

SECTION D, SOCIAL SCIENCES

Attempts to Pass a Second Anti-Evolution Law in Oklahoma

R. HALLIBURTON, JR., Cameron State College, Lawton

Oklahoma witnessed a pungent anti-evolution controversy during the decade of the 1920s. This fact has been largely overlooked or ignored by scholars. Yet, Oklahoma in many ways established the precedent that her sister states were to follow. She was the first state to enact "anti-Darwin" legislation (more than two years prior to the celebrated Scopes trial) and was also first to rescind such a statute. Moreover, the controversy endured one of its longest and bitterest durations in Oklahoma.¹

Oklahoma's anti-evolution law originated as House bill number 197, an act creating and providing for a system of free textbooks in the public schools, and was introduced in the Ninth Oklahoma Legislature in 1923.² House bill 197, in turn, was supplemented by an "anti-Darwin" amendment proposed by Representative J. L. Montgomery of Anadarko. The anti-Darwin or Montgomery amendment read: ". . . provided, further, that no copyright shall be purchased, nor text book adopted that teaches the 'Materialistic Conception of History' (i. e.) The Darwin Theory of Creation vs. the Bible Account of Creation."³ After considerable debate, the measure passed both houses of the legislature and on March 26, 1923, Governor John C. Walton signed the controversial measure into law.⁴

The obfuscatable statute was rigidly enforced⁵ but proved unsatisfactory to both its supporters and opponents. The fundamentalists were well aware of the limited applicability of the law and desired a stronger measure.⁶ Also, due to the tremendous costs incurred, the free textbook law itself became exceedingly unpopular. As a direct result of these circumstances, the free textbook act and its accompanying anti-Darwin amendment were repealed in November 1926.⁷ The sentiment which lead to the repeal of the textbook law was fiscal in nature and had *nothing* to do with the proscription of evolutionary teachings.⁸

The fundamentalists sought to obtain new and more stringent anti-evolution legislation when the Eleventh Legislature convened in 1927. Early in the session Representative W. R. Trent and several colleagues introduced House bill 81, "An act prohibiting the teaching of the Evolution Theory in all the universities, normals, and all other public schools of Oklahoma, which are supported in whole or in part by the public school funds of the state, and to provide penalties for the violations thereof."⁹ There are no extant copies of this proposed measure as "The House destroyed all copies of this bill."¹⁰ However, "The bill would provide a fine of not less than \$100 or more than \$500 to be imposed upon any teacher guilty of teaching 'any theory, that denies the story of the divine Creation, as taught in the Bible,' and teaching instead that man has descended from a lower order of animals."¹¹

Representative W. R. Trent, a Baptist preacher from Hammon, Oklahoma, was one of the authors of the bill and acted as the spokesman for the measure. He steadfastly maintained that the proposed legislation was not sponsored by any religious group or denomination. In explanation, he stated, "We just talked it over between ourselves and decided to introduce the bill." Trent expressed confidence that the measure would not meet with any serious opposition and would be passed in rapid order.¹²

Meanwhile, on January 15, 1927, after some eighteen months of litigation, the Tennessee Supreme Court held that state's anti-evolution law to be constitutional.¹³ Since Oklahoma's proposed law was modeled

after the Tennessee statute, this gave considerable encouragement to the fundamentalists.¹²

Opponents of the anti-evolution law viewed the Tennessee Supreme Court decision and Representative Trent's bill in a different perspective than did the fundamentalist protagonists. Even though several other states were considering similar legislation, some Oklahomans were of the opinion that an anti-evolution law "would make of our Oklahoma a ridiculous Tennessee."¹⁴ Some opponents of the proffered law argued that the prohibitive measure would repudiate the very geology that gave Oklahoma its mining and oil industries. One editor admonished, "Pass such a bill and you could not lawfully conduct either the university at Norman, the state college at Stillwater or maintain a single high school or college in the commonwealth that has enough intellect to meet the respect of the enlightened twentieth century."¹⁴ Educators did not desire legislation that would restrict academic freedom. Faculty members of all state institutions remained discreetly silent, however, since they were afraid to jeopardize the security of their positions.¹⁵ "Evolution" was a term never used by most of the high school teachers in the state.¹⁶

Considerable comment concerning Governor Henry F. Johnston's deep religious convictions and his apparent intention to mix religion with his duties as governor circulated over the state.¹⁵ In November of 1929 Doctor William Bell Riley, President of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association, had remarked from an Oklahoma City platform that the fundamentalists would have a clear majority in the next legislature and would pass anti-evolution legislation with Governor Johnston's approval.¹⁶ Opponents of the governor described him as being ". . . the apostle of Rosicrucianism, who is said to decide Executive matters by recourse to astrology."¹⁶ Nevertheless the governor continued to carry on a speaking campaign from the pulpits of various churches over the state urging literalism in the interpretation of Genesis.¹⁶

Aside from the lay press, there was still practically no organized opposition to the fundamentalist agitation. Some Oklahoma editors, however, were caustic in their denunciation of Trent's bill. One editor commented that the introduction of an anti-evolution bill in the legislature with the promise of its proponents that it would pass, opened a myriad of new possibilities to the law-makers. "It heralds the . . . day when the teaching of any minority theory may be prohibited. . . . If . . . the evolutionists ever become the majority party . . . they will find a predicate . . . for . . . a law forbidding the teaching . . . of the theory of Creation found in Genesis."¹⁷ These comments appeared in no less than five separate publications over the state.¹⁵

Speaking of the bill, another newspaper stated, ". . . we believe that it will be so overwhelmingly snowed that we may be able to pass it off as the work of a practical joker rather than the serious proposition it appears to be in the mind of its introducer."¹⁵

Threats of a minority report that House bill 81 "do not pass" caused "rough sailing" for the House Education Committee and delayed the "reporting out" of the measure.¹⁸ Representative David M. Logan, a committee member who did not favor the bill, attempted to sponsor such a report. Committee Chairman J. T. Daniels, Claude Briggs, and one or two other committeemen also opposed the measure.¹⁹ Representative Will M. Thompson, P. R. Crowley, Frank Manning, Tom Johnson, and A. C. Easter, however, recommended the bill¹⁹ and on February 25, chairman Daniel "reported" the bill thus, "We your Standing Committee on Education, . . . beg leave to report that we . . . return the . . . [bill] with the recommendation that it do pass. . . ."²⁰

The bitter fight that was expected to occur on the House floor failed to materialize. Representative Will M. Thompson, one of the authors of the bill and a leader of the group favoring its passage, sought to have the measure declared a special order to accelerate its progress. Representative David M. Logan countered with a substitute motion that the bill be stricken from the calendar.²¹ Logan, a geologist from Okmulgee, was opposed to the bill because of the effect it would have upon the teaching of geology in the state colleges.²² The University of Oklahoma was about to receive a large grant from Standard Oil and several other companies for the founding of the largest geological school in the world. It was feared that if the granting oil companies learned that the institution would be "trammeled" by such a law, they might decide against making the grants.²³

After considerable maneuvering, a standing vote was taken on Representative Logan's motion, and it carried by a margin of forty-six to thirty.²⁴ This action eliminated any anti-evolution legislation in the Eleventh Legislature.²⁴

It is not surprising that the House of Representatives refused to pass anti-Darwin legislation in 1927. Whereas in 1925 the legislature was accused of acting like, "sheep . . . taken to the woods on the evolution question,"²⁵ the law-makers now had a broader perspective upon which to base a decision.²⁵ Anti-evolution legislation seemed to be going out of style in 1927, as Alabama, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Minnesota (the home state of Doctor William B. Riley, president of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association), Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, New Hampshire, and West Virginia all rejected varying proposals of this type during the year.²⁵

With the exception of the press, there had been practically no organized opposition to Representative Montgomery's anti-Darwin amendment in 1923.²⁴ By 1927, however, several organized groups opposed all such legislation. Prominent leaders and organizations in the Seventh Day Adventist,²⁷ Methodist,²⁸ Episcopal,²⁹ Unitarian,³⁰ and Roman Catholic,³¹ churches opposed the legislation. Several other denominations remained silent on the controversy from the very beginning, while still others allowed the individual to settle the matter in his own conscience.³²

The laity had made themselves "heard" as letters to the editors of the metropolitan newspapers show; moreover, the press was more vociferous than ever in its campaign against the measure. A random but representative editorial example is:

Here in Oklahoma . . . we have fellows down in our legislature who are as hill-billy-minded as anything Tennessee ever brought down her red clay roads to Nashville.

They say, "By gum the earth ain't round and it's got four corners, the Arkansas Valley was made on the first Friday afternoon at about 4 o'clock, and there ain't no sense to science, —we ain't going to have none of this gol-durned nonsense in Oklahoma."³³

The geologists of the state were as "a unit in opposing the anti-evolution bill."³⁴ Educators, even if they did remain silent, did not favor the bill, and many of the fundamentalist agitators had alienated a portion of their support by being so belligerently vocal. Also, by this time the fundamentalists had begun to divide among themselves.

Though the legislature had again closed the statute books on the anti-evolution issue for at least two years, the fundamentalists continued to agitate for restriction and prohibition of the teaching of "Darwinish" theories. This agitation was strongest among the various Baptist conventions of Oklahoma. The Red River Missionary Baptist Convention held at the Spears Baptist Church on October 14, 1927, adopted a resolution declaring that, "Inasmuch as the evolutionary Theory is contrary to the . . . Bible and . . . true science, we bitterly protest against it being taught in our publis [sic] schools. Therefore . . . the Red River Association . . . go[es] on record as opposing the teaching of Evolution in our tax supported schools. . .".³⁵ The association then initiated a new attempt to gain anti-evolution legislation from the Twelfth Legislature by adding, "Be it further resolved that a copy of this writing be sent to each of our respective members of the State Legislature. . .".³⁵

During and immediately after the Baptist state convention of 1927, the fundamentalists brought several eminent theologians to Oklahoma for a series of lectures. Among the first was "the pugnacious Fundamentalist preacher" the Reverend J. Frank Norris of Fort Worth, Texas, who appeared in Tulsa while the convention was in progress. It is not surprising that Doctor Norris was invited to Tulsa, since he was one of the South's most vocal anti-evolutionists. In 1925 he had been given the opportunity to present his views on evolution before the Thirty-Ninth Texas Legislature, and had said, "So far as I am concerned, so help me God, I will not be a party to wink at, support, or even remain silent when any group, clique, crowd or machine undertakes to ram down the throats of Southern Baptists that hell-born, Bible destroying, deity-of-Christ denying, German [!] rationalism known as evolution."³⁶ Norris was quite an attraction when he arrived in Tulsa; ". . . breathing vivacious fundamentalist declarations almost with every breath. . ." his quick answers and witty "mannerisms" kept his hosts, the Roger Williams Club of Tulsa, in "continual laughter."³⁷

Norris' conduct led to an uncomplimentary editorial in the *Tulsa World*. The Texas preacher became incensed and replied that he could "smell" the newspaper. For good measure, Norris described his method to "shut up" editors who made uncomplimentary statements in their columns. Speaking of a Texas editor who, Norris said, attacked him, "I just gave the people [his congregation] the information where he parked his car about one night in a week. The next day that paper said editorially it would never mention the name of J. Frank Norris again."³⁸

Despite the fact that the Reverend Mr. Norris was an acknowledged fundamentalist leader, the Oklahoma Baptist convention followed the precedent of Texas' Baptists and did not allow him to address the convention. The Texas Baptists would allow him to preach only from his own pulpit. Enroute to Tulsa, Norris had spoken at the Baptist church at Okmulgee, and the ministerial alliance of that city voted a resolution opposing and deploring his appearance, "not on account of his views, or teachings, but on his character and record as a man 'whose hands are stained with human blood.'"³⁹

In late November of 1927, Doctor William B. Riley, president of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association and pastor of the First Baptist Church of Minneapolis, Minnesota, arrived in Oklahoma City. Doctor Riley's avowed purpose was to further plans to secure passage of a new law prohibiting the teaching of evolution in Oklahoma's public schools. Riley hoped to launch a program to "stir up" the electorate and cause the voters to demand an anti-Darwin bill from the Twelfth Legislature.⁴⁰

The Reverend Doctor Riley sought the use of the University of Oklahoma auditorium for a lecture. Doctor W. B. Bizzell, president of the university and himself a Baptist, refused; his action became a *cause celebre* to the fundamentalists. Doctor Riley described their situation by saying, "An overwhelming majority of the church people [Baptists] of Oklahoma now are in favor of an anti-evolution law but the 'liberals' hold the offices, while university and college leaders throughout the country are almost as a unit in opposing the fundamentalists."⁴⁰

The press devoted considerable space to the W. C. F. A. president, who professedly had come to Oklahoma to carry "war" into the state. One editor replied in part: "Shades of the lowly Nazarene! Just at the time when there is disposition on the part of the people of all the world to preach peace, and at a time when Oklahoma, more especially, wants peace, here comes a fundamentalist carpetbagger from Minneapolis to 'fight to the finish.'"⁴¹

The next week the Reverend Mordecai F. Ham, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Oklahoma City, announced that he was working with an organization to carry the evolution question before the next legislature. Ham warned, "Oklahoma soon will find itself in the midst of the greatest fight in the state's history. I speak of the impending clash of the fundamentalists and modernists."⁴²

On December 5, following the announced intentions of the Reverend Messrs. Riley and Ham to carry on an aggressive anti-evolution campaign, the Reverend J. Frank Norris once again journeyed to Tulsa. Norris, this time the guest of the Roger Williams Club of Tulsa's Immanuel Baptist Church, quickly began to wage an attack on modernism and Al Smith.⁴³ The Reverend Mr. Norris also made known his opinion on birth control and divine healing. Then he credited the fundamentalist "victory" in Texas to the example provided by Oklahoma's Baptists." Early in 1928 in a press interview, the Reverend Mordecai F. Ham renewed his previous verbal attack on Doctor W. B. Bizzell for refusing the university auditorium to Doctor William B. Riley. Ham charged that "Red" money of the Soviet government was to blame for the teaching of evolution in the University of Oklahoma. The Oklahoma City minister then informed the press, "The fundamentalists are organizing, however, and some surprises are in store during the next legislature."⁴⁴ "All of the schools, the modernistic churches and the newspapers," he said soon after, "will be cast into the junk heap."⁴⁵

Editors over the state again began to take notice of the fundamentalists' activities. One newspaper in a long editorial stated: "Let Oklahoma pass the Hamites' anti-evolution law if she will, but in its passage she will condemn her children to ignorance of the world in which they are to live and work and herself to be the laughing stock of enlightened men and women throughout the earth."⁴⁶ Another editor opposed any attempted legislation as a constitutional violation of the separation of church and state."

During the month of March, the American Baptist Association met in Oklahoma City and proved itself to be a strong supporter of the anti-evolution doctrine.⁴⁷ The association adopted a resolution which stated their position without the slightest trace of ambiguity. The statement read:

Resolved, that we place ourselves on record as being opposed to the theory of evolution, which teaches that mankind descended from some lower order of animals, and that we recommend to the churches that they give no encouragement to any preacher or teacher who may hold to that theory;

Second, that we use all diligence to circulate literature against the theory and that we seek to prevent any teacher from teaching, in any tax supported schools, who may believe the theory to be true;

Third, that we encourage legislation which will prohibit the theory of evolution being taught in our tax supported schools.⁴⁹

While the American Baptist Association was in convention, Doctor John Roach Straton, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church in New York City, was engaged to deliver five lectures at the First Baptist Church in Oklahoma City. Doctor Straton had an eminent reputation as a fundamentalist, and all of his lectures were directly concerned with evolution.⁵⁰ Straton was also known for his "campaign against the American Museum of Natural History." He had demanded "that a representation of Moses be substituted for fossil relics of man in the museum."⁵⁰ During his Oklahoma City lectures (March 18 through March 21) the Reverend Doctor Straton ". . . made a powerful appeal for action to secure laws for forbidding the teaching of evolution in public schools."⁵¹

When Straton completed his lectures in Oklahoma City, he journeyed to Tulsa, where he repeated a similar series of performances. Then he returned to Oklahoma City and again ". . . appealed for legislative enactment against the teaching of evolutionary theories."⁵² After addressing about five thousand members of the Baptist Young People's Union, who were in state convention in Oklahoma City, Straton departed from the state.⁵²

In April the Reverend Mordecai Ham, pastor of Oklahoma City's First Baptist Church, initiated an inquisitorial practice which probably represents the apogee of the fundamentalists' brazenness. The Reverend Mr. Ham formulated a questionnaire to be sent to all Oklahoma City school teachers. The document inquired into the classroom teacher's religious convictions by asking a series of specific questions designed to "ferret" out "infidel beliefs." All questions were to be answered with a "yes" or "no." The questions the teachers were asked to answer were, "Do you believe an intelligent personality was the first cause of Creation? Did it [creation] come about by chance? Do you believe man is a created being? Do you believe development and progress such as we see taking place, is directed by intelligent personality? (either God or man?) Does development and progress come about through inanimate matter, independent of external aid?"⁵³

The "insidious propaganda going on in our schools," was the explanation the Reverend Mr. Ham offered for his questionnaires. Ham promised that "The ones who refuse to answer the questionnaires will be *checked over*."⁵⁴ While the formulation of the questions and their subsequent mailing to Oklahoma City teachers was entirely the work of Doctor Ham, it was reported that several of the city's Baptist ministers gave their approval to his actions. The "check[ing] over" indicted that an effort would be made to dismiss teachers who supplied "wrong" answers to the questions. Many of the teachers promptly answered all questions and returned the documents to Doctor Ham, but of this number two appended a note stipulating that they believed in evolution.⁵⁵ One teacher candidly answered, "None of your damned business[!]"⁵⁶

The Reverend Mr. Ham admitted he sent out the questionnaires as an important step" in the campaign for a state anti-evolution law. He then announced his intention of expanding the questionnaire program by informing the press, "The inquiry is not going to stop with just the Oklahoma

City teachers. It will be carried into every school in the state. If the teachers do not answer in the spirit of helpful understanding in which the letters were sent out, the only alternative is *iron clad legislation*."⁵⁴

The fundamentalist forces seemed to be in a fairly favorable position. Their imported speakers had appeared before thousands of Oklahomans, and Doctor Ham's questionnaire had certainly helped to keep the evolution issue before the people. The "literal interpreters" also received implied support in May of 1928, when Oklahoma Lutherans of the Missouri Synod met in their state conference. The Lutheran church had remained quiescent during the previous five years of the evolution controversy, but in the 1928 conference they affirmed their "full and final fundamentalism."⁵⁵

This declaration by the Lutherans was more than offset two weeks later, however, at the one hundred and fortieth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, held in Tulsa. The fundamentalist question appeared in the first item of business, the election of a moderator. No strong fight was made, however, and the "liberal" candidate was chosen by a "decisive" majority.⁵⁶

At approximately the same time, the Quadrennial General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church held a month-long session in Kansas City. At this meeting the Methodists "... passed on a number of questions of doctrine and policy." Among them, the conference "Refused to permit a discussion of modernism vs. fundamentalism," by a ten to one vote.⁵⁷ Then the Methodists adopted a declaration on this subject, saying "If we are afraid to go into the laboratory with the scientists or into the geological field with true and reverent investigators, then we are doubting God. The preacher may go with the scholar wherever reverent and honest scholarship can go."⁵⁸ This stand by two of the three largest denominations proved to be a calamitous blow to anti-evolutionism in Oklahoma.

Later in November Oklahoma's Southern Baptists gathered at Ardmore for their state convention of 1928. Evolution, for the first time in six years, was not a prime topic for discussion in the meeting. A "prominent" Baptist leader estimated the strength of the fundamentalists as seventy-five per cent of the convention, however.⁵⁹

Thus 1928 ended without any additional happenings of significance. Early January of 1929, however, found J. Frank Norris visiting the Reverend Mordecai Ham in Oklahoma City. Striking at "disbelief and modernism," Norris said, "The church is over-organized. . . . It is water-logged. It has so many committees that people forget what they come to church for. . . . But the church has nothing to fear," Norris ambiguously continued. "The mother wants to know whether she will ever see her lost babe again. The wife who mourns over a husband must have hope. Education can't comfort him. It is like an icicle hanging in the sun, beautiful but cold."⁶⁰ There was no equivocation, however, in Doctor Norris' last statement, "As for the Atheists. Let them teach if they want to. But let them finance their own schools."⁶¹

It is doubtful that J. Frank Norris appeared accidentally in Oklahoma City at the very time the Twelfth Legislature was convening. On January 11, 1929, *Harlow's Weekly* reported, "Simultaneously with the convening of the Legislature, the campaign to pass an anti-evolution law . . . has taken on renewed activity. Thus far; it appears to be principally in the Baptist Church."⁶² No mention of evolution appeared in the metropolitan press until January 26, when the *Oklahoma City Times* said, "Another [anti-evolution measure] is likely to be introduced this [legislative] session."⁶³

It was not until March that the fundamentalists' silence was broken. It was at this time that "A petition for an initiated bill to prohibit the teaching of evolution in tax supported schools in Oklahoma . . ." was circulated.⁶²

This new effort to circulate an initiative petition was in the charge of self-styled Doctor T. T. Martin,⁶³ a new personality in the Oklahoma controversy and field secretary of the People's League of America, whose home was in Blue Mountain, Mississippi.⁶⁴ Martin addressed a group at the Kelham Avenue Baptist Church in Oklahoma City on the subject of the petition, and the pastor of the church supported his effort.⁶⁵ Both the petition and T. T. Martin dropped from sight almost immediately, however, and neither was heard from again in Oklahoma. The anti-evolution controversy was rapidly becoming a moribund issue.

During the following October, the Chairman of the Broad of Trustees of Oklahoma Baptist University announced that Doctor W. W. Phelan would be dismissed as president of that institution at the end of the current academic year. Some sources believed "The fundamentalist-modernist division among the Baptists of the state, . . . to be responsible . . . for [the] differences of opinion at the university."⁶⁶

The dismissal of Phelan removed the last of the principals in Oklahoma's anti-evolution controversy. The paladins of fundamentalism had already dropped by the wayside. The Reverend Mordecai F. Ham had resigned from his Oklahoma City pulpit, and national personalities such as J. Frank Norris, William B. Riley, and John Roach Straton were no longer returning to the state. When the Southern Baptists met in state convention at Shawnee in November of 1929, "The tense atmosphere which had been in evidence at the meeting the past few years due to the modernist-fundamentalist controversy appeared to be absent."⁶⁸

Oklahoma appears to be fortunate in having had to share only a small part of "The Shame of Tennessee,"⁶⁷ which was aptly described by Lady Darwin, daughter-in-law of Charles Darwin, as she boarded an ocean liner after a visit to this country. In response to a request to comment on the Scopes trial she quipped, "I think men are beginning to make monkeys of themselves."⁶⁸

FOOTNOTES

¹See R. Halliburton, Jr., "The Nation's First Anti-Darwin Law: Passage and Repeal," *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, XLI (1960), pp. 123-135.

²*House Journal*, Regular Session, Ninth Legislature, Oklahoma, 1923, p. 304.

³*Session Laws of Oklahoma*, 1923, p. 296.

⁴*House Journal*, Regular Session, Ninth Legislature, Oklahoma, 1923, p. 1380.

⁵*Tulsa Tribune*, July 17, 1925, p. 1.

⁶"Report of Christian Education," *Minutes of the Nineteenth Annual Session of the Baptist General Convention of Oklahoma*, November 11-13, 1924, p. 83.

⁷Oklahoma State Election Board, *Directory of the State of Oklahoma 1957*, (Guthrie: Co-Operative Publishing Company, n. d.), p. 179.

- R. Halliburton, Jr.**, "The Nation's First Anti-Darwin Law: Passage and Repeal," *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, XLI (1960), p. 131.
- House Journal**, Regular Session, Eleventh Legislature, Oklahoma, 1927, p. 281. The bill was introduced by legislators representing both major political parties and came from widely scattered areas of the state.
- Mrs. Leah H. Law**, Reference Librarian, Oklahoma State Library, to author, June 11, 1959.
- Daily Oklahoman** (Oklahoma City), January 14, 1927, p. 20; Maynard Shipley, "Evolution Still a Live Issue in the Schools," *Current History*, XXVII (1928), pp. 801-803.
- Tulsa Tribune**, January 14, 1927, p. 11.
- New York Times**, January 16, 1927, p. 1; **Tulsa Tribune**, January 14, 1927, p. 11.
- Tulsa Tribune**, January 18, 1927, p. 20.
- "Anti-Evolution Bill Is Scored by Editors," *Harlow's Weekly*, January 29, 1927, p. 12.
- Maynard Shipley, "Evolution Still a Live Issue in the Schools," *Current History*, XXVII (1928), pp. 801-803.
- Daily Oklahoman** (Oklahoma City), January 19, 1927, p. 8.
- "The Eleventh Legislature," *Harlow's Weekly*, February 5, 1927, p. 6.
- Tulsa Tribune**, February 2, 1927, p. 18.
- House Journal**, Regular Session, Eleventh Legislature, Oklahoma, 1927, p. 1203.
- Ibid.*, p. 1208.
- Harlow's Weekly**, March 5, 1927, p. 6.
- New York Times**, February 26, 1927, p. 15.
- Tulsa Tribune**, February 25, 1927, p. 1.
- Maynard Shipley, "Growth of the Anti-Evolution Movement," *Current History*, XXXII (1930), pp. 330-332. Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Missouri, and South Carolina had all previously defeated such legislation, and the law-makers of Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Texas, and West Virginia had defeated such proposals twice.
- The Oklahoma Farmer Stockman**, February 24, 1923, p. 4.
- "Religion," *Harlow's Weekly*, January 14, 1928, p. 14; February 2, 1929, p. 7.
- Tulsa Tribune**, March 22, 1923, p. 11; July 18, 1928, p. 1; February 5, 1927, p. 10.
- Ibid.*, February 22, 1923, p. 1; July 18, 1925, p. 1.
- Ibid.*, "Religion," *Harlow's Weekly*, March 31, 1928, p. 7.
- "Religion," *Harlow's Weekly*, January 14, 1928, p. 14.

- ²²Personal interview with Doctor Robert G. Martin, Dean of the Undergraduate Bible College, Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma, May, 1959.
- ²³*Tulsa Tribune*, February 4, 1927, p. 30.
- ²⁴*American Saturday Night* (Tulsa), quoted in "Anti-Evolution Bill Is Scored by Editors," *Harlow's Weekly*, January 29, 1927, p. 12.
- ²⁵"Resolution," *Minutes of the Eighth Annual Session of the Red River Missionary Baptist Association*, October 14-16, 1927, p. 7.
- ²⁶Maynard Shipley, *The War on Modern Science*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927, p. 171.
- ²⁷*Tulsa Tribune*, December 5, 1927, p. 5.
- ²⁸*Ibid.*, November 10, 1927, p. 1.
- ²⁹"Religious Notes," *Harlow's Weekly*, November 12, 1927, p. 9. On July 17, 1926, Norris had shot and killed Dexter E. Chipps, a Fort Worth lumber dealer. Norris claimed the shooting was in self-defense as Chipps had made a "hip pocket" move. Chipps was unarmed. A jury from which there was an attempt by the defense to exclude all Roman Catholics and "so-called liberals" and the prosecution to exclude all fundamentalists and members of the Ku Klux Klan, acquitted Norris on January 25, 1927. See *Daily Oklahoman* (Oklahoma City), January 9-26, 1927.
- ³⁰"Religion," *Harlow's Weekly*, November 26, 1927, p. 14. The crux of the legislation sought would be that no public school teach that man had descended from a lower order of animal life.
- ³¹*Altus Times-Democrat* (Altus, Oklahoma), quoted in "Religion," *Harlow's Weekly*, December 10, 1927, p. 15.
- ³²"Religion," *Harlow's Weekly*, December 3, 1927, p. 13.
- ³³*Tulsa Tribune*, December 6, 1927, p. 11. Norris, along with the Reverend John Roach Straton and other prominent fundamentalists, led the crusade against the "Catholic menace" epitomized by Al Smith's candidacy for the presidency of the United States in 1928.
- ³⁴*Ibid.*, December 5, 1927, p. 5.
- ³⁵*Ibid.*, January 28, 1928, p. 16.
- ³⁶*Oklahoma Leader* (Oklahoma City), quoted in "Religion," *Harlow's Weekly*, January 28, 1928, p. 16.
- ³⁷*Lawton Constitution* (Lawton, Oklahoma), quoted in "Religion," *Harlow's Weekly*, January 28, 1928, p. 16.
- ³⁸The American Baptist Association was an organization of Baptist Missionary groups, and was distinct from the Baptist General Assembly.
- ³⁹"Religion," *Harlow's Weekly*, March 17, 1928, p. 5.
- ⁴⁰Shipley, *The War on Modern Science*, pp. 290-291.
- ⁴¹"Religion," *Harlow's Weekly*, March 24, 1928, p. 12.
- ⁴²*Ibid.*, March 31, 1928, p. 7.
- ⁴³*Ibid.*, April 14, 1928, p. 12.

- "*Ibid.* Author's italics.
- "*Ibid.*, April 28, 1928, p. 5.
- "*Ibid.*, April 14, 1928, p. 12. Author's italics.
- "*Ibid.*, May 12, 1928, p. 11.
- "*Ibid.*, June 2, 1928, p. 7.
- "*Ibid.*, November 24, 1928, p. 16.
- "*Ibid.*, January 11, 1929, p. 12.
- "*Oklahoma City Times*, January 26, 1929, p. 16.
- "*"Religion," Harlow's Weekly*, March 9, 1929, p. 12.
- "Shipley, *The War on Modern Science*, p. 67. Martin was formerly a fundamentalist editor and teacher of "natural science" in a Texas fundamentalist "female college" and had been one of the leaders in gaining an anti-evolution law for Mississippi in 1926.
- "*"Religion," Harlow's Weekly*, October 19, 1929, p. 4; March 18, 1930, p. 19.
- "*Ibid.*, November 9, 1929, p. 14.
- "Shipley, *The War on Modern Science*, p. 187.
- "*New York Times*, June 14, 1925, Section I, p. 15.
-