antievolution laws. David Barton, "Evolution and the Law: A Death Struggle Between Two Civilizations," Wallbuilders, Jan. 2001, <http://www.wallbuilders.com/libissuesarticles.asp?id=97>. Ironically, historian Adam Laats would later use the Scopes trial and the subsequent history of creation science as a metaphor to describe Barton's "ideologically-driven narrative" that had come under fire for its historical inaccuracies. Laats mused about whether Barton's popularity marked a trend toward a rival version of American history that was being accepted by a portion of the population, much like had happened with creation science decades earlier. Adam Laats, "Does David Barton's Flameout Make This a Scopes Moment for American History?" History News Network, 20 Aug. 2012, <http://hnn.us/articles/does-david-bartons-flameout-make-scopes-moment-american-history>.

they have associated them with the Scopes trial. But neither would they look at Scopes the same way. Its consistent application as symbol of intolerance, ignorance, and cultural regression could only reinforce the assumption that its meaning ought to be expressed in these terms.

Conclusion

In *Summer for the Gods*, Edward Larson wrote,

The issues raised by the Scopes trial and legend endure precisely because they embody the characteristically American struggle between individual liberty and majoritarian democracy, and cast it in the timeless debate over science and religion. For twentieth-century Americans, the Scopes trial has become both the yardstick by which the former battle is measured and the glass through which the latter debate is seen.⁴⁵⁰

A diverse array of Americans has endeavored to articulate the trial's meaning and significance: evolutionists and creationists, Broadway playwrights and small-town amateurs, Democrats and Republicans, and professional scholars and freelance journalists. But as they tapped into this memory, their present circumstances shaped the narrative they composed and the application they proposed. As a rhetorical strategy, as a symbol, and as a story, the Scopes trial was from the beginning an event of contested significance. Historians will doubtlessly continue to refine their comprehension of the trial, offering an increasingly nuanced account of pertinent events, participants, and ideologies as they continue to revisit their sources and even discover new ones. But as long as various groups find it useful to appeal to a certain memory that attests to their respective interests, the "world's most famous

⁴⁵⁰ Larson, *Summer*, 265-266.

court trial” will be remembered as a story that cuts to the heart of what it means to be American.

REFERENCES

- Aksionczyk, Nicholas M. *A Second Look at Fundamentalism, The Scopes Trial, and Inherit the Wind*. El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research, 1999.
- Alexander, Larry. "79 Years Later, It's Still 'Red' States Versus 'Blue.'" *Intelligencer Journal*, 22 Jan. 2005.
- Alleged*. DVD. Directed by Tom Hines. Chatsworth, Calif.: Slingshot Pictures, 2011.
- Allen, Frederick Lewis. *Only Yesterday: An Informal History of the Nineteen-Twenties*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1931.
- Allen, Robert A. *William Jennings Bryan: Golden-Tongued Orator*. Milford, Mich.: Mott Media, 1992.
- Alpern, David M. "Abortion and the Law." *Newsweek*, 3 Mar. 1975.
- Alter, Jonathan. "Monkey See, Monkey Do." *Newsweek*, 15 Aug. 2005, 27.
- Anderson, Judith and John Weister. "Dealing with the Media in the Science Textbook Controversy." Access Research Network, 1997, <http://www.arn.org/docs/pc1110.htm>.
- "Arkansas Editorial Roundup," *Associated Press*, 23 March 2004.
- Baden, Linda Kenney. "Tim Tebow, the Fans and the Disbelievers." Huffington Post, 30 Nov. 2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/linda-kenney-baden/tim-tebow_b_1120871.html.
- Baker, Peter and Peter Slevin. "Bush Remarks on 'Intelligent Design' Theory Fuel Debate." *Washington Post*, 3 Aug. 2005, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/08/02/AR2005080201686.html>.
- Barnett, J.D. "Bigotry Now OK." *Tulsa World*, 28 Aug. 2005.
- Barry, Ellen. "County Rescinds Vote to Ban Gay Residents." *Los Angeles Times*, 19 Mar. 2004, <http://articles.latimes.com/2004/mar/19/nation/na-gayban19>.

- Barton, David. "Evolution and the Law: A Death Struggle Between Two Civilizations." Wallbuilders, 2001, <http://www.wallbuilders.com/libissuesarticles.asp?id=97>.
- Bartz, Paul. "The Shocking Truth About the Scopes Trial." *Bible Science Newsletter*, 1984.
- Bates, Stephen. *Battleground: One Mother's Crusade, the Religious Right, and the Struggle for Control of Our Classrooms*. New York: Poseidon Press, 1993.
- Bernabo, Lawrence Mark. "The Scopes Myth: The Scopes Trial in Rhetorical Perspective." Ph.D. diss., University of Iowa, 1990.
- Beyeler, Glen. *Beyond Superficiality with God*. West Conshohocken, Pa.: Infinity Publishing, 2007.
- Bird, Wendell R. *Origin of Species Revisited*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1989.
- Blake, Arthur. *The Scopes Trial: Defending the Right to Teach*. Spotlight on American History. Brookfield, Conn.: Millbrook, 1994.
- Bliss, Richard B. "Evolutionary Indoctrination and Decision-Making in Schools." *Impact* (June 1983), <http://www.icr.org/article/evolutionary-indoctrination-decision-making-school/>.
- Bodnar, John. *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Booker, M. Keith. *Alternate Americas: Science Fiction Film and American Culture*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2006.
- Bowler, Peter J. *Monkey Trials and Gorilla Sermons: Evolution and Christianity from Darwin to Intelligent Design*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Bregel, Emily. "Weekend." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 14 July 2006, H16.
- "Briefly Put..." *Roanoke Times*, 22 Mar. 2004.
- Brooke, John Hedley. *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Brooks, David. "The Values-Vote Myth." *New York Times*, 6 Nov. 2004.

- Brown, Daniel S. "The Evolving Lesson of the Scopes Trial." Crosswalk.com, 22 July 2005, <http://www.crosswalk.com/1341835/>.
- Brown, Rodger Lyle. *Ghost Dancing on the Cracker Circuit: The Culture of Festivals in the American South*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1997.
- Bryan, William Jennings and Mary Bryan. *Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan*. Chicago: John C. Winston Co., 1925.
- Bryant, Jen. *Ringside 1925: Views from the Scopes Trial*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008.
- Buchanan, Pat. "Santorum's Theology Gamble." *WND*, 2 Feb. 2012, <http://www.wnd.com/2012/02/santorums-theology-gamble/>.
- Buckna, David and Danny Phillips. "In the Beginning... Were the Facts: What Happened CBS?" Revolution Against Evolution, <http://www.rae.org/danny.html>.
- Burgan, Michael. *The Scopes Trial: Faith, Science, and American Education*. Tarrytown, N.Y.: Marshall Cavendish Benchmark, 2011.
- Burkeman, Oliver. "Civil Disobedience Has a Role to Play." *The Guardian* (London), 6 Nov. 2009, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/nov/07/al-gore-interview-climate-change>.
- Burnham, Michael. "Chamber Threatens Lawsuit if EPA Rejects Climate Science 'Trial.'" *New York Times*, 25 Aug. 2009.
- "Bush Is Trying to Force Politics into Schools with Stance on 'Intelligent Design.'" *Duluth News-Tribune*, 5 Aug. 2005.
- "Bush's Push on ID Scary, Embarrassing." *York Dispatch* (York, Penn.), 3 Aug. 2005.
- Butler, Michael J. "Has President Clinton Really Suffered Enough?" *New York Times*, 25 Jan. 1999.
- Campbell, John Angus and Stephen C. Meyer. "Evolution: Debate It." *USA Today*, 14 Aug. 2005, http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/2005-08-14-evolution-debate_x.htm.
- Carlson, Peter. "(The Last) Trial of the Century!; Will Bill Clinton's Day in Court Live Up to Its Billing? Let's Look at the Legal Precedent." *Washington Post*, 4 Jan. 1999.

- Carlyon, Les. "It's Time to Put Some Perspective into Politics." *Sydney Morning Herald (Australia)*, 29 Feb. 1996.
- Carpenter, Joel A. *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Carpenter, Tom. "A Defeat for Science." *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, 17 Jan. 2005.
- Carter, Paul. *The Twenties in America*. New York: Crowell, 1975.
- Caudill, Edward, ed. *The Scopes Trial: A Photographic History*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2000.
- Chapin, Frank. *Destiny in Dayton* (unpublished). In possession of author.
- Chapman, Matthew. *Trials of the Monkey: An Accidental Memoir*. New York: Picador, 2001.
- Clark, Constance Areson. "Evolution for John Doe: Pictures, the Public, and the Scopes Trial Debate." *Journal of American History* 87 (2001): 1275-1303.
- Clayton, Ron. "Symposium, Reunion Part of Scopes 75th Anniversary." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 13 July 2000, B1.
- CNN Live Saturday*, CNN, 20 Mar. 2004.
- Cohen, Norm. "Scopes and Evolution in Hillbilly Songs." *JEMF Quarterly* 6 (1970): 174-181.
- Conkin, Paul Keith. *When All the Gods Trembled: Darwinism, Scopes, and American Intellectuals*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1998.
- Cooper, Clint. "Pickers and Play Highlight Dayton's Scopes Festival." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 15 July 2011, H22.
- Cornelius, Richard M. and John Morris, eds. *Scopes: Creation on Trial*. Green Forest, AR: Master Press, 1999.
- Cornelius, Richard M. and Tom Davis. *IMPACT: The Scopes Trial, William Jennings Bryan, and Issues that Keep Revolving*. Dayton, Tenn.: Bryan College, 2000.
- Coulter, Ann. *Godless: The Church of Liberalism*. New York: Crown, 2006.

- Cowan, Doug. "Foster Critical Thinking in Schools." *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, 10 Oct. 2005.
- Crary, David. "Colorado Senate Committee Kills Creationism Bill." *Associated Press*, 24 Mar, 1981.
- Crewe, Sabrina and Michael V. Uschan. *The Scopes "Monkey" Trial. Landmark Events in American History*. Milwaukee: World Almanac Library, 2005.
- Croft, Jay and Joel Engelhart. "Hearts, Not Minds, Target of Campaign." *Palm Beach Post*, 8 Jan. 1995.
- Crompton, Samuel Willard. *The Scopes Monkey Trial: The Debate Over Evolution. Milestones in American History*. New York: Chelsea House, 2010.
- Cross, Howard. "Quick Glance at Today's News." *Chattanooga Free Press*, 16 July 1997, A2.
- Crossfire*, CNN, 29 May 2002,
<http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0205/29/cf.00.html>.
- Cruver, Timothy C. and Janet M. Cruver, ed. *You Be the Judge*. N.p.: College Press, 2000.
- "Culture in Crisis." *Answers in Genesis*, 1 Jan. 2007,
<http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v2/n1/culture-in-crisis>.
- Curl, Joseph. "Political Theater: GOP Field Not Exactly the Fab Four." *Washington Times*, 20 Feb. 2012.
- Dallek, Robert. "Bush Has Chance to Redeem His First Term." *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, 7 Nov. 2004.
- Darbee, Peter A. Letter to Thomas Donohue. 18 Sept. 2009.
http://www.eenews.net/public/25/12516/features/documents/2009/09/22/document_pm_03.pdf
- Darrow, Clarence. "The Eugenics Cult." *The American Mercury*, 30 Aug. 1926, 129-137.
- Darrow, Clarence. *The Story of My Life*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.
- Davis, Jerry E. "Intelligent Design: Origin Education Shouldn't Be Limited to Evolution Theory." *Charleston Gazette*, 1 Feb. 2003.

- Davis, P. William, Dean H. Kenyon, and Charles B. Thaxton. *Of Pandas and People*. Dallas: Haughton Pub. Co., 1993.
- Davis, Tom. "New Play Recounts Dayton's Strategy in Landing the Scopes Case." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 6 May 2009, B2.
- De Camp, L. Sprague. *The Great Monkey Trial*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968.
- Debenport, Ellen. "He Keeps the Faith atop His Agenda." *St. Petersburg Times*, 7 July 1994.
- Dewey, Katrina. "The Romantics." *Lawdragon*, 5 Jan. 2012, http://www.lawdragon.com/images/uploads/pdf/The_Romantics_Prop_8.pdf
- Dove, James. *All Their Graves are Occupied! His Tomb is Empty!: The Controversial Reality*. Lincoln: Writers Club Press, 2001.
- Dowd, Maureen. "Rove's Revenge." *New York Times*, 7 Nov. 2004.
- Draper, John William. *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1875.
- Driemen, John Evans. *Clarence Darrow*. New York: Chelsea House, 1992.
- Dwyer, Jim. "Foes Making It D-Day For Dole; Preachin' Pat Makes Monkey out of Truth." *New York Daily News*, 20 Feb. 1996.
- Easterbook, Greg. "The New Fundamentalism." *Wall Street Journal*, 8 Aug. 2000.
- Edwards, Frederick. "Why Creationism Should Not Be Taught as Science." *Creation Evolution Journal* 1.1 (Summer 1980), <http://ncse.com/cej/1/1/why-creationism-should-not-be-taught-as-science>.
- Eisen, Jonathan. "John McCain on Evolution." The Tree of Life Blog, 3 July 2006, <http://phylogenomics.blogspot.com/2006/07/john-mccain-on-evolution.html>.
- Eisen, Jonathan. "Sarah Palin on Evolution Creationism." The Tree of Life Blog, 29 Aug. 2008, <http://phylogenomics.blogspot.com/2008/08/sarah-palin-on-evolution-creationism.html>.
- Evans, Rachel Held. *Evolving in Monkey Town: How a Girl Who Knew All the Answers Learned to Ask the Questions*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.

- Farrell, John A. "Edwards Can Look to Darrow's Case." *Politico*, 6 June 2011, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0611/56287.html>.
- Fitzgerald, Stephanie. *The Scopes Trial: The Battle Over Teaching Evolution*. Snapshots in History. Minneapolis: Compass Point Books, 2007.
- Fitzpatrick, Vincent. *H.L. Mencken*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2004.
- Folsom, Burt W., Jr. "The Scopes Trial Reconsidered." *Continuity* 12 (1988): 103-127.
- _____. "Two Scopes Trial Myths Debunked." *Human Events* 54.55 (Nov. 1998): 24.
- Forrest, Barbara and Paul R. Gross. *Creationism's Trojan Horse: The Wedge of Intelligent Design*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Fowler, David. "Making John Scopes Proud—Finally." *TheChattanooga.com*, 21 Feb. 2011, <http://www.chattanooga.com/2011/2/21/195128/David-Fowler-Making-John-Scopes-Proud.aspx>.
- Fowler, Geoffrey A. "Broadway Tackles Gay Marriage Trial in '8.'" *Wall Street Journal Law Blog*, 20 Sept. 2011, http://blogs.wsj.com/law/2011/09/20/broadway-tackles-gay-marriage-trial-in-8/?mod=google_news_blog.
- Friedman Barry. "Prop. 8, the Trial that Should Be Seen." *Los Angeles Times*, 15 Jan., 2010, <http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jan/15/opinion/la-oe-friedman15-2010jan15>.
- Friedman, Thomas L. "The New Sputnik." *New York Times*, 26 Sept. 2009.
- Froomkin, Dan. "Instructor Sues to Teach Creationism." *Orange County Register*, 1 Oct. 1991.
- Geisler, Norman L. "Was Clarence Darrow a Bigot?" *Creation Evolution Journal* 9.1 (Fall 1989), <http://ncse.com/cej/9/1/was-clarence-darrow-bigot>.
- _____. *Creation & the Courts: Eighty Years of Conflict in the Classroom and the Courtroom*. Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2007.
- _____. *The Creator in the Courtroom: "Scopes II."* Milford, Mich.: Mott Media, 1982.
- _____. "The Conservative Agenda: Its Basis and Basics." 1997, <http://www.normgeisler.com/articles/political/TheConservativeAgendaBasisAndBasics.htm>.

- Geisler Norman L. and Frank Turek. *Legislating Morality: Is It Wise? Is It Legal? Is It Possible?* Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1998.
- Gerstein, Dan. "The Republican Devolution." Politico, 18 May 2007, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0507/4075.html>.
- Ginger, Ray. *Six Days or Forever? Tennessee vs. John Thomas Scopes*. New York: New American Library, 1958.
- Gish, Duane T. "The Scopes Trial in Reverse." *The Humanist* 37.6 (Nov./Dec. 1977), 50.
- _____. *Teaching Creation Science in Public Schools*. El Cajon, Calif.: Institute for Creation Research, 1995.
- Glenn Beck*, CNN, 18 Feb. 2008.
- "Global Warming on Trial?" *Los Angeles Times*, 26 Aug, 26 2009, <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/aug/26/opinion/ed-epa26>.
- Goldberg, Jonah. "Turning Up the Heat on Gore." National Review Online, 23 Mar. 2007, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/220394/turning-heat-gore/jonah-goldberg>.
- Goldman, Peter. "The Battle of the Button." *Newsweek*, 1 Sept. 1980.
- González, Justo L. *The Story of Christianity*. Vol. 2. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984.
- Gore, Albert. "The Chamber of Commerce and the Climate Crisis." Al's Journal, 8 Oct. 2009, http://blog.algore.com/2009/10/the_chamber_of_commerce_and_th.html.
- Graves, Renee. *The Scopes Trial*. Cornerstones of Freedom. New York: Children's Press, 2003.
- Grebstein, Sheldon Norman ed. *Monkey Trial: The State of Tennessee vs. John Thomas Scopes*. Houghton Mifflin Research Series. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960.
- Greenberg, Paul. "Inherit the Wind." *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, 22 April 2001.
- Greuter, Kimberly. "Judge Weighs Fate of Bible Class in Rhea." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 23 Jan. 2002.
- Gurko, Miriam. *Clarence Darrow*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1965.

- Ham, Kenneth. "Always Be Ready." Institute for Creation Research, <http://www.icr.org/article/always-be-ready/>.
- _____. *Journey through the Creation Museum*. Hebron, KY: Answers in Genesis, 2008.
- _____. *The Monkey Trial: The Scopes Trial and the Decline of the Church*. VHS. Florence, KY : Answers in Genesis, 1997.
- Hankins, Barry. *Jesus and Gin: Evangelicalism, the Roaring Twenties, and Today's Culture Wars*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Hansen, Ellen. *Evolution on Trial*. Lowell, Mass.: Discovery Enterprises, 1994.
- Hanson, Freya Ottam. *The Scopes Monkey Trial: A Headline Court Case*, Headline Court Cases Series. Berkeley Heights, N.J.: Enslow Publishers, 2000.
- Hardball*, MSNBC, 11 June 2007.
- Hardball*, MSNBC, 24 June 2011.
- Hardball*, MSNBC, 6 June 2007.
- Hardball*, MSNBC, 9 Dec. 2009.
- Hari, Johann. "Gore Tells the Truth. His Enemies Smear Him." *Independent* (London), 15 Oct. 2007.
- Harrell, David Edwin, Jr. *The Churches of Christ in the 20th Century: Homer Hailey's Personal Journey of Faith*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2000.
- _____. "Recovering the Underside of Southern Religion." In *Autobiographical Reflections on Southern Religious Historians*, ed. John B. Boles. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 2001.
- Harrell, David Edwin, Jr., et al. *Unto a Good Land: A History of the American People*. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2005.
- Hart, D.G. Review of *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate over Science and Religion*, by Edward J. Larson. *American Historical Review* 104.1 (Feb. 1999): 206-207.

Hatcher, June. "Getting Ready for Scopes Trial Festival in Dayton." *Chattanooga Free Press*, 6 July 1997, K5.

_____. "Scopes Trial Play & Festival." *Chattanooga Free Press*, 22 June 1997.

Hays, Arthur Garfield. *Let Freedom Ring*. 1932. New York: Da Capo, 1972.

Head, John. "Southern Almanac: Fest Brings Event to Life." *Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, 23 July 2000, 2M.

Hendrick Bill. *Associated Press*, 15 Feb. 1977.

Henry, Matthew. "Gabbin' About God: Religion, Secularity, and Satire on *The Simpsons*." In *Homer Simpson Marches on Washington: Dissent through American Popular Culture*, ed. Timothy M. Dale and Joseph J. Foy. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2010.

Hightower, Cliff. "Scopes Trial Film Begins July 14." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 6 July 2007.

_____. "Scopes Trial Show Kicks Off Tonight." *Chattanooga Free Press*, 18 July 2008, B1.

Hilts, Philip J. "Creation vs. Evolution: The Battle Resumes in Public Schools." *Washington Post*, 13 Sept. 1980.

Hirshman, Linda. "Gay Marriage's Great Hope." *The Daily Beast*, 6 Jan. 2010, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2010/01/14/gay-marriages-great-hope.html>.

_____. "In Lance Black's '8' Drama Overrules the Courts." *Salon.com*, 20 Sept. 2011, <http://www.salon.com/2011/09/20/play8/>.

Hofstadter, Richard. *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R.* New York : Knopf, 1955.

_____. *The American Political Tradition: And the Men Who Made It*. New York: Knopf, 1948.

Homnick, Jay D. "Dare to Win." *Jewish World Review*, 26 Jan. 2005, http://www.jewishworldreview.com/0105/homnick_evolution.php3.

Hull, Dana. "Apple Quits U.S. Chamber of Commerce over Global Warming Views." *San Jose Mercury News*, 5 Oct. 2009.

Hutton, Patrick. "Recent Scholarship on Memory and History." *The History Teacher* 33.4 (Aug. 2000), 533-548.

Iannone, Carol. "The Truth about *Inherit the Wind*." *First Things*, Feb. 1997,
<http://www.firstthings.com/article/2007/12/002-the-truth-about-inherit-the-wind--36>.

_____. "Wm. Jennings Bryan Was Right." *New York Press*, 8 May 2001.

Inherit the Wind. DVD. Directed by Stanley Kramer. 1960; Los Angeles: MGM; 2001.

Ipsen, D.C. *Eye of the Whirlwind: the Story of John Scopes*. Reading, MA : Addison-Wesley, 1973.

Israel, Charles A. *Before Scopes: Evangelicalism, Education, and Evolution in Tennessee, 1870-1925*. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 2004.

Johnson, Anne Janette. *The Scopes "Monkey Trial."* Defining Moments. Detroit: Omnigraphics, 2007.

Johnson, Gale. *Monkey in the Middle* (unpublished). In possession of author.

Johnson, Keith. "Inherit the Wind? A Scopes Trial for Climate Change?" Wall Street Journal Blogs, 25 Aug. 2009,
<http://blogs.wsj.com/environmentalcapital/2009/08/25/inherit-the-wind-a-scopes-trial-for-climate-change/>.

Johnson, Phillip E. *Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1997.

_____. "How to Sink a Battleship: A Call to Separate Materialist Philosophy from Empirical Science." Leadership U,
<http://www.leaderu.com/real/ri9602/johnson.html>.

Johnson, Ted. "Prop 8 Trial, The Reenactment." *Variety*, 2 Feb. 2010,
<http://www.wilshireandwashington.com/2010/02/prop-8-trial-the-reenactment.html>.

_____. "Savvy Marketing Surrounds Prop. 8 Trial." *Variety*, 18 Jan 2010,
<http://www.variety.com/article/VR1118013934?refcatid=22&printerfriendly=true>.

"Just like Scopes Trial." *Salt Lake Tribune*, 2 Mar. 2012,
<http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/opinion/53605027-82/education-sex-utah-wright.html.csp>.

- Kaplan, Carl S. "Rounding up the Century's Greatest Trials Online." *Cyber Law Journal*, 15 Oct. 1999.
<http://partners.nytimes.com/library/tech/99/10/cyber/cyberlaw/15law.html>.
- Kazin, Michael. *A Godly Hero: The Life of William Jennings Bryan*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2006.
- Keith, Bill. *Scopes II: The Great Debate*. Shreveport, Louisiana: Huntington House, 1982.
- Kennedy, D. James. "Evolution's Bloopers and Blunders." *Bible-Science Newsletter*, March 1987, <http://www.cai.org/bible-studies/evolutions-bloopers-and-blunders>.
- _____. *The Case for Creation*. VHS. Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.: Coral Ridge Ministries, 1988.
- Kennedy, D. James and Jerry Newcombe. *Lord of All: Developing a Christian World-and-Life View*. Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway Books, 2005.
- Kersten, Andrew E. "'Tim Tebow is Football's Clarence Darrow' Says Huffington Post." Andrew E. Kersten's Blog, 1 Dec. 2011,
<http://www.andrewekersten.com.vhost.zerolag.com/2011/12/01/tim-tebow-is-footballs-clarence-darrow-says-huffington-post/>.
- Kidd, Ronald. *Monkey Town: The Summer of the Scopes Trial*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006.
- Koenig, Louis W. *Bryan: A Political Biography of William Jennings Bryan*. New York: Putnam, 1971.
- Koppelman, Alex. "A Scopes Trial for Global Warming?" *Salon.com*, 25 Aug. 2009,
<http://www.salon.com/2009/08/25/scopes/>.
- Kosek, Charmain. "Educator Banned from Teaching Creation Science." *United Press International*, 9 Nov. 1990.
- Kosner, Alice. *The Voice of the People: William Jennings Bryan*. New York: Julian Messner, 1970.
- Kowalski, Kathainn M. *Evolution on Trial: From the Scopes "Monkey" Case to Inherit the Wind*. Famous Court Cases that Became Movies. Berkeley Heights, NJ : Enslow, 2009.

Kraft, Betsy Harvey. *Sensational Trials of the 20th Century*. New York: Scholastic Press, 1998.

Krauss, Clifford and Kate Galbraith. "Climate Bill Splits Exelon and Chamber Of Commerce." *New York Times*, 29 Sept. 2009.

Krauthammer, Charles. "The Clinton Kulturkampf." *Weekly Standard*, 22 Feb. 1999.

Kriz, Margaret. "Science Can Be Our Ally." *National Journal*, 10 Mar. 2007.

Laats, Adam. "Does David Barton's Flameout Make This a Scopes Moment for American History?" History News Network, 20 Aug. 2012, <http://hnn.us/articles/does-david-bartons-flameout-make-scopes-moment-american-history>.

_____. *Fundamentalism and Education in the Scopes Era: God, Darwin, and the Roots of America's Culture Wars*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Lacy, Bill. *The Trial of John Scopes: a Re-creation of John Scopes' Trial in 1925, Debating Man's Origin-Science vs. Fundamentalism*. El Cajon, Calif.: Interaction Publishers, DBA Interact, 1980, 1992.

LaFollette, Marcel C. *Reframing Scopes: Journalists, Scientists, and the Lost Photographs from the Trial of the Century*. Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas, 2008.

Larson, Edward J. "Monkey Business." *Oxford American* (Nov/Dec 2000): 35-37.

_____. *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate Over Science and Religion*. New York: Basic Books, 2006.

_____. *Trial and Error: The American Controversy Over Creation and Evolution*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Late Edition with Wolf Blitzer, CNN, 22 Aug. 1999.

Lawrence, Jerome and Robert E. Lee. *Inherit the Wind*. New York: Bantam Books, 1955.

Lawrie, Jud. "Monkeys Galore." *News & Observer* (Raleigh), 13 June 2012, <http://www.newsobserver.com/2012/06/13/2132054/jud-lawrie-monkeys-galore.html>.

"Lawsuit Threatened Over Confiscation of Science Books on Intelligent Design, Order that Teachers Teach Evolution as a Fact." *U.S. Newswire*, 21 April 2005.

- Lemonick, Michael D. and Andrea Dorfman. "Dumping on Darwin." *Time*, 18 Mar. 1996, 81.
- Leonard, Andrew. "The Chamber of Commerce is Mad as Hell." Salon.com, 27 Oct. 2009, http://www.salon.com/2009/10/27/chamber_of_commerce_sues_the_yes_men/.
- Lepore, Jill. *The Mansion of Happiness: A History of Life and Death*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012.
- Levine, Lawrence W. *Defender of the Faith: William Jennings Bryan; the Last Decade, 1915-1925*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Lienesch, Michael. *In the Beginning: Fundamentalism, the Scopes Trial, and the Making of the Antievolution Movement*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Lindberg, David C. and Ronald L. Numbers, eds., *God and Nature: Historical Essays on the Encounter between Christianity and Science*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986.
- Lindberg, David C. and Ronald L. Numbers. "Beyond War and Peace: A Reappraisal of the Encounter between Christianity and Science." *Church History* 55 (1986): 338-54.
- Linder, Douglas O. "Goals and Purpose of the Famous Trials Site." Famous Trials, <http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/trialsgoals.html>
- _____. "John Scopes." Famous Trials, 2004, http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/scopes/sco_sco.htm.
- Lipps Curtis. *One Hot Summer* (unpublished). In possession of author.
- Livingstone, David N. *Darwin's Forgotten Defenders: The Encounter Between Evolutionary Theory and Evangelical Thought*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Lowry, Rich. "Let the Perry Bashing Begin." National Review Online, 16 Aug. 2011, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/274725/let-perry-hatred-begin-rich-lowry>.
- Luo, Michael. "Romney Elaborates on Evolution." New York Times Blog, 11 May 2007, <http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/05/11/romney-elaborates-on-evolution/>.
- Marklein, Mary Beth. "School Debate Evolves to Put Scopes' Foes on Defense." *USA Today*, 19 July 2000.

- Marsden, George M. *Fundamentalism and American Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- _____. *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Martin, James L. "Time to Chill Out." *Washington Times*, 21 Feb. 2004, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2004/feb/20/20040220-100116-1946r/?page=all>.
- McClain, Mark. "Voices of the Valleys." *Roanoke Times*, 23 May 2010.
- McCombs, Sean. "Anti-Gay Preachers Congregate in Rhea." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 7 May 2005.
- _____. "Outside Ministers Converge on Dayton." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 8 May 2004.
- McGowen, Tom. *The Great Monkey Trial: Science Verses Fundamentalism in America*. A Twentieth Century American History Book. New York: Franklin Watts, 1990.
- McIver, Tom. "Creationist Misquotation of Darrow." *Creation Evolution Journal* 8.2 (Spring 1988), <http://ncse.com/cej/8/2/creationist-misquotation-darrow>.
- McMillian, Kimberly. "24th Scopes Festival Offering Bluegrass, Historical Drama." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 15 July 2011.
- _____. "Festival Renews Scopes Trial Events." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 17 July 2010.
- _____. "Students Delve into History During Scopes Festival Activity." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 8 June 2011, B2.
- Mencken, H.L. *A Religious Orgy in Tennessee: A Reporter's Account of the Scopes Trial*. Hoboken, N.J.: Melville House, 2006.
- Menton, David N. "'Inherit the Wind': A Hollywood History of the Scopes Trial." *Bible-Science Newsletter* 23.1 (1985), <http://www.pathlights.com/topics/InherittheWind.htm>.
- Mercer, Marsha. "Unintelligent Design." *Richmond Times Dispatch*, 7 Aug. 2005, E-4.

- Meyer, Stephen C. "Danger: Indoctrination: A Scopes Trial for the '90s." *Wall Street Journal*, 6 Dec. 1993.
- Milam, Matthew. "An Interview with Fred Foote, Co-Writer and Producer of 'Alleged.'" *ChicagoNow*, 20 Aug. 2010, <http://www.chicagonow.com/matthew-milams-films-and-music/2010/08/an-interview-with-fred-foote-co-writer-and-producer-of-alleged/>.
- Milbank, Dana. "Some Heated Words for Mr. Global Warming." *Washington Post*, 22 Mar. 2007, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/03/21/AR2007032102060.html>.
- Monbiot, George. "A Life with No Purpose." *The Guardian* (London), 15 Aug. 2005, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2005/aug/16/religion.science>.
- "'Monkey Trial' in Reverse Opens in Arkansas Court." *Christian Science Monitor*, December 8, 1981.
- "Monkey Trial." *American Experience*. PBS, 2002, <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/monkeytrial/filmmore/pt.html>.
- Mooney, Chris. *The Republican War on Science*. New York: Basic Books, 2005.
- Moore, James R. *The Post-Darwinian Controversies*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Moran, Jeffrey P. *American Genesis: The Evolution Controversies from Scopes to Creation Science*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- _____. "Reading Race into the Scopes Trial: African American Elites, Science, and Fundamentalism," *Journal of American History* 90 (2003): 891-911.
- _____. *The Scopes Trial: A Brief History with Documents*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2002.
- Morris, Henry M. "Recent Creation is a Vital Doctrine." *Acts & Facts* (June 1984), <http://www.icr.org/articles/view/237/306/>; *Acts & Facts* 39.6 (2010), <http://www.icr.org/article/5360/>.
- _____. *History of Modern Creationism*. San Diego: Master Book, 1984.
- Morris, Henry M., III. "Darwin's Dangerous Doctrine." *Acts & Facts* 38.2 (2009), <http://www.icr.org/article/4337/>.

- _____. "Guiding Lamp or Simply Luster." Institute for Creation Research, <http://www.icr.org/article/2713/>.
- Morris, John D. "The Creation Worldview and the Scopes Trial." *Acts & Facts* 40.1 (2011), <http://www.icr.org/article/creation-worldview-scopes-trial/>.
- Mulkern Anne C. "Lobbying: 'Hot button' Climate Issue Spotlights how U.S. Chamber Sets Policy." *Greenwire*, 6 Oct. 2009.
- "Mythology in the White House." *Independent* (London), 4 Aug. 2005.
- Nardo, Don. *The Scopes Trial*. Famous Trials. San Diego: Lucent Books, 1997.
- Nash, Roderick. *The Nervous Generation: American Thought, 1917-1930*. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1970.
- "New Briefs." *Creation Evolution Journal* 3.4 (Fall 1982), <http://ncse.com/cej/3/4/news-briefs>.
- NewsHour with Jim Lehrer*, PBS, 31 May 1996.
- Newton, Steven. "Voices: Defending Science: The Link between Creationism and Climate Change." *Earth Magazine*, 30 April 2012, <http://www.earthmagazine.org/article/voices-defending-science-link-between-creationism-and-climate-change>.
- Noll, Mark A. Review of *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate over Science and Religion*, by Edward J. Larson. *Isis* 90.2 (June 1999): 383-384.
- _____. *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- "Not Scopes." *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, 22 Feb. 2010.
- Novick, Peter. *The Holocaust in American Life*. Boston: Mariner, 1999.
- Numbers, Ronald L. *The Creationists*. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1992.
- _____. *The Creationists*. Expanded ed. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- _____. *Darwinism Comes to America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

- _____. "Inherit the Wind." *Isis* 84.4 (Dec. 1993): 763-764.
- _____. "Science and Religion." *Osiris*, 2nd ser., 1 (1985): 59-80.
- _____. "Science without God." In *When Science and Christianity Meet*, ed. David C. Lindberg and Ronald L. Numbers. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Olasky, Marvin and John Perry. *Monkey Business*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2005.
- Olasky, Marvin. "When Worldviews Collide: Journalists and the Great Monkey Trial." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. Norman, OK, Aug. 3-6, 1986.
- Olson, Richard G. *Science and Religion, 1450-1900: From Copernicus to Darwin*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2004.
- Olson, Steven P. *The Trial of John T. Scopes: A Primary Source Account*. Great Trials of the 20th Century. New York: Rosen Pub. Group, 2004.
- Pareene, Alex. "The GOP Candidates Have No Time for Your 'Science,' Scientists." Salon.com, 19 Aug. 2011.
- Pearcey, Nancy. "Scopes in Reverse." *Washington Times*, 24 July 2000.
- Pearlstein, Steven. "The Republicans' Magical Thinking." *Washington Post*, 11 Sept. 2011.
- Pedersen, Jim. "'Global Warming' is Alarmism." *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, 29 Jan. 2008.
- Phillips, Kevin. "How the GOP Became God's Own Party." *Washington Post*, 2 April 2006.
- _____. *American Theocracy: The Perils and Politics of Radical Religion, Oil, and Borrowed Money in the 21st Century*. New York: Viking, 2006.
- Pinsky, Mark I. *The Gospel According to the Simpsons*. Louisville : Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Planet of the Apes*. Directed by Franklin J. Schaffner. APJAC Productions, 1968.
- Poovey Bill. "Tenn. County's Vote to Ban Gays Protested." Associated Press Online, 8 May 2004.

- Pope, Carl. "A Second Scopes Trial?" *Huffington Post*, 31 Aug. 2009, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/carl-pope/a-second-scopes-trial_b_273058.html.
- Press Bill. *How the Republicans Stole Christmas: The Republican Party's Declared Monopoly on Religion and what Democrats Can Do to Take It Back*. New York: Doubleday, 2005.
- Priest, Gerald L. "William Jennings Bryan and the Scopes Trial: A Fundamentalist Perspective." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 4 (1999): 51-83.
- Radcliffe, Donnie. "The Southern Touch." *Washington Post*, 26 Aug. 1980.
- "Ready for Trial." *Chattanooga Times*, 19 July 1996, B1.
- Rich, Frank. "Journal; Inherit the Wind." *New York Times*, 20 Jan. 1999, <http://www.nytimes.com/1999/01/20/opinion/journal-inherit-the-wind.html>.
- Richards, Stanley ed. *America on Stage: Ten Great Plays of American History*. New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Ridgeway, James. "Making Monkeys of Us." *Village Voice*, 2 Aug. 2005, <http://www.villagevoice.com/2005-08-02/news/making-monkeys-of-us/>.
- Riley, Karen L., Jennifer A. Brown, and Ray Braswell. "Inherit the Wind as an Appraisal of the American Teacher." *American Educational History Journal* (2007): 263-273.
- Rintels, David W. *Clarence Darrow: A One-Man Play*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1975.
- Roberts, Jon H. *Darwinism and the Divine in America: Protestant Intellectuals and Organic Evolution, 1859-1900*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.
- Romm, Joe. "Memo to Alcoa, Kodak, IBM, Nike, Toyota et al.: Luddite U.S. Chamber of Commerce seeks 'the Scopes Monkey Trial of the 21st Century' on Global Warming." *Thinkprogress.com*, 25 Aug. 2009, <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2009/08/25/204545/memo-to-alcoa-kodak-ibm-nike-pepsi-toyota-luddite-chamber-of-commerce-seeks-the-scopes-monkey-trial-global-warming/?mobile=nc>.
- Rosenau, Joshua. "Chamber of Commerce Plans a Monkey Trial." *Thoughts from Kansas*, 24 Aug. 2009, <http://scienceblogs.com/tfk/2009/08/24/chamber-of-commerce-plans-a-mo/>.

- _____. "Climate Change Preps for Its Scopes Trial: State Legislatures Take Up the Assault on Science." *Scienceprogress.org*, 26 Feb. 2010, <http://scienceprogress.org/2010/02/climate-change-scopes-trial/>.
- Rosenberg, Emily S. *A Date Which Will Live: Pearl Harbor in American Memory*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2003.
- Ross Andrew S. "PG&E dumping the U.S. Chamber." *San Francisco Chronicle*, 23 Sept. 2009.
- Ruse, Michael. Review of *In the Beginning: Fundamentalism, the Scopes Trial, and the Making of the Antievolution Movement*, by Michael Lienesch. *Church History* 76.4 (Dec. 2007): 870-872.
- Rusher, William. "Do You Believe in Accidentalism?" *Human Events Online*, 31 Aug. 2005, <http://www.humanevents.com/2005/08/31/do-you-believe-in-accidentalism/>.
- Sanders, Theresa. *Approaching Eden: Adam and Eve in Popular Culture*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2009.
- Schulman, Michael. "Do-Over." *The New Yorker*, 3 Oct. 2011, http://www.newyorker.com/talk/2011/10/03/111003ta_talk_schulman.
- Schweikart, Larry. *48 Liberal Lies about American History*. New York: Sentinel, 2008.
- "Scopes Dined, Says Fight is for Liberty." *New York Times*, 11 June 1925, 1-2.
- "Scopes Festival." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 7 July 2006, H11.
- "Scopes Festival Starts Friday." *Chattanooga Free Press*, 8 July 2006.
- Scopes, John Thomas and James Presley. *Center of the Storm: Memoirs of John T. Scopes*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967.
- "Senator's Twaddle." *Tulsa World*, 16 April 2007.
- Settle, Mary Lee. *Scopes Trial*. New York: F. Watts, 1972.
- Shackleford, Chris. "Bryan College Dedicates New Buildings during Homecoming." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 8 Oct. 2001.

- _____. "County Rescinds Gay Marriage Ban." *Herald-News* (Dayton, Tenn.), <http://rheaheraldnews.com/story/5798>.
- _____. "Dayton Gears Up for Scopes Festival." *Chattanooga Free Press*, 25 June 2001, B2.
- _____. "Rhea Festival Will Center on 1925 Scopes Evolution Trial." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 20 June 2002, B2.
- _____. "Strawberry, Scopes Festivals Post Profits for Dayton, Chamber of Commerce." *Chattanooga Times Free Press*, 20 Aug. 2001, B2.
- Shaw, Liz. "'Alleged' Screenwriter Fred Foote Discusses the Story behind His Story on the Scopes Monkey Trial." *Flint Journal*, 24 Sept. 2009, http://www.mlive.com/news/flint/index.ssf/2009/09/alleged_screenwriter_fred_foot.html.
- Shearer, John. "Homes to Serve Dinner During Scopes Festival." *Chattanooga Free Press*, 30 June, 1996.
- Shields, Mark. "Memo to Ronald Reagan." *Washington Post*, 29 Aug. 1980.
- Shipnuck, Alan. "Tim Tebow's Wild Ride." *Sports Illustrated*, 28 Nov. 2011, <http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/vault/article/magazine/MAG1192439/3/index.htm>.
- "Should EPA Bow to Chamber's Demand?" *Energy Experts Blog*, 31 Aug. 2009, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2009/08/should-epa-bow-to-chambers-dem.php>.
- "Silencing Science Won't Prevent Global Warming." *Denver Post*, 25 Jan. 2008.
- Simon, Jeff. "In the Media and at Home, the Goblins of Bigotry." *Buffalo News*, 10 Mar. 1996.
- Simonds, Robert L. "Teachers Can Teach Creation Science in the Classroom." *Impact* (Oct. 1989), <http://www.icr.org/article/teachers-can-teach-creation-science-classroom/>.
- Simpson, J.Y. *Landmarks in the Struggle between Science and Religion*. New York, George H. Doran, 1926.
- Sivertsen, Walt. "Creationism Ruling is Misunderstood." *Daily Herald*, 16 Mar. 2011, <http://www.dailyherald.com/article/20110316/discuss/703169801/print/>.

- Slater, William. "Forensic Evidence Supports Both Ideas." *Chicago Daily Herald*, 30 July 2005.
- Smith, William. *The Social and Religious Thought of William Jennings Bryan*. Lawrence, Kan.: Coronado Press, 1975.
- Smout, Kary Doyle. *The Creation/Evolution Controversy: A Battle for Cultural Power*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1998.
- Speaking of Faith*, NPR, 12 April 2007.
- Springston, Rex. "Va. Challenges EPA's Stance on Global Warming." *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, 17 Feb. 2010, http://www2.timesdispatch.com/news/2010/feb/17/cucc17_20100216-222005-ar-8276/.
- Steinhorn, Leonard. "How the GOP Became the Anti-Science Party." *Huffington Post*, 21 Sept. 2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/leonard-steinhorn/how-the-gop-became-the-an_b_970410.html.
- Sullivan, Amy. "Elitist Ridicule Fuels Palin's Faithful Base." *USA Today*, 11 April 2011.
- Szasz, Ferenc M. "The Scopes Trial in Perspective," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 30 (1971): 288-298.
- _____. Review of *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate over Science and Religion*, by Edward J. Larson. *Journal of Southern History* 66.1 (Feb. 2000): 154-155.
- Tankersley, Jim. "U.S. Chamber of Commerce Seeks Trial on Global Warming." *Los Angeles Times*, 25 Aug. 2009, <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/aug/25/nation/nacclimate-trial25>.
- "Tenn. County Retreats from Gay Ban." *Associated Press*, 18 Mar. 2004.
- "Tenn. County Wants to Charge Homosexuals." *Associated Press*, 17 Mar. 2004.
- Teodoro, Luis V. "Vantage Point: Sleepless in Somalia." *BusinessWorld*, 19 Sept. 2008 S1/4.
- "The Scopes Retrial." *Answers in Genesis*, 24 July 2010, <https://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v5/n3/scopes-retrial>.

The Scopes Trial: Interpreting Alternate Viewpoints in Four Primary Source Documents. Debating the Documents. Fort Atkinson, WI : Highsmith, 2004.

The World's Most Famous Court Trial: Tennessee Evolution Case. 1925. Union, N.J.: The Lawbook Exchange, 1997.

Thomas, Kevin. "Proposition 8 Play Transcends the Stage." Examiner.com, 11 Mar. 2012, <http://www.examiner.com/article/proposition-8-play-transcends-the-stage>.

Tomaselli, David. "Just Where is the Proof?" *Houston Chronicle*, 8 Oct. 1993.

Tompkins, Jerry R. *D-Days at Dayton: Reflections on the Scopes Trial.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965.

Toumey, Christopher P. *God's Own Scientists: Creationists in a Secular World.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1994.

"Travesty \$40 Million Attack." *Charleston Gazette*, 28 Jan. 1999, 4A.

"U.S. Chamber is a Dinosaur on Climate Change." *San Jose Mercury News*, 2 Oct. 2009.

Varn, Gene. "'Noah's Ark' Suit Filed Against UA." *Tucson Daily Citizen*, 16 July 1970, 31.

Waggoner, Paul M. "The Historiography of the Scopes Trial: A Critical Re-Evaluation." *Trinity Journal* 5 (1984): 155-174.

Webb, George E. "The 'Baconian' Origins of Scientific Creationism." *National Forum* 63.2 (1983): 33-35.

Weicker, Jean. "Weighing Options for November Vote" Connecticut Post Online, 24 Sept. 2008.

West, John G. "New Film Exposes Bigotry and Junk Science of Early Twentieth-Century Darwinists." *Evolution News and Views*, 10 Nov. 2011, http://www.evolutionnews.org/2011/11/new_film_exposes_bigotry_and_j052751.html.

Whalen, Edward. "Staging a Show Trial on Same-Sex Marriage." *National Review Online*, 4 Jan. 2010, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/228895/staging-show-trial-same-sex-marriage/edward-whelan>.

- White, Andrew Dickson. *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1896, 1905.
- Whiting, Jim. *The Scopes Monkey Trial*. Monumental Milestones: Great Events of Modern Times. Hockessin, Del.: Mitchell Lane Publishers, 2007.
- Whitman, Janet. "Corporate America Fights Back; Chamber of Commerce Goes to Bat for Capitalism." *National Post's Financial Post & FP Investing*, 15 Oct. 2009.
- Wickham, DeWayne. "John Edwards the Victim of Political Puritanism." *USA Today*, April 30, 2012, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/story/2012-05-01/john-edwards-trial-campaign-affair/54647934/1>.
- Wilkinson, Francis. "Discover Interview: Newt Gingrich." *Discover Magazine*, Oct. 2006, <http://discovermagazine.com/2006/oct/discover-interview-newt-gingrich/>.
- Wills, Gary. "The Day the Enlightenment Went Out." *New York Times*, 4 Nov. 2004.
- Winter, Jay. *Remembering War: The Great War between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Witham, Larry. "Scopes Trial Re-Enactments Show Controversies Linger." *Washington Times*, 6 July 2000, A11.
- _____. *Where Darwin Meets the Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Wolf, John and James S. Mellett. "The Role of 'Nebraska Man' in the Creation-Evolution Debate." *Creation Evolution Journal* 5.2 (Summer 1985), <http://ncse.com/cej/5/2/role-nebraska-man-creation-evolution-debate>.
- Wood, L. Maren. "The Monkey Trial Myth: Popular Culture Representations of the Scopes Trial." *Canadian Review of American Studies* 32.2 (2002): 147-164.
- World News Tonight*, ABC, 2 Mar. 1981.
- Zimmerman, Michael. "Debunking New Myths." *Creation Evolution Journal* 9.1 (Fall 1989), <http://ncse.com/cej/9/1/debunking-new-myths>.