Campbell and the Colleges

Perry Epler Gresham

Campbell and the Colleges

Campbell and the Colleges

by

Perry Epler Gresham

The Forrest F. Reed Lectures for 1971

THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE
1973

Copyright 1973 by
Disciples of Christ Historical Society
Nashville, Tennessee

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Preface

On November 2, 1841, the opening of Bethany College was formally celebrated. Present for the occasion were the five members of the faculty, including President Alexander Campbell (a sixth professor was still en route from Canada); the student body of one hundred and two, representing nine states and Canada; members of the board of trustees; and an assembly of relatives and friends. Of the three projected college buildings only one, "Steward's Inn," was completed. But it was a substantial four-story brick of a pleasing republican simplicity and commodious enough to house the students and temporary classrooms; and a second building, the "College Proper," was well under way. More notable was the beauty and serenity of the setting for the "new institution," on the gently sloping crest of a hill that rose dramat-

ically from the Bethany-to-Wellsburg turnpike against a backdrop of higher wooded peaks. Campbell himself had chosen this site on his farm—far from the distractions and temptations of city or town—in the mountain country of western Virginia, which had reminded more than one appreciative traveler of the Swiss Alps or the highlands of Scotland.

The program of the day consisted of "Introductory Addresses" by Campbell and three young men of the faculty. They were addresses well-designed to impress on the listening audience that a high order of intellectual and moral discipline was to be demanded at Bethany. The first college of the Disciples of Christ, established in Kentucky only a few years earlier, had taken the name "Bacon." On this opening day at Bethany each speaker, in turn, evoked the name of Francis Bacon and did so in order to affirm the philosophy of education that would distinguish the new college. Clearly, it was a philosophy rooted in the best traditions of the Revival of Learning and of the English Enlightenment deriving from the principles of Bacon, John Locke, and Isaac Newton (the immortal trio which Campbell, like Jefferson, placed first on his roster of great men)—a philosophy proclaiming a free, bold spirit of inquiry open to every new advance in knowledge and unshackled by dogmas of the past, either intellectual or theological. At the same time, Bethany's president and his colleagues made it equally clear that, in their philosophy, the foundation-stone of all education is "moral culture." "With us," said Campbell in the concluding address of the day, "the chief object of education is not the acquisition of knowledge . . . [but] the formation of habits,"[1] the cultivation of a high sense of ethical and religious values and of moral judgment and responsibility. Only so could education achieve the Renaissance ideal of development of "the whole man"—body, mind, and spirit. Only so, in the larger dimension,

could man hope to attain his full "rank and dignity in the universe."[2]

When Dr. Perry Epler Gresham—the twelfth president of Bethany College—was invited to deliver the 1971 Forrest F. Reed Lectures of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society, both the speaker and the lecture committee were agreed that "Campbell and the Colleges" appeared a natural, even preordained, choice of subject. Like Bethany's first president, Dr. Gresham has enjoyed a career embracing the twin worlds of the ministry and of college administration and teaching, even while turning out from his writer's desk a succession of books, articles, lectures, poems, and hymns. Himself educated at Texas Christian University, with graduate study at the University of Chicago and Columbia University, he held university pulpits at Denver and Fort Worth; and, for ten years, he was professor of philosophy and for a time also acting head of the philosophy department at Texas Christian University. On leaving the podium to return to the pulpit in 1943, he accepted the pastorate of University Christian Church in Seattle. Four years later he moved to the industrial city of Detroit to become pastor of Central Woodward Christian Church, serving there until he accepted the presidency of Bethany College in 1953. Even as this volume is being prepared for the press, Dr. Gresham—after nineteen years in the president's chair at Bethany—is preparing for his retirement in June, 1972.

The record of this presidency has already been compiled in James Carty's *The Gresham Years*. There Mr. Carty states his conviction that Bethany's twelfth president is "this century's most eloquent champion of the intellectual philosophy of Campbell."[3] From the record it is also evident that Perry Gresham viewed Alexander Campbell *con amore* long years before coming to Bethany; and once he had come—to walk daily where Campbell had walked for half a century—he

accepted as a personal challenge the task of devising means "to lift the stature of our distinguished founder to the place he deserves in American history."[4] A new building was named for Campbell, and a library and museum room, and scholarships and lectureships. One of the lecture series was published by Bethany Press in 1960, entitled *The Sage of Bethany: A Pioneer in Broadcloth.* Dr. Gresham compiled and edited the volume, and he contributed the first article on "Alexander Campbell–Schoolmaster."

The subject of Campbell and education has, of course, attracted numerous students and scholars over the years, some of whom have explored the field for master's theses and doctoral dissertations. To name only two of the more recent: Gustavus A. Ferré, *A Concept of Higher Education and its Relation to the Christian Faith as Evidenced in the Writings of Alexander Campbell,* Ph.D., Vanderbilt University, 1958; John Lowell Morrison, *Alexander Campbell and Moral Education,* Ph.D., Stanford University, 1967. But none of these studies has been published. They are available only in typescript, except the doctoral dissertations which are available also on microfilm.

The publication of these lectures, therefore, becomes a first in the field. It was Dr. Gresham's original intention to expand the lectures in somewhat greater breadth and depth for publication. But illness preventing this venture, the lectures are, with some editorial revision, being presented largely as delivered in the Phillips Memorial building of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society at Nashville, Tennessee, on May 10-11, 1971. It is the hope and expectation of the lecture and publication committees of the Society that this volume will prove a seminal work in Campbell studies.

At no point, perhaps, do Alexander Campbell and Perry Gresham seem more akin than in their philosophy of change, their belief that living institutions are and should be in a constant state of flux and development. In his "Introductory

Lecture" on the opening of Bethany College, Campbell assured his audience that its "course of study . . . is designed to keep pace with all the improvements of this rapidly progressing age."[5] In his "Obiter dicta" column written as he closed his presidency at Bethany, Dr. Gresham has said, "A college is a river of change, sweeping away the white-capped memories and bringing new, interesting prospects and possibilities."[6] This volume, of course, centers on Bethany College, with some attention given to the influence of Campbell's philosophy of education both on his contemporaries and on subsequent Disciple colleges. It closes with a chapter on "The Predicament of the Colleges." Here, while dealing realistically with present problems and difficulties, Dr. Gresham characteristically concludes on a note of hope and challenge. With a canny mixture of prudence and daring, wisdom and vision, Alexander Campbell had met the exigencies of the swiftly changing scene of his young America. Through awareness of this heritage, Disciple educators of today may be better prepared to help their church-related colleges both to endure and to play a creative role in meeting the needs of our Twentieth Century world, which seems bent on plunging ahead at ever swifter speed toward doom or redemption.

EVA JEAN WRATHER, *Chairman*
1971 Reed Lecture Committee

Nashville, Tennessee
July, 1972

The Lectureship

The FOREST F. REED LECTURESHIP of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society was established October 3, 1964. The funds for its endowment were given through a permanent trust set up by Mr. Reed, a Disciple layman of Nashville, Tennessee, and a member of the board of trustees of the Society. By unanimous action of the trustees, the lectureship was named in honor of its donor; and its purpose, as described in the trust agreement, is to provide "a series of lectures by history scholars objectively interpreting some phase of [Disciple] church history."

The 1971 Lectures Committee

EVA JEAN WRATHER, *Chairman*	Nashville, Tennessee
LAWRENCE H. MAINES	Decatur, Alabama
HENRY K. SHAW	Indianapolis, Indiana
WILLIAM M. ELLIS	Orlando, Florida
HUGH M. RILEY	Los Angeles, California
FORREST F. REED	Nashville, Tennessee

Author's Note

The lingering influence of Alexander Campbell is apparent in the colleges and universities associated with the Christian Churches and Churches of Christ. His thoughts on higher education, revolutionary in the early Nineteenth Century, are still relevant as the Twentieth Century draws to a close. This creative personality who exemplified young America deserves a better place in history than he now enjoys. This lecture series will attempt a brief consideration of Campbell's philosophy of education, the colleges and universities which his views influenced, and the present predicament of these institutions.

Acknowledgments

My abiding interest in the educational philosophy of Alexander Campbell and the colleges which exemplify his thought has prompted me to write on the subject from time to time.

No comprehensive statement of my impressions and ideas of this relationship would have occurred had it not been for an invitation to deliver the 1971 Reed Lectures. I am very grateful to the committee for the invitation and to Mr. Forrest F. Reed who provided the subvention for the lectures and their publication.

My lifelong friend, Dr. Willis R. Jones, came to my rescue when illness denied me the privilege of making the necessary revisions, additions and deletions which were indicated when my scholarly colleagues read the manuscript. Dr. Jones, recently president of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society and a Campbell scholar himself, graciously accepted the editorial responsibility. For his indispensable help, I am most deeply grateful.

Miss Eva Jean Wrather, celebrated biographer of Alexander Campbell, found time even in a period of personal bereavement to read the manuscript and offer valuable suggestions which have improved both the accuracy and the literary qualities of the book.

Her scholarly interest in Mr. Campbell's life and thought has had a considerable influence on my estimates of the Campbell heritage.

President Hugh E. Williams and his able staff at the Disciples of Christ Historical Society afforded not only help in the study but the occasion which made the lectures and the publication possible. I am especially grateful to Mr. Marvin D. Williams, Director of the Library and Archivist, who undertook the meticulous assignment of checking all references and marshalling the footnotes in scholarly order. I am grateful also to the capable members of the Society board who encouraged the enterprise. A special word of praise to the committee on the lectureship.

I was delighted to see so many scholarly people assemble on successive Nashville summer evenings to hear these lectures. An assembly of select historians from throughout the land was a genuine inspiration to me in this, my final year as President of Bethany College, which Mr. Campbell founded on his own farm with his own money.

PERRY E. GRESHAM
Bethany College
1971

Contents

Preface v

The Lectureship xi

Author's Note xiii

Acknowledgments xv

I. *Campbell on Education* 19

II. *Campbell's Bethany* 39

III. *Subsequent Colleges and the Campbell Heritage* 71

IV. *The Present Predicament of the Colleges* 95

Notes 111

I

Campbell on Education

The higher learning in America acquired many of its characteristics in the early Nineteenth Century which was the age of Alexander Campbell as well as the age of Jefferson and Jackson. There were few schools and fewer colleges as the century began. By the end of the century, however, schools were everywhere and colleges which had managed to survive were all over the nation. Among them were several colleges of arts and sciences that reflected the views of a celebrated pioneer debater, scholar, publisher, preacher, and educator named Alexander Campbell. This man had written extensively on higher education in his *Millennial Harbinger* and had lectured throughout the land on education and its role in rapidly developing America. The late Doctor W. E. Garrison called him a "Pioneer in Broadcloth."[1]

Pioneer he was, for his home in northwest Virginia was part of the frontier about which Turner wrote so eloquently, "This perennial rebirth, this fluidity of American life, this expansion westward with its new opportunities, its continuous touch with the simplicity of primitive society, furnish the forces dominating American character."[2] Camp-

bell shared in the newer and more optimistic version of the American dream called "Manifest Destiny." The covered wagon rolled westward across the prairies to the tune of "Oh, Susannah." Van Dyke described the men as,

> Big hearted, big handed
> Lords of the plow, the axe, and the rifle
> Suntanned tamers of horses and men
> Themselves remaining tameless.[3]

In his *American Song* Paul Engle hymned the pioneer mothers as able to "plant a wolf trap on a shallow grave" or "beat out a dying cabin fire with a husband's blood soaked shirt."[4] The boundless possibilities of extensive lands lured the populace from their homes along the Atlantic. "Debaters in Congress pointed out as late as 1852 that, in the preceding sixty years, only 100,000,000 acres of public land had been sold, and that 1,400,000,000 remained in the hands of the National Government. From such figures the conclusion was drawn that it would take from 400 to 900 years, at the existing rate of sale, to reach the end."[5]

Campbell had every reason to share in the boundless optimism of the frontier. He had shared in the beginning of a new religious body which enjoyed an amazing development. Ernest Sutherland Bates wrote of the Restoration Movement, "That it was welcomed by the frontier is shown by the extraordinary growth of his movement. The Disciples, beginning with two hundred members in their Brush Run congregation of 1811, numbered over ten thousand by 1830, over two hundred and fifty thousand by 1850 and half a million by 1865."[6]

He shared, also in the mood of the nationalist and expansionist period which included faith in the dignity of man, belief in the perfectability of man, individualism, free enterprise, capitalism and education. He was proudly patriotic, but he entertained some fears about America not

unlike those identified by Alexis de Tocqueville whom he admired and whom he could have met when the latter was delayed in Wheeling for the repair of a river boat. The "tyranny of the majority" of the French nobleman's *Democracy in America* is reflected in Campbell's warning,

> What, then, is to be done to save us from a new species of political spontaneous combustion, quite a conceivable contingency in the new phases of society? This, to every true patriot, and to a far nobler personage—to every true philanthropist—is the greatest question of the age. No nation or people, whose history is written in the chronicles of earth, has ever been placed in such a perilous predicament as young America—I say *young America;* not your fantastic young America, but this great infant empire of States, already more numerous than all the States of Europe, and yet to be more numerous than all the present foreign States of civilized humanity. What conservative element is to be infused into the confederate masses of our population! This is the grand question—the most soul-absorbing question, of a moral or political character or complexion, that can be propounded.[7]

CAMPBELL'S PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

Campbell was no mere product of the American frontier. He was a first-rate scholar, disciplined in the British and European ideas of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. His capitalism was that of Adam Smith who taught political economy at the University of Glasgow; his doctrine of man and his trust in reason derived from the French Enlightenment; his political philosophy came from John Locke whose *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* was a benchmark in western philosophy; his practical approach to the world of science was in the tradition of Sir Isaac Newton; and his doctrine of freedom in intellectual affairs belonged to the noble heritage from John Milton's

Areopagitica. A bright and creative mind, responsive to the best thought of his age, interacting with the mood of the American frontier with renaissance interest and versatility, all these elements issued in the educational philosophy of Alexander Campbell. Some of the salient features of this philosophy are as follows:

(1) Education is for everybody—rich or poor, bright or dull, male or female; but the kind of education depends on the talents and vocational interests of the students. In his own words concerning the founding of a new institution he called for "A system of education founded upon all the demands of our nature in the ratio of their importance, developing a human being to himself, his physical, intellectual, and moral constitution—his position in the universe, and corresponding obligations and duties—his capabilities and sources of enjoyment, inducting him into those sciences and moral habits essential to his usefulness and true excellence."[8]

(2) Education should begin in infancy and continue throughout a lifetime. His original plan for Bethany College included a nursery school, an elementary school, a high school, and a college. Libraries, churches, literary societies, etc. could assist all adults in self education.

> Every student that has attained to a collegiate literary and scientific majority—usually called graduation, or the receiving of academical degrees, is merely licensed to become his own teacher and pupil. And let me say, kindly and emphatically say, that you owe to God, to society, to your Alma Mater, and to yourselves, to continue to be students in a very large school possessing an immense library, a splendid apparatus, and a very large and highly gifted faculty, each and every one of which is a Pantomimist, so called from Pantomimus who could represent all sorts of actions and characters without speaking one word, expressing his meaning in mute action. . . .
>
> To command the tongue and the pen, are two of the great-

est achievements that a literary and scientific education can confer. But they are always obtained at a high price. A price that would more than bankrupt the all pecuniary potent house of the Rothchilds. Genius, ratiocination, imagination, eloquence, and philosophy are no more to be purchased by money than was the supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit displayed in Jerusalem on the ever memorable Pentecostal day. Money commands only materialisms, or the means of obtaining, holding, and enjoying the materialities of earth.[9]

The grammar, the dictionary, and the text-book, are but the tools of a literary and scientific education, and the mere means of acquiring learning and knowledge. But unless these are afterwards used and applied to their proper objects, the owner of them is likely to be a mere drone in the hive of humanity . . .[10]

(3) Higher education is the principal means for the improvement of the individual, both for his own happiness and effectiveness and for the good of society. "Useful, honorable, and happy men" is the Campbell definition of the collegiate products. "But, young gentlemen, we do not contemplate you as all disposed or designed to engage in the Christian ministry, or in any one of the learned professions. We want educated mind, moral dignity, and Christian integrity in all the walks and callings of social and civilized life. And whether we guide the plough or the helm of Church or State we may be useful, honorable, and happy men. He that acts honorably his part in the drama of humanity does well; Angels can do no more even in the presence chamber of the King of kings."[11]

The amelioration of society generally, whilst it is the result, is not the aim of individual advancement. Self absorbs almost every noble and expanded impulse, and any system that does not appeal to this universal principle fails to take hold of the main spring of enterprize. Society, though based upon mutual sacrifice, has its origin in selfishness or necessity. It was only because children and families were dependent

> upon their heads, that they remained subject to their authority in the patriarchal age, and we can only hope to influence men now by motives addressed to him personally; yet society is made up of individuals; and as are the parts, so must be the aggregate. Develop individuals, and you develop society, cultivate the minds and enlarge the powers of the citizens, and you promote the glory and increase the influence of the Republic.[18]

While Campbell was optimistic about human nature and social progress, his confidence was based on man's ability to learn and teach morality. He did not accept the Socratic belief that man with knowledge will choose the right. Morals, even more than ideas, were central to any worthy academic program. "On the subject of moral culture, it is uniformly agreed, among all persons of superior or even common education, that, without it, mere intellectual improvement but furnishes the individual with the means and facilities not only of being more eminently wicked, but more extensively mischievous to society."[19] It is not mere intellect that governs the world. It is intellect associated with moral excellence.

(4) Sectarian education is a contradiction in terms. Education is moral and intellectual development of the whole person for his own self realization and for the good of society—never for the mere aggrandizement and enlargement of a denomination.

> One of the greatest blemishes in the character, and one of the greatest defects in the system, of most of our literary institutions is, that they are religiously sectarian, and politically aristocratic in their constitution and administration. They are even in many instances much more so, strange as it may appear, in the American republic than they are in the British empire. This is perhaps more owing to the boards of trustees entrusted with the management of those institutions, and to the mighty spirit of emulation which seems to actuate religious sectaries in the contest who shall be great-

> est. The constitution and laws of the United States, predicated of the grand principles of religious liberty, having placed all denominations on the same race-course, and having given to every one a fair start, presents the goal equally accessible to all, and the palm of distinction to that which runs fastest by its own strength—has indirectly contributed to that emulation which makes each one of the coursers willing to take hold of all the literary institutions he can grasp, in order to outrun, in this struggle for popularity, his competitors. It is perhaps owing to this that almost all our colleges are converted into sectarian schools, and are really more sectarian than under the English monarchy.[14]

> When I speak of divesting literary institutions of a sectarian character, it is with a reference solely to the public good; and as a measure of policy, I know of none that would contribute more to the reputation of any University, and consequently to increase its usefulness, by enlarging the number of its students, than to adopt such a course.[15]

(5) The dignity of man and his ability to improve his lot, both individual and social, by means of education, are the basic assumptions of a rational view on education. Campbell shared the views of his fellow Americans, Jefferson, Franklin and even Jackson, that man is capable of building a righteous, reasonable and free society. He could not go as far as Jackson whose fierce democracy prompted him to suggest that any office which cannot be filled by a common man without special training is too complicated for a democracy and should be abolished. He held, rather, with the Enlightenment and Locke that man is by nature capable of learning and achieving dignity and greatness, but his success depended on his application, effort, and ability. Men are created equal in opportunity, but thereafter they are on their own. Campbell was more of a democrat than Locke whose educational philosophy tended toward the cultivation of gentlemen.

"I think a Prince, a Nobleman, and an ordinary Gentle-

man's Son, should have different ways of Breeding" wrote Locke. "But having had here only some general Views, in reference to the main End, and aims in Education, and those designed for a Gentleman's Son . . . I have touch'd little more than those Heads, which I judged necessary for the Breeding of a young Gentleman of his Condition in general."[16]

Campbell saw education as useful for making a living as well as decorative for a cultured life and he regarded vocational and liberal studies as part of each other and equal in value. He addressed his Bethany seniors in this vein when he said:

> I do not say that you should all become preachers, lawyers, doctors, legislators, farmers or professional men of any type, caste, or genealogy, in order to be useful, honorable and happy men.
>
> In any and every calling, pursuit, or profession essential to the social system, it is competent and practicable to every man to be useful, honorable, and happy, who cultivates and employs his own powers in harmony with the progress and advancement of that portion of humanity or society of which he is a component member and part.[17]

(6) The Bible is an essential textbook for all schools and colleges. Campbell would tolerate no sectarian or dogmatic courses in the curriculum of Bethany nor in any school over which he had any influence. The Bible, however, seemed to be free from any sectarian tendency in the opinion of this pioneer educator. In a characteristic flight of eloquence he wrote:

> Then let us act in harmony with the oracle of the great Chancellor Chillingworth-"The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants." Let it be venerated as it superlatively merits, in every school, from the nursery to the

> university. Let its history of the past and its history of the future be daily studied and taught. Let its stupendous facts, its sublime precepts and its rich and ineffably transcendent promises command a daily portion of our time and of our studies. Let its deep and lofty philosophy and divine science imbue the minds of all our youth that receive instruction and garniture for our social system, and the high offices in the schools, the churches, the courts, the legislative-halls and great councils of our august Republic. Let no sectarian dogmata, no ready-made and finished creed or formula of faith, be introduced into any school or into any literary or philosophic institution. Let the Lord himself teach in all our seminaries in his own words and in his own arguments, and let us fear not that he may impinge upon our shibboleths or weaken our earth-born sanctions of heaven-descended truths. Bribe not the infant mind with the honeyed arguments and paltry tinsellings of your favorite dogmata, which neither their authors nor their advocates can demonstrate or make intelligible to any discreet and inquiring mind.[18]

Campbell's criticism of his contemporaries who taught the classics and little else took the sensible turn of a proposal that to the classics of Greece and Rome must be added the wise and righteous culture of the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings. Even more, he argued, are the Gospels and the Epistles essential to a comprehensive literary education. He was even more critical of his contemporaries in church colleges who claimed to teach "sacred knowledge." He defended the scientific and literary studies as part of man's intellectual love of God. "It follows, then, that secular knowledge, so far from being inimical to religion, is, in reality, its most powerful auxiliary. The direct tendency of mental culture is to prepare the mind for the reception of truth, and is, therefore, a most efficient agent in paving the way for the ultimate triumphs of Christianity."[19]

(7) Education is, by its very nature, international. Campbell shared none of the parochial or provincial interests and beliefs of contemporary educators who promoted

colleges as a device for the practice of local pride rather than as institutions of universal higher learning. He was proud of the national and international flavor of his own Bethany College. In 1849 he wrote:

> Almost half the States in the Union, and occasionally the Canadas, are annually represented in this College. England, Ireland and Scotland were also represented in the session just expired. Still there is room for many more.
>
> It is an advantage to young men, during their College course, to form an acquaintance with their juvenile contemporaries from numerous and various States and Territories. These acquaintances are often useful in after life; and during the formative period of our character it is important to have persons of different climes, manners and customs amongst our class-mates and fellow-students.—Students from east and west, north and south, from Texas to New Brunswick, from Great Britain to the Missouri occasionally meet at Bethany College; and hand in hand clamber up the steeps of Mount Helicon, breathe its pure air, drink its sweet waters, and bathe in the pure fountains of its Muses. They side by side visit Acropolis, the capital of Attica—the Palatine Hill, the battle fields of Salamis, Platea and Mycale—pay their homage to the Alexandrian Geometrician, to the sages of Greece and Rome—and hie away to the Holy Land, the capital of Judah's Kings—make their visits to Mount Sinai and Mount Zion, and listen to the Jewish Lawgiver and the Oracles of the Christian King.
>
> The recollections of their protracted and simultaneous struggles in the languages, sciences and arts; the studies of physics and metaphysics—in hearing the same lectures and in reading the same lessons not only attach them to one another for the present, but often make them serviceable to one another in after life.[20]

CAMPBELL'S PSYCHOLOGY OF EDUCATION

Campbell derived much of his educational psychology

from that fascinating English philosopher, John Locke. Living in the period when faculty psychology was the best known formulation of man's approach to learning, Campbell differed from most of his contemporaries in that his common sense Scottish philosophy and his interest in and agreement with Locke gave him some freedom from the stereotyped formulations of his time. He anticipated experimental educational psychology in some respects, even though several assumptions of the faculty psychology appear in his literature as the subsequent analysis will show.

Campbell's proposal for an infant school was almost a specific application of Locke's somewhat desultory treatment, called *Thoughts on Education*. Campbell rightly saw that his whole viewpoint of education depended fundamentally upon his doctrine of man. When he followed Locke, therefore, in holding that there are no innate ideas and that the mind of the infant is a *tabula rasa* written upon by experience, he committed himself to consider the kind of experience provided in an educational system. Obviously, if a man's total outlook depends upon his experience, the extent and quality of that experience constitute the chief concern. In this view he differed sharply from those who held that education consisted in the direction and motivation of instinct. He said explicitly, "man has little or no instinct. . . ."[11] He was committed also to the Lockean view of association. In this he did not hold that perception, memory, reflection, reason, imagination, and abstraction were completely isolated from each other. College educators of his day were unfortunately of this persuasion, as Butts says, "These faculties were looked upon as distinct powers of the mind; hence they were considered to be merely potential until brought into actuality by training or practice, and the exercise of one faculty was thought to transfer beneficially to other faculties. Development of the powers of the mind had been set up, especially by the Yale report

of 1828, as the supreme aim of college training, and the classics and mathematics had been looked upon as the best means of bringing about this development of the intellectual powers."[22]

Campbell held that man had a three-fold nature: a body, a soul, and a spirit. In his own words, "Man is not merely his own body, his own soul, or his own spirit. These three comprehend neither more nor less than the legitimate meaning of the great pronominal *I*, myself. The pronoun *I* is purely a *personal* pronoun, indicative of all that constitutes the thinking, feeling, willing, acting personality, and not any one portion of it."[23] It is to be noted that he conceived of this three-fold nature in functional, rather than static, terms. In this he was truly a Lockean and not an Aristotelian. He was critical of Aristotle for having confused "operations" for "operating powers." He was concerned that a genuine scientific approach to the nature of mind be speedily achieved. "It is to be hoped that the present century . . . will add to its renown the glory of substituting psychological fact for hypothesis, and of discarding from our schools and colleges the imaginative conjectures and metaphysical theories of ages more speculative and romantic than the present."[24]

He conceived of the human body in terms of the popularly held biology of the middle nineteenth century. The word "soul," which he took to be almost equivalent to life and intellect, might live "in ten bodies during seventy years. Still, it is the same *person* inhabiting ten different houses." The spirit he conceived to be the character or inner man. This, again, is not static. "It is impressible and transformable by intellectual, moral and spiritual considerations, arguments or motives."[25]

This very interesting psychological conception is further outlined in another context in which he gives seven propositions which might be the creed of a teacher. These are so

pertinent as to merit quotation:

1. The human soul incarnate operates only through organs, and through organs only can it be operated upon.

2. An organ is a natural instrument, such as the brain, the eye, the ear, the tongue, the hand. The human soul thinks and feels by the brain, sees by the eye, hears by the ear, speaks by the tongue, and operates by the hand.

3. A faculty, contradistinguished from its organ, is the power of the organ. The eye is an organ, but seeing is its faculty or power. The ear is an organ, but hearing is its faculty.

4. Organs and faculties are simple and compound. The eye and the ear are simple organs—the brains and the hand are compound organs. Each and every subdivision of the brain, as every finger on the hand, is a single organ, and has a single faculty. But there are faculties which require a plurality of organs: thus, while the faculty of apprehending requires but a finger, the faculty of comprehending a substance requires the whole hand. The faculty of perceiving a single object requires but one organ of the brain, while the faculty of remembering an event requires various organs. The faculty of perceiving requires the organs of perception; the faculty of reflecting requires the organ of reflection; the faculty of remembering requires all the organs originally employed in perceiving the object and in reflecting upon it.

5. Operations are to be distinguished from the organs and the faculties. Organ is the instrument—faculty, the power of the instrument: operation, the act of the faculty or of the organ. Thus the eye is an organ—seeing, the faculty of that organ; and a particular look, sight, or seeing, the operation of that organ. Again there is one organ of the brain by which we perceive color—this is the organ of color: perceiving color is the faculty of that organ, and the observance of any particular color the operation of that organ.

6. The strength of an organ is its size and firmness. It is a law of the animal economy that exercise directed by reason

enlarges and confirms every organ; hence every fibre of the human system is improved by exercise. To improve a faculty is to enlarge and confirm its organ or organs. By strengthening and making more active an organ, we not only improve its faculty, but also every particular operation of that organ. Education, if rational, will, therefore, seek to improve the mind by improving its organs—it will seek to improve the organs by improving the faculties, and the faculties by improving their operations. The natural order of education in seeking to improve the intellectual and moral powers is first the operation—then, the faculty—then, the organ—then, the mind. It is by this course the painter, the sculptor, the musician, the orator, and the practical moralist attain to perfection. Single acts precede habits and strengthen faculties; and these faculties strengthen the organs; and then the organs in turn strengthen the faculties, and the faculties strengthen their particular acts and operations. Thus we strengthen the muscles in the arm by acts or operations; these operations strengthen the faculty of the whole arm, or increase its muscular power; and that strength increased redounds to the improvement of those very acts by which it was itself improved. Hence if the natural organs did not decay by age, the mind would, like the rotation of a wheel on an infinite declivity, be perpetually increasing its activity and its momentum in a series of infinite progression; which no doubt, after it has "shuffled off this mortal coil," will be its eternal destiny.

7. It must be laid down with all the formality of a positive precept, that *the exercise of any one organ only improves itself*. That we cannot improve the eye or the ear without exercise, is not more incontrovertible than that we cannot improve the eye by improving the ear, or the faculty of tasting by the faculty of smelling. No person will, therefore, seek to improve the memory by improving the imagination, nor the organs of perception by the organs of reflection; neither will a wise man seek to improve the moral powers by exercising only the intellectual.[26]

It is to be noted that Campbell's education psychology is characterized by the organizational consistency which made

him an effective writer and speaker. While he did not depart widely from Locke, he took the insights of that great philosopher and worked them into a comprehensive scheme which was appropriate to the needs and opportunities of the situation in which he lived and worked. Almost every phase of his theory could be deduced from the fundamental proposition that there are no innate ideas and that, consequently, all that a man learns must come from experience.

Certain conditions were essential to a learning situation according to Campbell. The first of these was the "interest of the pupil." In a variety of lectures, essays, and addresses he discusses in great detail the futility of teaching those things that are not actually related to the needs and desires of the learner. He reproduced in his paper an article which said, "It is a plain fact that without this self-labor, self-discipline, self-education all direct instruction must be unavailing and useless."[27] In the development of the importance of centering the activity of the learning process in the one taught rather than in the teacher, he expounded his ideas of the importance of attention, about which he says, "Were I again asked what power, or art, or habit, most of all accelerates and facilitates the acquisition of knowledge, which most of all widens, deepens and enlarges the capacity of the human mind; feeling myself sustained by the oracles of reason and the decisions of experience, with equal promptitude I would allege that it is that undefined and undefinable something, which no one comprehends, but which every one understands, usually called the faculty or art of *attention*—a power, indeed, not often appreciated, not easily cultivated, and never enough commended, even by the most devoted sons of literature and science."[28] This doctrine is reminiscent of his philosophical parent, John Locke, who spoke in a similar vein as follows:

The great Skill of a Teacher is to get and keep the Attention

> of his Scholar, whilst he has that, he is sure to advance as fast as the Learner's Abilities will carry him: and without that, all his bustle and pudder will be to little or no purpose. To attain this, he should make the Child comprehend (as much as may be) the Usefulness of what he teaches him, and let him see, by what he has learnt, that he can do something, which he could not do before; something, which gives him some Power and real Advantage above others, who are ignorant of it. To this he should add sweetness in all his Instructions; and by a certain Tenderness in his whole Carriage, make the Child sensible, that he loves him and designs nothing but his good, the only way to beget love in the Child, which will make him hearken to his Lessons, and relish what he teaches him.[29]

Campbell's emphasis on the importance of attention in learning is another way of saying that we learn by experiencing, which in his terminology and by his ideology amounted to experimental observation. In fact, he said, "Another name for the attentive application of our minds, through the senses, to whatever passes before us in the operations of nature and society"[30] is observation.

The second factor in learning is reason. In using this term he made reference to the comparison of one idea with another either directly or by means of a series of intermediate steps. For a man to reason meant for him to compare and combine simple and complex ideas in such a way as to relate them to vaster collections and orders of thought. He considered the ability to classify any thought, inclination, or impression as fundamental not only to understanding but to intelligent action. He says, "It is the power of properly labelling every new thought, and of marshalling all our ideas under their proper captains on every emergency. It is the power of generalizing and of abstracting whatever is foreign to some grand idea, or some particular system or law or principle of nature. Every man will be eminent amongst his compeers in the ratio of his readiness

and power to classify the objects of nature, society, art and religion; or, what is the same thing, his views of them according to any given attribute or property which they may possess, or according to any end or object he may have in view."[31]

This quotation must be understood in terms of the operative and functional philosophy of Campbell. It must be warned that he does not mean classification in terms of mere pigeon-holing. He means, rather, the systematic ordering of means and conditions in order to achieve certain ends or purposes. In this he sounds strangely modern. Whitehead devotes his essay, "Aims of Education," to the exposition that inert ideas are educationally worthless. Dewey has developed his "Method of Intelligence" around the proposition that isolated facts are unsatisfactory for learning. The ability of an organism to intelligently order physical conditions and circumstances into a plan of action is what matters. With a totally different metaphysical orientation, Hutchins enters a protest against facts without principles which give them meaning. Campbell's emphasis on "classification" was the attempt of an obscure educator a century ago to emphasize this value.

With him reason was considered perverse when it was devoted to the development of a speculative system. His principle of observation, comparison, deduction, and judgment were to be clearly distinguished from the foregoing. He said, "In physics or in metaphysics, in philosophy or in science, there was no progress—no perceptible or valuable progress—for many centuries; during, indeed, the entire reign of Aristoteleian philosophy and the tyranny of the mere logical and catechetical learning. Answers printed or written, for stereotyped questions, propounded in seminaries of learning—I care not what the subject or the science—never made a thinker, a scholar, a philosopher, or a great man, much less a saint or an heir of immortality. It is observation,

comparison and deduction that make the man, the philosopher, the Christian."[32]

To understand Campbell one must bear in mind that with him attention and reason are not only powers of the mind, but rather, its habits, which may be developed through practice. It is only by actually performing the mental operations that one becomes expert. In a rhetorical passage he says, "Did any one ever learn to read by listening to the definitions and precepts about the art of spelling and reading, or by listening to others reading according to the best rules of that useful and elegant art? Has ever any one acquired the art of writing by reading or hearing the whole theory propounded and explained, or by seeing it exemplified by the hand of a master? In one word, what art is learned, what habits are acquired by listening to the words or looking to the actions of others?"[33] The implication of this for the school is that conditions must be provided that will stimulate and facilitate the exercise of these so-called powers and faculties. He thoroughly believed that education made the man. It mattered little how gifted a student might be, he could make improvement in his ability to observe and reason by virtue of his actual practice. This led Campbell to define education as "development and culture." By development he meant increased facility for function on the part of body, mind and spirit. He was of the conviction that the last of these was "impressible and transformable by intellectual, moral, and spiritual considerations, arguments, and motives." By culture he had reference to the individual's knowledge and appreciation of his vast social heritage with particular emphasis upon the moral and religious aspects of the human legacy. In its verbal sense he used it to convey the idea of cultivation. The aim of a school, in his judgment, should be the physical, the intellectual, the moral and religious development and culture of the pupils that compose it.

Campbell's fidelity to Locke in general outlook is remarkable. He assumed and promulgated an empirical theory of knowledge. He limited man's information to sensation, and the intuition of his own existence. His theory of truth was substantially that of Locke, who said, "Wherever we perceive the agreement or disagreement of any of our ideas, there is certain knowledge: and wherever we are sure those ideas agree with the reality of things, there is certain real knowledge. Of which agreement of our ideas with the reality of things having here given the marks, I think I have shown wherein it is that certainty, real certainty, consists. Which, whatever it was to others, was, I confess, to me heretofore one of those *desiderata* which I found great want of."[34] He continues by showing that real truth consists of the agreement of ideas with things. Campbell went beyond his great god-father, however, in his reliance upon testimony. While all the elements of Campbell's position are to be found in Locke, they do not receive the emphasis that Campbell gave them. Locke's theory is developed in his chapter on "Probability," in which he shows the grounds upon which testimony is to be accepted as truth. This consists of affirmation of other people considered in light of (a) the number (b) the integrity (c) the skill of the witnesses (d) the design of the author, where it is a testimony out of a book cited (e) the consistency of the parts and circumstances of the relation, and (f) contrary testimonies.[36] In one of his many carefully prepared baccalaureate addresses Campbell reiterates this approach to knowledge with striking emphasis:

> All true and real development of the human mind is, in its foundation, based on faith *in human testimony*. Our whole intellectual education, our whole moral education, and our whole religious or Christian education, are rudimentally alike based on *testimony* addressed to our reason, our understanding, and our affections, only with this difference, that the

> claims of the gospel, its evidence, and its arguments, are transcendently superior to those of the flesh and the world that now is; and its evidences are, when rationally adjusted and weighed in the balances of palpable fact, truth, evidence or reason, paramount to any other evidence, or any other subject in the whole range of human education and human acquirements.
>
> Experiences of some sort is the material of all history, of all testimony, and, consequently, of all faith, human or Divine. But if we receive the testimony of men, on any subject of their actual observation and experience, the testimony authenticated by Divine testimonials is greater, and produces greater assurance. So reasons an apostle, and so reason we, on the evidence or testimony before us.[36]

His psychology of education may be epitomized in a few propositions. The mind is a blank tablet at birth to be written upon by experience. It acquires knowledge by sensation. The progress of the individual's experience depends on observation, reason, and faith in human testimony critically examined. A college provides conditions for a student to acquire habits and skill in observation, reason, and inquiry *primarily* and in knowledge *incidentally*. The role of the school is the "development and culture" of the student's abilities. Morals and religion are learned in the same way as anything else. The teacher should serve as one of superior experience rather than one of mere prestige. All instruction should be adapted to the nature of the students, and should begin with his active interest.

II

Campbell's Bethany

The Campbell philosophy soon became incorporated into nascent colleges of the frontier. The usual compromise between educational idea, expounded in the *Millennial Harbinger* of the late 1830's and the institutional exemplification of the idea is apparent in Bacon College of Georgetown, Kentucky, founded in 1836 by Thornton Johnson; Bethany College, founded at Bethany, Virginia in 1840 by Alexander Campbell; and Franklin College, founded near Nashville, Tennessee in 1845 by Tolbert Fanning. These three institutions were all products of individuals who shared to a large extent the ideas previously expounded as the educational philosophy of Alexander Campbell, although Campbell failed to incorporate several of the original ideas he had written about when Bethany became an operating college of arts and sciences.

The three founders were dedicated to the common-sense views of Adam Smith, John Locke, Isaac Newton, Francis Bacon, and John Milton. (It is significant that the first of the three colleges was named for Francis Bacon.) Campbell built the first building with his own money on his own land and called it "a literary and scientific institution,

founded upon the Bible as the basis of all true science and true learning." Eva Jean Wrather, in her *History in Stone and Stained Glass* quotes Campbell as giving tribute to his intellectual benefactors as he outlined his doctrine of the harmonious relationship of science and religion: "*Bacon*, the founder of the inductive philosophy; *Locke*, the great mental and moral philosopher; and *Newton*, the interpreter and revealer of nature's secrets, are . . . as eminent for their homage to the Bible as for their devotion to the studies of nature. Philosophy, with them, and Christianity were not at variance . . . We may conserve all that is good and true, so long as we cherish the Bible and the Baconian creed."[1] Tolbert Fanning attempted to actualize his similar ideas in Franklin College* only five years after Bethany began.

THE CURRICULUM

Campbell derived his philosophy of a collegiate curriculum from a variety of sources. His own experience of

* Substantive reference to Bacon College, especially to its president, James Shannon (leadership years 1840-1850) appears later in this chapter. Franklin College (years of influence 1844-1861) was founded by Tolbert Fanning who was encouraged in the enterprise by Campbell. Though he was also influenced by Campbell's views on education, his college was to develop along lines with some marked differences from either Bacon or Bethany. A towering figure in Tennessee church history as preacher, editor, and educator, Fanning (1810-1874) built the new college at "Elm Crag" his farm property five miles east of Nashville. From the outset the Tennessee church membership and readers of Fanning's publications considered Franklin College "their school." The initial result of this close affiliation was salutory and Franklin College experienced a strong beginning, but the longer term result was the image of a strictly religious school which narrowed the the student patronage and limited the areas of financial support. In addition, and in sharp contrast to Campbell, Fanning was opposed to the idea of endowments. Furthermore, his anti-society advocacy and the approaching war between the states added further divisive and disquieting elements and the result of it all was a suspension of operations in June, 1861. A poignant and painful effort was made to restore operations at the conclusion of the war. On October 2, 1865, Franklin College reopened with Fanning as president. Before the month was over fire destroyed the main building and with it went the future hopes of this one time important educational institution.

study in his father's school with his subsequent training at the University of Glasgow undoubtedly contributed to his conception of what should go into a course of studies for the college level. This latter school at the time of his residence had an enrollment of around fifteen hundred students and a curriculum comparable to the best schools of England. Its academic offerings were constructed along lines harmonious with the Lockean viewpoints of the youthful Campbell. When he later began to devise a program of studies suitable for the young men of the great American frontier, he proceeded from the assumptions of the dignity of man and his possibility for infinite improvement with a social philosophy of toleration and reasonableness. This simple common sense philosophy caused him to consider seriously the practical utility of education. These items in the tradition of Locke were impressed upon him by both positive and negative circumstances. He was by training inclined to respond with tolerant consideration toward those of divergent inclination and temper. The forward looking, scientific outlook of his Glasgow professors reenforced this tendency. The bigotry of the churches and certain theologians, on the other hand, inspired him to active opposition to anything that smacked of sectarianism. In defense of the ideas of liberty his reliance upon Locke became more profound and clear.

America, when he arrived, was already inspired with the philosophy of Manifest Destiny. Jefferson had made the rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" more than a universally quoted maxim. The men of the frontier were living their lives with liberty in the pursuit of happiness. This spirit of optimistic self-confidence was appealing to Campbell. The American Dream of the dignity and usefulness of the common man inspired him. In that expanding West he found his philosophy actually at work. A college curriculum must certainly respond to such a climate of opinion.

The schools of the third and fourth decades in the nineteenth century were inchoate and haphazard. Universal elementary education was far from established and high school was the privilege of a few. College was limited to a minority. The percentage of illiteracy was fairly high. Campbell looked with critical eyes upon the total educational situation. His own experience with the culture of Ireland and Scotland led him to hold these frontier colleges, which were little more than high schools, in some disdain. This was the period when denominational schools were proliferating across the country. Campbell repudiated almost the entire lot of them on the basis of their sectarianism. The older and more established colleges of the East still retained an atheistic inclination which had characterized them at the turn of the century when deism was most influential. The young educator and author had no defense for this inclination. He was, therefore, beset with atheism as a Scylla and sectarianism as a Charybdis.

A sensitive and creative man like Campbell could not carry on an experiment in education like his Buffalo Seminary, begun in 1818, without developing some pretty definite ideas as to what should make up a course of study for the young people of the adolescent West. Added to this opportunity to work at first hand with young people, he was appointed representative to the Virginia Constitutional Convention in 1829. In his preparation for an address which was made in the presence of such notables as John Marshall and James Madison, he gave careful consideration to the problem of the necessity for the total education of the American populace. Unquestionably this experience left a deep impression in his mind and affected his later actions with reference to a course of study for Disciple schools.

From whatever source his views were derived, by the time he began to develop his educational philosophy he was prepared to base the academic program upon the nature

and needs of the student rather than upon either tradition or some metaphysical conception of the truth which should be promulgated. Every phase of instruction, every text book, and every bit of material utilized should be adapted to the physical, mental and spiritual development and culture of the individual. He believed that a student who has gone through the formal education experience of a four-year college course should be "possessed of the means and the power of becoming his own teacher and his own pupil in every department of learning, science, and art, in which he has been instructed during the years of his scholastic minority."[2] He aimed at a "system of public or private education in harmony with the genius of humanity and the wants of society."[3] Such was to be based on what he called the true conception of man. This meant the whole man and not just the discipline of some of his faculties that would, by theory, improve others. He believed that there was no transfer of training from one faculty to another, as has been previously pointed out. Society's welfare was a major concern, but this was to be brought about by attention to the individual rather than the converse procedure.

It is worthy of note that Campbell did not conceive the mere acquisition of knowledge to be very important. Everything that a student learned should serve him primarily as a tool for further inquiry and action. He would have been in hearty sympathy with the remark of President Wilson, who said, "The mind is not a prolix gut to be stuffed." It was a favorite theme of his on the annual July Fourth baccalaureate of Bethany College to tell the students that they were not educated. He would then explain his instrumental conception of formal study. The following is a quotation from his address to the graduates in 1844:

> But, in conclusion, may I add one word to you, gentlemen, on the choice of a calling. This, indeed, may be too late;

> or, perhaps, you may think wholly unnecessary. Still I am willing to run the risque. Educated men must rule the world. But for that purpose it is not necessary that every scholar should be either a General or a Statesman. Few of our politicians rule the state or the world. Their ambition through their constituents too frequently rules them. It is a great misfortune that Kings, Presidents, Judges, and Generals should occupy so large a space in the annals of the world, and overshadow with their fame in history and romance, in poetry and in prose, earth's real nobility and its most illustrious benefactors. A Bacon or a Locke, an Aristotle or a Plato, a Faustus or a Columbus, a Franklin or a Fulton, a Luther or a Calvin, a Prophet or an Apostle, governs the world much more than any living Emperor or King. A hermit like Peter, or a preacher like Melanchthon, a scholar like Erasmus, or a writer like Addison or Cowper, makes a deeper and more enduring impression upon the minds of millions than the achievements of the greatest Statesman in America or in the world.[4]

The "tools for learning" curriculum was to be related to the previous subsequent experiences of the students. He was willing that a student should be admitted to the college without as much prerequisite training as was generally demanded by the English, Scottish, and European universities. Of this he said, "The amount of education necessary to matriculation, or admission to the College course proper, is generally much greater in Europe than in this country. The precocity, however, of American genius, the warmth of our climate, and the exuberant fertility of our soil, may indeed be plead in favor of shorter seed-time, a more rapid growth, and a more abundant harvest. Still we are of the old opinion, that a thorough liberal education requires more time, more attention, and more labor on the part of the student and the precepter than is generally allowed or bestowed upon it."[5] It is difficult to see much point to his analogy of education to soil and climate. He complained, however, of the immaturity of certain students who came

to Bethany College and insisted that they ripen somewhat more before matriculating at his school. In a discourse on the scholastic achievements he said:

> Our experience satisfies us that the College, in the proper sense of the word, is not the place for boys,—a thorough course of study and a system of instruction pitched to an elevated standard and adapted to the mental development of young men, cannot be made fully available to the minds of boys—and these, therefore, should not be classed together in any scheme for the full and appropriate instruction of each. We are enabled to erect a high standard of scholarship in Bethany College, and to adopt an elevated and manly method of discipline and instruction, because our Students have, for the most part, attained to a degree of mental maturity, that renders them capable of rising to the mark, and susceptibles, of such a course. There are, upon the entire catalogue for the session, only six under *eighteen*, and sixteen under *nineteen* years of age. There are upwards of a hundred over *twenty*, and more than seventy over *twenty-one*. They already have the minds and the character of men, and there is material to work upon with noble success. We rejoice in this. It is of such that we wish our classes to be made up—for it is through such that we hope to build up our cause and provide for its future and growing wants.[6]

Since the higher learning should contribute both to the utility and happiness of the student, he believed that it should be both liberal and vocational. His conception of a liberal arts course was as follows:

> Not of the mechanic arts; for into these you have not yet been initiated. Not of the fine arts, such as poetry, music, painting, sculpture; for these are not taught in colleges. But beside the mechanic arts and the fine arts we have those properly called the liberal arts. These furnish and qualify man for the attainment of all the useful and ornamental arts of social life. It is in these you have taken the first or bachelor's degree. From this day you commence the life of bachelors of the liberal sciences and arts. Hence its promi-

> nence in academic life. It is, indeed, a sort of literary majority. For as a young man arrived at legal age of manhood is permitted henceforth to manage his own affairs; so from this day, according to collegiate and scholastic law, you are henceforth permitted to manage your future improvement and education in those languages, sciences and arts, constituting that which, by common consent, is called a *liberal* education.
>
> They are called liberal arts and sciences, not merely because they free the human mind from vulgar prejudices, ignorance, and error which they certainly do; but because they are general in their character and application, and open to us an extensive acquaintance with literature, science, and art; and thus furnish us with the means of extending our acquaintance with nature, society, and the Bible, to any extent commensurate with the wants of our nature and the limits of our existence.[7]

He agreed with Locke that every student should learn a trade, but his reason for it was on different grounds. For in spite of Locke's practical and humanistic theory of education, he did not depart from the aristocratic conception of education for the gentleman instead of the common man. Campbell on the other hand was a thorough-going democrat and held that education should be universal. In describing the founding of Bethany, he pointed out that it included "an academy of Arts and Sciences for those who do not take the liberal or College course, but who desire a scientific education adapted to Agriculture, Commerce, or the Mechanical Professions, . . . as well as a Normal School for the preparation of literary and scientific Teachers."[8] The training of teachers bulked large in his attention. His enthusiastic devotion to the cause of an improved universal education led him to emphasize the training of teachers. He believed that the colleges were the only hope for the necessary rapid improvement of the educational system in the frontier period. The fact that many teachers were graduated

from Bethany before his career ended at the time of the Civil War is evidence that he took this viewpoint seriously.

The vocational distribution of the alumni, as reported in 1866, showed that of 331 graduates, 15 were doctors, 34 were teachers, 13 were college professors, 15 were principals of seminaries, 35 were lawyers, 50 were planters, 2 were college presidents, and 118 were ministers.[9] This preparation for the practical pursuits of life was not exclusively for the advancement of the individual economically. In this Campbell was much like Jefferson who viewed vocational training in terms of public usefulness rather than private advantage.

The scheme of the curriculum was much like that of the University of Virginia. Campbell was an admirer of Thomas Jefferson and familiar with the work of the great school which was the pride of Jefferson. One member of Bethany's first faculty—and Campbell's successor as president—was a graduate of the University of Virginia.[10] The school of sacred history and moral philosophy required four years for its completion and included such studies as the evidences of Christianity, sacred history, Biblical literature, ecclesiastical history, and moral philosophy. Over this school the president himself presided. There was also a school of mathematics and astronomy which required three years for completion and had a rich offering of algebra, geometry, trigonometry, surveying, astronomy, etc. The early announcements clearly indicate the purpose of these studies which was "the development of the intellectual powers, the formation and cultivation of correct habits of thought and investigation, by a rigid regard to the logic and the philosophy of Mathematics, are made the paramount object of every recitation. Freedom of thought and inquiry, in harmony with the laws of analysis and synthesis, is encouraged; original modes of demonstration are highly estimated in the grading of scholarship; and every proper stimulus is em-

ployed to inspire in the student a generous love of science."[11] The school of natural, intellectual, and political philosophy could be completed in two years. This corresponded to what we call physics and social science, and included psychology in addition to political economy and government. It is commendable that this pioneer educator made efforts to equip the school with the best possible laboratory, of which he said, "Nature is presented as she seems to the senses, and her phenomena explained in the language and to the comprehension of the popular mind. For this purpose the institution is provided with an extensive Philosophical Apparatus, affording the means of experimental demonstration of all the leading and more interesting phenomena of this department of science."[12] His interest in American government led him to include courses in constitutional and international law. Of this he said, "In no country on the globe is it so important that every citizen should understand the great and fundamental principles of government, as in America, and yet the study of these has, hitherto, been almost totally neglected in the literary institutions of our country."[13]

A two-year course was also offered in chemistry and belles lettres. The chemical division was prepared to offer laboratory studies to supplement the lectures and textbooks. The applied aspects of the study of physiology and agriculture were specifically mentioned in the aims of the course. The department of belles lettres within this school was the customary literary course. A preparatory school and a school of Hebrew and modern languages completed the curricular offering. It is interesting to compare this arrangement of studies into seven schools with the eight schools which made up the curriculum of the University of Virginia at its beginning in 1825. In that catalogue were presented (1) the ancient languages, (2) the modern languages, (3) mathematics, (4) natural philosophy, (5) natural history, (6)

medicine, (7) moral philosophy, and (8) law.[14]

The influence of Thomas Jefferson on Campbell would make an interesting study.[15] He spoke of the work of Jefferson as "the emancipation of the human mind from the shackles of superstition." He made frequent reference to the University of Virginia in his addresses, and in describing the "bill of fare" offered at the Steward's Inn, where the students were boarded, he said that "the food diet was that which was offered at the University of Virginia." In keeping with the practice of that school, he permitted the student to elect schools and even certain courses. Modern languages and Hebrew were offered on an elective basis. This is significant because the general idea of election had not yet been accepted.

Since the Dartmouth decision in 1819, one of the major problems in American higher education has been the determination of the role of religion. In the period of Campbell's lifetime the denominational colleges were engaged in a battle against secularism and were committed to indoctrination and sectarianism. Eastern Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists were establishing colleges to combat the so-called atheism of the West. Campbell was at cross purposes with their viewpoints. He held that secular knowledge was not contrary to religion. The sectarianism he condemned with the scathing invective and vituperation characteristic of his day. He was not, however, in sympathy with the viewpoint of Jefferson, who wanted to leave religion out altogether. He was even more critical of the compromise position of substituting deism for sectarianism or secularism. He held with Locke that religion must be taught if anyone is to accept it. He believed, furthermore, that it provides the only sanctions for the moral life. He was not willing, however, that theology or any doctrinal matter should be presented in an academic institution, with the exception of courses for theological students.

He had it written into the charter of Bethany that systematic theology should never be taught in that institution. His feelings were deep on this matter because of bitter personal experience. His own childhood had been clouded by intellectual difficulties precipitated by Calvinistic doctrines of total depravity and election. Locke had been his liberator.

He found a solution to the problem by making the Bible the core of his total curriculum. This was before the days of widespread historical criticism, but Campbell wanted the Bible taught the same as any other book, devoid of doctrine and presented as history, ethics, literature, etc. Biblical matters, like all others, must commend themselves to the active human reason for acceptance. The Bible was to be considered not as a level book. There was a distinction between the New and the Old Testaments, with a preference for the New as important for Christians. So important did this Biblical idea loom in the mind of Campbell that he declared Bethany was the only higher institution founded completely upon the Bible.[16] He printed in his paper an interesting quotation from a letter written by N. Webster to Girard College, which re-enforced his position. Webster said, "Now, sir, in my view the Christian religion is the *most important and one of the first things* in which *all* children, under a free government, ought to be instructed. . . . When I speak of the Christian religion as the basis of government, I do not mean an ecclesiastical establishment, a creed, or rites, forms, and ceremonies, or any compulsion of consciousness. I mean primitive Christianity, in its simplicity, as taught by Christ and the Apostles."[17]

One of his most cherished viewpoints was that all schools, public and private, should teach the Bible in this fashion. There would be no problem with reference to the separation of church and state, for, he argued, America is in reality a religious nation. There is in America an established religion,

he continued, though not an established church. In this he considered himself to be pleading the cause of all Americans. Did not the pact on the Mayflower begin, "In the name of God, Amen"? Was not the Declaration of Independence assumption that the Creator had endowed man with certain unalienable rights? How else could virtue be taught? All education, he thought, should be religious but completely non-sectarian.

While undoubtedly many Disciples of the early period believed that the chief justification for the college was the advancement of the religious sect, that was not Campbell's view. His argument for the founding of Bethany College was that the country needed good institutions of higher learning and that it was the responsibility of this nascent religious body to do its share in providing them. That college training would redound to the benefit of his movement he did not doubt. He believed, however, that a college should exist for the enrichment of the lives of the students and the improvement of society and should not be prostituted to the advancement of any particular sect. As evidence of his liberal position with reference to the purpose of a Disciple college, I present a quotation from his appeal to his fellow members in behalf of the support of the incipient Bethany College. Since the denominational self-interest would have made a stronger plea to this particular clientele, his viewpoint is all the more indicative of a sincere and consistent philosophy. The following is an extract from the *Millennial Harbinger* of 1841:

> Popular education is dependent on liberal education, as lakes and rivers are dependent on oceans and seas for their periodical and full supplies. The Family, the State, the Church, with a hundred voices demand a number of such institutions as that in contemplation. And can we not, friends of humanity, civilization, morality, and religion, that we are—I say, can we not, shall we not, erect and establish one or two

such institutions, and thus contribute our mite to the advancement of the great cause of human redemption from ignorance, immorality, superstition, and error![18]

THE PRODUCT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

In the *Timaeus* Plato pictures a weaver with a certain pattern in mind attempting to reproduce it in the material before him. He is never quite able to succeed, but his vision constitutes the aim and standard for his work. The purpose served by a college, in like manner, may be best measured by its products. The aim of an educator is essentially his imaginatively constructed pattern to which he commits his actions and for the achievement of which he orders the educational facilities. In the determination of the values cherished by Alexander Campbell for the schools which he was to influence greatly, a careful investigation of his writings pertaining to the kind of graduates which he hoped the college would produce seems rewarding. Fortunately, the sources for such a study are plentiful since he printed in his paper a baccalaureate address delivered each year to the students and the great assembly of friends who made the Bethany commencement their Fourth of July celebration.

If the president had his way, a graduate of Bethany College was intellectually liberated in the best sense of the term. He was freed from superstition and tradition. The restraints of his own inability and consciousness of inferiority had been broken. He was prepared to handle facts in a straightforward, scientific and reasonable fashion. The school had attempted to supply him with a modicum of skill, knowledge, and the tools of learning in order that he might meet the issues of frontier life in America. The value of his college training was to be measured by the happiness and usefulness that it provides for the graduate.

A favorite figure of speech on these occasions was: "You

were not created or educated to be a mere drone in the hive of humanity." A man's responsibility was in proportion to his opportunity. The young man who had the advantage of a college education was thereby obligated to greater usefulness in society. He declared once that the greatest of all arts and sciences was that of usefulness. He constantly reiterated his contention that graduation from college represented only the beginning of learning and the tools for its pursuit and achievement. Preparation for usefulness demanded that the alumnus be able to read and write convincingly and effectively. Campbell's own facility for words made him all the more critical of the inarticulate and rude of speech. It further required that he know how to use figures. Mathematical knowledge was extremely useful in the frontier. In an address on common schools, he indicated that seven arts should be the basis of common school education—the arts of thinking, speaking, reading, singing, writing, calculating and bookkeeping.[10] It is to be noted that this was a wide departure from the "spelling, reading, writing and ciphering to the end of rule three" which was practiced in most schools. These studies were not for mere adornment. He had broken completely with the aristocratic tradition of education for the gentle. They were the prerequisites to the effective functioning in the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness.

There was to be, moreover, some proficiency in the vocations. Campbell viewed with disdain the man who simply looked with reflection and detachment upon the busy, throbbing, working life of the youthful nation. His training should fit him to participate in the world's work. The words, "useful, honorable and happy men," constitute an admirable, concise epitome of his conception of an educated man.

The stamp of Disciple education was a man's recognition of his responsibility to carry on the great American institu-

tions, such as the school, the church, the state, the home, and the professions. He, therefore, demanded that all academic procedure be in accord with "the genius of humanity and the wants of society." In an apostrophe to the college, he said:

> Men, and not brick and mortar, make colleges, and these colleges make men. These men make books, and these books make the living world in which we individually live, and move, and have our being. How all-important, then, that our colleges should understand and teach the true philosophy of man! They create the men that furnish the teachers of men—the men that fill the pulpit, the legislative halls, the senators, the judges and the governors of earth. Do we expect to fill these high stations by merely voting or praying for men? Or shall we choose empirics, charlatans, montebanks, and every pretender to eminent claims upon the suffrages of the people? Forbid it, reason, conscience and Heaven![20]

In that day of great inventive and scientific activity it is not strange that this pioneer placed emphasis upon the ability of every man to contribute to the general welfare. He expected that everyone should devote himself to the improvement of man's state in this western empire. He specifically mentioned the need for advancement in the understanding of hygiene and the provision of improved conditions. He was inspired by Morse's discovery of telegraphy, and made reference to the great display of inventions which was in Washington. In all these things he considered the college to be of prime importance and its graduates to be the chief contributors.

In sympathy with Jacksonian individualism, he expected that a college graduate should be able to govern himself. In an address before a convention at Clarksburg, Virginia, on the subject of "Common Schools," he declared that "The great end of all human government is to teach men to govern themselves."[21] This self-government could be accom-

plished, he held, only through education. In this demand for independence of mind and ability to solve problems his educational theories sound strangely modern. He declared, "*Intelligence* and *freedom* are but two names for the same thing."[22]

The most essential characteristic of a college man, however, in Campbell's view, was his moral excellence. To the question of Socrates, "Can virtue be taught?," Campbell would have responded, "It can be learned." Since he rejected innate ideas, education was the sole basis of morality. While Campbell loved the self-reliant pioneers and was a partaker in their optimistic outlook, he was afraid of their excesses. There was need, therefore, for some kind of restraint. Suffrage and power in the hands of immoral men constituted a genuine threat to America's future. He, therefore, urged the course of Biblical instruction as an attempt to provide moral sanctions for individual and collective living. He was persuaded with Bacon that knowledge is power rather than with Socrates that knowledge is virtue.

In his scheme of education Biblical instruction was to safeguard ethics, both individual and social. He was acutely aware of the lewdness and licentiousness which had resulted in a society liberated by distance and broken convention from the common restraints of a closely knitted community life. He believed that moral education could save a lad from the common vices pertaining to sex, honesty, and the conduct of personal life. He said, with regard to education, "Still less were your lips moulded for puffing a cigar, uttering a smutty tale, or taking the name of God in vain."[23]

Matters of individual propriety, however, occupied very little space in the writings of Campbell. This is truly amazing when one considers that the majority of frontier preaching was directed against dancing, card playing, smoking, drinking, swearing, and sexual vice, all of which were subsumed under the phrase, "the world, the flesh, and the

devil." Campbell himself smoked a pipe and drank wine. The Disciple colleges were never subjected to the emotional appeals for the students to repent which characterized this period even at Yale in staid old New England. Campbell's position is more reminiscent of Locke, who said, "The only fence against the world is knowledge."

The social responsibility of the college perpetually engaged his attention. He said, "They are the sources whence issue the science and the literature, the professors and the teachers, that create the academies, the schools and the seminaries of every grade, furnishing teachers for all the schools in Christendom."[24] He believed that only by the judicious promulgation of higher education could the intellectual and moral advancements of man keep pace with his rapid expansion in the West. With the college he entrusted the welfare of the schools, churches, and even the state. The culture which was so conspicuously absent from the new West could be supplied by higher education. Educated men were required to take sides in the promotion of all cultural causes. He said, "Society expects, and will expect from you, the advocacy and support of the institutions of your prosperous and happy country. For this purpose you must study and comprehend them in their political and moral tendencies."[25] He said to his young men, "You must take some side in the great controversies of the age. Survey the battle-ground before you. On the one side are ranged antiquated error, superstitution, despotism and misanthrophy; on the other, truth, intelligence, liberty, religion and humanity. In such a war no good man can be neutral. . . . The weapons of this our warfare are not swords and spears, but reason, truth, persuasion."[26]

The life of this man was a living argument for his educational views. He supported the claims of universally state supported education made effectively free. While living in a slave state, he freed the slaves that came into his hands

as soon as they could be educated for the responsibilities of freedom, and he consistently and eloquently opposed slavery as an institution. He was an ardent exponent of the cause of peace and made a widely disseminated address on war, which was delivered in Wheeling, Virginia in 1848. He was the constant opponent of all quackery and mountebankery in whatever form it appeared. He believed heartily in higher education for women and said as much with cogent logic in an address before the Henry Female Seminary in New Castle, Kentucky.[27]

Throughout the land educators of note were emphasizing the responsibility of the colleges in defense of American democracy. This was a commonplace idea to this nineteenth century prophet of religion and education. On this great theme he said, "Another reason [for the college] is the *safety* of the state. Education, in its proper import, not only enlightens the understanding, but forms the conscience and humanizes the heart of man . . . education is a better defense to a state than standing armies and puissant navies."[28]

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

In addition to other things, Campbell had extraordinary insight into the nature and processes of society. He was aware of the close relationship between the organization of the churches and schools with the form of government of the state in which they operated. He said, "Absolutism pervading the state, it will pervade the church, the synagogue, the school, and the family. Democracy pervading the state, it will pervade every human, and sometimes every Divine, institution in it."[29] His own behavior with regard to college organization illustrated this contention, for the early administration of Bethany College was completely democratic. Since he was the founder not only of the school but of the sponsoring communion, he had almost unlimited

influence and could have been a virtual dictator. He was willing, however, to go out of his way to consult with other interested parties about plans and programs. At his suggestion a competent board of trustees was appointed and met regularly to consider the affairs of the school. A lay board of trustees is distinctly an American idea. In this he yielded to the custom of the new community rather than to his training in Scotland. He had confidence in the judgment of these laymen who faced and solved the same problems which confronted him as a landed gentleman and planter. He laid down no requirements that the trustees had to belong to the church. They were, for the most part, farmers and businessmen with a few clergymen. This was the reverse of the common practice for managing boards of denominational colleges which were composed mostly of ministers. The Disciples drew no sharp distinction between clergy and laity.

The faculty was brought into consultation in the determination of the school's administrative program. The four or five competent young men were not infrequently invited to sit in with the board of trustees to consider matters of mutual concern. When the president decided to launch a program of selling scholarships to a great number of people and in that way providing endowment for the college, he presented the matter first to the faculty, then to the trustees, and, finally, to the community for approval.

The students undoubtedly had very little authorized voice in institutional direction. In the first year of the school's operation a discipline problem arose which almost wrecked the venture. Disorderly and rowdy young men made life miserable for everyone concerned. The situation was so desperate that many of the patrons were objecting, and Campbell was forced to write a disheartening editorial about the unfortunate circumstance. Before the year was out, however, the situation was pretty well in hand. The temper

of the school may be sensed when in 1850 the board of trustees voted that a five-cent fine be assessed each student for each absence from class. The money was to be collected by the professor and used to buy a merit award for the ones who wrote the best examinations.[30]

There was almost constant pressure from the church. Many of the frontiersmen, believing that all education was the work of the devil, recommended to him that he disband the college and do away with all such sinful things. Others urged that the school should teach different doctrines or in a different manner. This stout old warrior resisted all such claims and answered them with ringing conviction. His protection for his faculty represented a beginning of a tradition of academic freedom within the Disciple schools. Controversial subjects were taught in the classroom, even the hot issues that drew fire from partisan enthusiasts. His desire for fairness led him to include in the statement of the purpose for such courses, "In the conduct of this department, however, every care will be taken to avoid any undue bias on the great points of controversy, which have grown up in the United States as to the *interpretation* of our Federal Constitution. The grounds of these controversies will be presented historically only, and the students left to their own judgment in adopting an opinion."[31]

The method of finance did not differ from other schools of similar nature. The president was disappointed that people did not respond with greater generosity to the support of the school. The gifts ranging up to several thousand dollars were the principal sources of support. The scholarship plan, which would provide almost free tuition to the children of the contributors, was not too highly successful. He was aware of the necessity for endowment to do an effective piece of work educationally, and made every effort to procure it. In this he was only partly successful. In this also he seems to have set the mold for all subsequent Dis-

ciple colleges. The brethren who were anxious to begin colleges in other sections of the country met with their spiritual father's disapproval. He held that it was better to have one or two good schools than a multitude of ineffective institutions. He said, in comment on a notice telling him of the founding of colleges in the West:

> It is no common, no easy, no every-day occurrence, to institute, to constitute, to continue, and make useful one good college. We have not yet, in any one case, given full demonstration of the conservative and self-perpetuating power of one college in all our limits. These mere academic colleges—or rather high schools—with three, four, or five officers each, are, however, useful as *schools*, lean and decrepit substitutes for colleges or universities worthy of the name. I could, I presume to say, write the history of three-fourths of these contemplated colleges, and presidents, and professors, and boards of trustees, before they shall call their first roll or graduate one Master of Arts. But to assume such an invidious task we have neither leisure nor inclination. I only repeat the wholesome oracle made and provided for such cases—"Hasten leisurely."[32]

INFLUENCES

It is commendable that a consciousness of the close relationship between the higher institutions and the common schools was established early. The American idea of education beginning at the cradle and extending on through life, now advocated by the most progressive educators, was the subject of the educational activities as well as the addresses of Alexander Campbell. I have said that his original intention was to found an infant school and a high school, as well as a college, at Bethany. He wrote a series of addresses showing how education begins in the family, extends through the college, and is then taken over by the church.[33]

The educational reforms in the ascendency at that period did not escape his interest and attention. He wrote at some

length about the Prussian system of education and made an extensive quotation from Fellenberg, the celebrated student and follower of Pestalozzi. It is not surprising that Campbell was delighted with Fellenberg's vocational and observation methods, for that great Swiss educator had also been greatly influenced by John Locke. When Horace Mann came to the presidency of Antioch College in Ohio, Campbell printed extensive extracts from his inaugural address. The women of the Bethany Church presented this distinguished jurist and educator with a number of Bibles on his inaugural occasion. Mann's address was in almost complete agreement with the views expressed repeatedly by Campbell, which caused the latter to write:

> The merited celebrity of the author of this address, the very excellent views and sentiments which it contains, and the fine style in which they are expressed, would have constrained me to have laid much of it before my readers, as exhibiting very forcibly many of the positions and views which we have, from time to time, expressed to the readers of the *Harbinger* on the subject of education, the supremacy of the moral sentiments, and the importance of making the Holy Scriptures a text-book, and their contents a study in every College, had it not been copyrighted in the Clerk's office for the District of Ohio, 1854. I have, therefore, merely noticed it for the sake of calling the attention of our readers to it, as a very valuable document from a highly respectable source, and as advertising such of our readers as are engaged in the work of teaching the youth of our generation of its existence, that they may obtain it, and give to it a very careful perusal.[34]

Another in the field of education whose views influenced Campbell was Thomas Smith Grimké of Carolina. Of him Campbell said, "I have not found any writer who more fully expresses my views of the present fashionable collegiate course, than . . . Mr. Grimké, nor any with whom I more generally agree on all questions of literature."[35] This brilliant

Southern barrister was possessed with the conviction that education should "partake deeply and extensively of the vital spirit of American institutions." He argued for a course of study that would center in science. He was an early advocate of manual training in the schools. These he defended on the basis of their usefulness from the standpoint of the church. He was a pioneer advocate of higher education for women. He held that modern literature, history, and scientific writings should replace mathematics and the classics to a large extent. He advocated the Bible as the basis for moral instruction for the entire range from the nursery to the completion of education. His influence touched Campbell in the early part of the century, for his untimely death came in the fourth decade. It is worth noting that Grimké was an avowed enemy of the classics and that Campbell, while seemingly in agreement with Grimké's position, appeared somewhat inconsistent in giving them such a large place in his course of study. His course was defended on the ground that all higher education taught the classics, but that Bethany College went beyond this by including an unusually large offering of sciences and by making the Bible the chief classic.

CAMPBELL AND BACON COLLEGE

One might assume that since Bacon College preceded the founding of Bethany by four years its character would constitute a separate stream of influence on subsequent Disciple colleges. A careful examination of the records, however, reveals that this is not the case. The founders of Bacon, which was originally located at Georgetown, Kentucky, had already come under the influence of Campbell's views as to what should constitute a college related to the Restoration Movement. Its first president was Walter Scott. Like many of the educators of this period, he had been

engaged as an academy teacher and was trained as a minister. He became acquainted with the Campbells early in their career and was immediately impressed by Alexander. Richardson says, "They conceived for each other . . . at once, the warmest personal esteem."[36]

For fifteen years before the first course was offered at Bacon, Scott had been privileged to talk with Campbell and labor with him in the cause of their common faith. From the outset he read Campbell's articles on education which appeared first in the *Millennial Harbinger*. His own experience in education and his new interest in religion, which had been inspired and encouraged by Campbell, made him susceptible to the influence of the man who was later to set the direction for Disciple education.

David S. Burnet, who succeeded Scott at Bacon, was in like manner a close associate of Alexander Campbell. The few things he wrote pertaining to the subject indicate that he accepted the analysis and convictions of the latter. At about this time Campbell had opportunity to visit the board of trustees, the administration, and the faculty of the school. One of the trustees was J. T. Johnson, a famous lawyer and preacher who had high regard for Campbell and was one of his close friends. Campbell wrote an article pertaining to Bacon in the *Harbinger* for 1837, naming the men in charge and expressing his satisfaction with their educational viewpoints. The following quotation proves conclusively that the school was in harmony with what Campbell himself would have prescribed:

> I have been backward hitherto to say much about this Institution, until I could ascertain from a personal interview with its principal managers and conductors, their views and designs, their prospects and means, &c. but especially with reference to the discipline and moral culture under which the youth are to be placed who attend this College; for this, with me, now is above all other sorts of eminence. I give

> my vote for learning and science and for high attainments in all branches of useful knowledge, but I would not give *morality* for them all; and therefore I have resolved never to speak in favor of any literary institution, from a common school to a University, however superior their literary eminence, that does not first of all, and above all, exercise a sovereign and supreme guardianship over the morals of its students and wards, and endeavor to make *good* rather than *great* men. Colleges without this are no blessing to any country. So I think.
>
> I was happy to learn that such is the firm determination of each of the Trustees and Faculty with whom I conversed. They have, indeed, given their pledge that the morals and moral culture of the youth shall be their paramount concern. Believing, then, that parents may safely send their sons to Georgetown as respects their moral safety; and as for literary and scientific advantages, it is already known that there is every thing which the students need. Therefore we can now say, that we hope that all who wish their sons well educated in all that is valuable in literature and science, without any hazard to their morals, will send them to Georgetown; and that our Christian brethren especially will patronize and build up an institution of inestimable value to themselves and their posterity.[37]

In the year that Bethany was founded a new president, James Shannon, was inaugurated president of Bacon College, which had been moved to Harrodsburg, Kentucky. Moore says of him: "President Shannon was a strong character. He afterwards became President of the University of Missouri, located at Columbia, and did much to give to that institution the position it occupied during his presidency."[38] This gentleman represents a somewhat different educational viewpoint from that of Campbell, but the curriculum and the institutional habits of the school were already established before his administration. He had attended school in the Belfast Academical Institute of Ireland and had won recognition for excellence in Greek and mathe-

matics. He taught for a while in a north Ireland academy and won distinction. Upon coming to America he became principal of Sunbury Academy in Georgia where he remained for half a decade. He became minister of a Baptist church upon terminating his connection with the school, which continued until 1830 when he was appointed to the chair of ancient languages at the University of Georgia. After six years in this institution and another period with an academy, he was called to the presidency of Bacon. His educational ideals for the school are expressed in his carefully prepared inaugural address. They can be reduced to a few propositions for comparison with those held by Campbell.

In his attempt to define education, he points out that a preliminary definition of what is to be educated is required. He then declares, "The subject to be educated is man; and however various may be the intermediate and minor objects, the grand and ultimate design is man's happiness."[39]

His definition of the physical, moral, and intellectual powers sounds for the world like the speech that would have been made by the founder of Bethany, but his psychology turned out to be quite different. He seems to have accepted completely the faculty psychology and the concept of the discipline of these faculties which was popularly held by many of the best educators of his day. He said, "The design of education may be regarded as two-fold:–*First,* and *mainly,* to develope and strengthen the faculties educated; so that the individual may thereby be prepared to think and act for himself. Secondly, to store the memory with useful knowledge for the purpose of practical application in the business of life."[40] Later on he continues, "To strengthen the mind, then, should be the *primary,* and to store it with useful knowledge the *secondary object* of intellectual education; a due regard meanwhile being had to the preservation of *a proper balance* throughout the system, *by laboring*

MOST *to strengthen those faculties that* MOST NEED *to be strengthened.*"[41] This last point was thrown in as argument against the people of his day who believed that the school should develop in each student that "department of knowledge in which he is by nature fitted to excel." This, he believed, would end in disaster. After a slight argument he says, "Now, when we add to the foregoing considerations the well established truth of the hereditary transmission of qualities, we will see that the course in question is well calculated to produce, at least in a few generations, a race of idiots and maniacs."[42]

He threw in an extensive argument for a predominance of languages in a college curriculum, basing their value on the discipline involved. "The very labor and time expanded in acquiring a thorough knowledge of Greek and Latin, is more than compensated by the healthful and invigorating discipline which it gives to the reflective faculties. It is a truth well attested by experience, that the mind is strengthened by exercise as well as the body."[43] In this he diverged from Campbell sharply on two points. First, Campbell would admit no hereditary transmission of training or knowledge. In the second place, he did not subscribe to the doctrine of the influence of discipline in one field upon another unrelated area.

Shannon held that the moral qualities of education should come first, but here again his conception of the learning process and the nature of mind led him astray, for he believed that man had certain moral faculties without which he could have no religion. He says, "Were man by nature destitute of moral and religious faculties, he must always remain in that condition. . . . You cannot *create faculties* by education;—nor can you educate faculties, which do not exist, any more *than you can improve the sight* of a man who has *no eyes.*"[44] Since these moral and religious faculties constitute the greatest glory of man and his

superiority to the brute, they should receive first consideration. So violent were his convictions with reference to the importance of religious emphasis that he said, "And, let me add, I would infinitely prefer, that Bacon College should be blotted out of existence, and its very name erased from our memory, rather than see it aid in perpetuating the miserable delusion, that the proper training of the MORAL SENTIMENTS is not the chief business of education, or that this training can be properly conducted, except in harmony with the sublime, the heavenly precepts and principles of the Christian religion."[45]

His conception of a curriculum was colored slightly by his own background but was not at cross purposes with the views of Campbell, or any other educators of the time, for that matter. He says:

> With respect to the particular subjects of study that should find place in a liberal course of a collegiate education, there is among the learned as general an agreement as could reasonably be anticipated. The study of languages, (especially the English, Greek, and Latin,) the various branches of Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, and Chemistry; History, Rhetoric, and Belles Lettres; Mental and Moral Philosophy; Evidences of Christianity, Constitutional Law, and Political Economy, or the Science of Wealth, are very generally regarded as worthy of a prominent place in American Colleges. The circumstances of a student may sometimes render it expedient, or even necessary, to omit one or more of the foregoing branches. But the favored youth who has it in his power to receive a full and regular course of instruction in them all, is greatly to blame, if, through sloth, caprice, or prejudice, he neglects to improve the golden opportunity.[46]

The fact that Shannon was greatly influenced by Campbell's viewpoint is apparent from the direction in which Bacon College developed under the leadership of this man who was later to serve not only the University of Missouri

but Christian College which is now Culver-Stockton and, in some advisory capacity, practically every Disciple institution which came into existence during his lifetime.

SUMMARY OF EARLY DISCIPLE PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

It is difficult to state definitely the philosophy of the Restoration leaders with reference to education since by the very nature of their organization each person is free to hold his own views. There is no official creed and no official institutional control. In spite of this fact, it is possible to point out certain general principles which are clearly discernible as influential in the educational practice of this body. As was indicated earlier, such characteristics and principles which bear on the aims and purposes of higher education are to be found in the history of the schools in their cultural matrix and the views of the most influential educators. Tewksbury expressed this insight in connection with his search for the dominating motives for the foundation of colleges: "In the course of this survey it was discovered that it was not in the formal preambles of college charters, nor in the printed announcements of the early colleges, nor even in the petitions made to the legislatures for a charter, that trustworthy evidence was to be found, but rather in the materials relating to individual institutions found in the candid statements of contemporary religious leaders, in the revealing reports and journals of educational societies and denominational organizations, and in the illuminating records of denominational history."[47]

In accord with this method the ten following principles are set forth as characteristic of early Disciple colleges:

(1) The dignity of man and his infinite improvability constitute a fundamental assumption for the conduct of higher education.

(2) Education is the sole basis not only for vocational and general social effectiveness but also for moral behavior. This derives in part from Locke's rejection of innate ideas.

(3) The program must relate itself to the persons which it attempts to train and the society in which they live. The mere repetition of traditional courses, such as the classics, is not adequate.

(4) All absolutes, whether metaphysical or creedal, are repudiated in the interest of human values and the conditions that will serve them. This accounts for the large emphasis given to natural and social sciences.

(5) The early Disciple college is committed in practice, and inclined by virtue of origin, to democracy. Each school, for that matter each individual educator, has freedom to make decisions. The individualism of the West with no restraining Eastern denominational bonds accounts in part for this preference. The democratic ideals were exemplified in Campbell's aspiration for the self-government of each graduate.

(6) While the schools were to be distinctly religious in nature, they were to be completely nonsectarian. Although the promotion of the young religious body bulked large in the interest of many constituents, it was not the major concern of Campbell nor his colleagues most directly associated with the functioning of the colleges.

(7) The Bible was set forth as the basis for teaching morality to the students and indirectly to society at large. This was offered as a substitute for theologies or ethical systems which were commonly indoctrinated by contemporary institutions.

(8) The vocational and liberal purposes were not sharply distinguished since there was no aristocratic tradition as opposed to the interests of the common man. The training of ministers and the training of teachers received major

emphasis, but these were to get their benefit from the college by virtue of its ability to provide educational advantages which would be of value to any thoughtful person. Belief in universal education is fundamental.

(9) From the beginning the followers of Campbell have not considered the college as isolated from other educational agencies. There has always been the recognition of the close relationship between the college studies and all previous and subsequent training.

(10) The chief aim of higher education was to produce "useful, honorable and happy men" fitted to function in their social situation.

The foregoing propositions set forth a formulation of educational preferences which should be clearly distinguished from those which give primary emphasis to the accumulation of knowledge or the mere refinement of a gentleman.

III

Subsequent Colleges and the Campbell Heritage

The Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Christian Churches, and Churches of Christ have not founded colleges and universities in the strictest sense. The wide variety of academic institutions which are more or less affiliated with the religious movement were for the most part founded by individuals who were identified with the churches. There is no record of any college, seminary, or university authorized and established by a national meeting of the early associated churches or by any meeting or assembly of the several subsequent divisions such as the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ, although efforts at the state level came as early as 1849 when the Indiana State Meeting passed a resolution to establish North Western Christian University (now Butler) in Indianapolis.[1]

One could argue that the absence of denominational structure denied the possibility of wide authority for establishing colleges, but there is no evidence that the churches would have agreed to the development of any such array of affiliated higher institutions as now exist even if the machinery had been available. The founders of most of these colleges were individuals with various motives more

or less related to the development of the religious body. Yet, all of the colleges have certain characteristics in common and all of them have been influenced by Alexander Campbell and his philosophy of education.

An enumeration of the colleges, living and dead, which have claimed some relation to the Restoration Movement is neither possible nor relevant to this lecture. Founding colleges was a nineteenth century fad and the Disciples had their share of fadists. Dozens of schools were started with high hopes and local pride, only to languish and die. The survivors are an interesting and impressive lot ranging from universities such as Texas Christian University in Fort Worth, Drake in Des Moines, and Butler in Indianapolis to tiny Bible colleges operated from the educational buildings of a local church. Universities, four-year colleges of arts and sciences, Bible chairs or schools of religion at state universities, seminaries, two-year colleges of arts and sciences, and Bible colleges which provide a sort of undergraduate seminary course for preachers are among the present institutions related to the Disciples of Christ, Christian Churches, and the Churches of Christ. Many of these higher institutions enjoy considerable prestige. Since none was officially founded by a corporate agreement of all the churches on a national basis, the persistent question is, "Why were they founded at all?"

The answer is complex since no motive is simple, and since some of the founders of colleges were not fully aware of their own motives. The "good" reasons for founding a college are so insistent and necessary for success that the "real" reasons are obscured. Obvious motives, moreover, have been imputed to the pioneers on so many occasions that the question has not been pursued with sufficient assiduity to exhaust the possible reasons. The people who have assumed responsibility for the continuity of the colleges have enough interest in the success of the venture

that any question of original motive becomes irrelevant if not impudent. That the motives were sufficient is clear; just what they were deserves additional inquiry.

When Floyd W. Reeves and John Dale Russell of the University of Chicago prepared their landmark study of the institutions associated with the Board of Higher Education of the Disciples of Christ in 1929, a detailed report of which appears later in this chapter, they stated flatly: "There seems to have been one single controlling purpose in the minds of those who were responsible for the founding of Disciple colleges. That purpose was the provision of opportunities for training the leadership for the communion, and through this leadership, to provide for the continuation and extension of the principles upon which the communion is founded. To a large extent, the religious motive has continued to dominate these institutions."[3] The motive, no doubt, played an important role in the founding, but not an exclusive, nor even a paramount role in some cases. Campbell himself went to his constituents for support of Bethany College, which constituency would have responded to the training of ministers motive, with the appeal that the constituency should do its part in the improvement of educational quality for the nation.

In that age of sectionalism the founder's identity with his region was a considerable motive for starting a college. Southern young people were not drawn to Yankee schools, nor were northern youth willing to go to school in the land of cotton. The brave new west felt alienated from the east, as well as proud of its own self-sufficiency. This issue was joined as the founders of what is now Butler University began to press for national church support and ran into Campbell's stout opposition. The founders of the Indianapolis institution, then called North Western Christian University, argued that their region needed a college adapted to the needs of the section, and which would

appeal to the youth of the "north west." Campbell, struggling to gain support for Bethany College, neither welcomed the competition nor accepted the sectional argument. He wrote: "But literature, science and religion, are neither northern nor southern; neither south-western nor north-western, but are wide as the earth, broad as the sea, high as heaven, and deeper than the regions of the dead. I, therefore, cannot see either the wisdom or the utility of giving to learning, morality or christianity, either a sectional, political, longitudinal, latitudinal or geographical designation, spirit or character."[8] Campbell convinced none of the leaders who felt the need for a Christian Church college in their region. Many sectional colleges were founded and almost as many died.

These eager pioneer educators were also secular men who felt the claims of their own local communities. Each city and many villages wanted a college, and the Campbellites were eager to nose out the Presbyterians and Methodists in their fair share of places. The resources of the community were seldom if ever, equal to the aspiration for the prestige and economic benefit of a college. The inevitable result was a number of abortive attempts at starting institutions of higher learning while several successful beginnings left only a few that have managed to survive. The heroic effort of the founders is to be admired, but the calculated judgments of feasibility were unequal to the high hopes. W. E. Garrison surveyed the ruins of Disciple colleges which had failed and wrote, "It is not surprising that the Disciples of that period little realized what it took to make a college, in money, scholarship, and constituency. Academic standards were low, secondary schools were almost non-existent, and teachers were cheap. But education was a magic word, and great sacrifices were made that the church might have its colleges, of whatever grade. The value of their service was incalculable, and even

some that could not long survive left a heritage of substantial accomplishment. Soon the prairies were scattered with the bones of dead colleges whose very names have been forgotten."[4]

Personal factors such as a desire to teach and train young people entered into the founding of colleges. Men like Tolbert Fanning, Walter Scott, Josephus Hopwood, Robert Milligan, James Shannon, Addison and Randolph Clarke, Robert Graham, and many others emulated Campbell in the personal desire to establish and develop institutions of higher learning. This was a service to God and man required by their commitment and their sense of mission. Even Thomas Jefferson, deist that he was, found major fulfillment in starting the University of Virginia. Education was the demand of the day and visionary pioneers were eager to take up the challenge. Some entrepreneurs on the frontier built schools for profit and thereby helped in the education of young America. The assistance of the churches was always sought, sometimes courted, but never received in sufficient measure to guarantee continuity. Campbell complained about the meager support of his Bethany College.

> Connected as we are, and have been, with a college now in successful operation for fourteen years, not yet fully endowed, and having already many of her graduate professors in other colleges, or evangelists in the great field of missionary labor, and rendering most important services in the vineyard of the Lord, we cannot but think it is high time that Bethany College was liberally endowed, and enabled to do as much in one year as she can now do in two or three. We have much more faith in doing one thing well, or one thing at a time, than in undertaking to set on foot so many institutions, and then leaving them to drift along, not accomplishing as much in two or three years as any of them might accomplish in one. We cannot but think at our stand-point, and from our premises, that there is a great waste of time and

of means in the present economy of the whole brotherhood, in attempting to do so much, and, consequently, in doing nothing well. Let Bethany College have the endowment she ought to have, and I will hazard nothing in saying she will do more in one year than she now does in three. So saying I only do justice to my own convictions, and regard myself as but faithfully performing a duty I owe to my Lord and to my fellowmen, however, these statements may be viewed in the optics of those committed to other localities. Bethany College, as a matter of economy and of active benevolence, ought to have a much larger endowment than she has ever asked; and so sustained she would fully sustain that proverb of Solomon—"there is that scattereth and yet increaseth, and there is a withholding more than is meet, and it tendeth to poverty."[5]

THE CAMPBELL INFLUENCE

These colleges related to the Christian Churches all felt the influence of Alexander Campbell. Many of the subsequent higher institutions were founded by those who had studied with Campbell at Bethany College. Those who had not known the Sage were familiar with his writing and his considerable reputation and felt obligated to honor his views in order to win support from his many followers. An examination of the continuing colleges shows the common characteristics which Campbell incorporated in his Bethany College in 1840. Locations and constituencies vary widely, but some fundamentals always appear.

Each college has its own self-perpetuating board of control with no requirement of church affiliation for trustees. The comparable colleges related to the Methodist and Presbyterian churches specify certain denominational restrictions, but the Christian Churches have no such control of their colleges. While a few of the universities and colleges, largely supported by the community, have tended to grow away from the churches, most of the schools have their church affiliation even though there has been only

limited financial support from that source. Those institutions, such as Butler University, which have moved away from church relation have done so only after the divinity school had been separated into a separate institution. Even then they continue to show many Campbell characteristics.

All have taught the Bible as thought and literature on a parity with any other discipline in accord with Campbell's declaration that Bethany was the only college founded on the Bible. This reasonable and somewhat secular approach to Bible courses derived from Campbell's conviction that any theological or sectarian emphasis was inappropriate in a college. The charter for Bethany College forbids the establishment of a professorship of theology. The Bible taught as any other book or collection of books, however, appealed to Campbell as free from any sectarian bias. The several institutions which felt his influence all followed his precept and example. The Reeves and Russell study shows all the colleges in their review giving a large portion of their offerings to Bible study with no offering in theology. The tendency of other denominational schools to offer religion as theology in conjunction with the philosophy department has not caught on with the Disciple institutions even though the Christian Churches provide only a small portion of their constituencies.

While the presidents of these colleges have, for the most part, belonged to the affiliated churches, there has been no inclination to require Christian Church membership for faculty or students as has been and is the policy of several denominational colleges. The Campbell tradition in this regard has been continued even though some church leaders have feared the loss of the affiliation of their colleges.

This fear proved to be justified, for many of the institutions have moved far away from the churches. The percentage of Christian Church young people in some of the colleges is very low and many faculty members are not

even aware of any church affiliation. Institutions with strong, local, secular constituencies are turning toward complete separation from the religious affiliation cherished by the founders. This is not in contradiction to the Campbell influence, for, you will remember, he argued that the churches should do their part in the education of American youth without demand for denominational advantage.

These institutions tend to be alike in that priorities are on the side of the arts and sciences rather than toward the other aspects of college life that might have more appeal to members of the churches. When W. E. Garrison was called on to define a Christian college, he said, "A Christian college is first a *college*."[6]

As individuals, in most instances, were the founders of the Disciple related institutions of higher learning, so individuals have been the principal factors in their continuity. Those institutions that have survived are the continuing witness to the courage and resourcefulness of academic leaders who were deeply involved in their success. The heroic efforts of Hill Bell at Drake, Thomas Cramblet at Bethany, Edward McShane Waits at Texas Christian University, W. H. Crossfield at Transylvania, H. S. Hilley at Atlantic Christian, and a host of others are men who literally gave their lives for the colleges they served. Today the success of the surviving colleges depends primarily upon leadership. This was the conclusion of Reeves and Russell in their study in 1929 and it is still the major factor as private institutions face new fiscal difficulties.

The interrelation between Disciple colleges has been very loose as one would expect from such thoroughly autonomous institutions of higher learning. A number of these institutions have been related to the Board of Higher Education of the Disciples of Christ, but the affiliation has been largely nominal and the influence of the Board over the lives of the school has done little more than fix boundaries for solicita-

tions of churches even though the highly qualified executives of the Board have exerted general influence in behalf of excellence and institutional development. The Board was responsible for the comprehensive and useful study by Floyd Reeves and John Russell previously mentioned.

These colleges, which share in the Campbell heritage, have one more thing in common. They are all now facing financial difficulties. Poverty was the concern of Campbell when Bethany was founded. His Scottish sense of practical concern for economics made him fearful when institutions multiplied. No institution in the entire Campbell tradition has at any time been adequately endowed. Today the new fiscal predicament of all private higher education threatens the very existence of some old and honorable schools. This new problem will receive more adequate treatment in the final chapter. For now it is enough to say that among other qualities that these colleges have in common is poverty.

John T. Brown prepared in 1904 *An Historical Biographical and Pictorial History of the Churches of Christ in the United States, Australasia, England and Canada*[7] which includes a good cross-section picture of the colleges that were in existence at that time.

Under the section entitled, "Some of Our Educational Institutions," are listed Kentucky University, tracing its history from both Bacon College and Transylvania; Kentucky University Medical Department, College of the Bible, Hamilton College, Campbell-Hagerman College, all of Lexington, Kentucky; William Woods College of Fulton, Missouri; Christian College, Columbia, Missouri; Add-Ran Christian University, now Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas; Bible College of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri; Cotner College, Bethany, Nebraska; Virginia Christian College, now Lynchburg, Lynchburg, Virginia; Milligan College, Johnson City, Tennessee; Christian University, now Culver-Stockton College, Canton, Missouri;

Carr-Burdette College, Sherman, Texas; Bethany College, Bethany, West Virginia; Eugene Divinity School, Eugene, Oregon, now Northwest Christian College; Madison Institute for Young Ladies, Richmond, Kentucky; Eureka College, Eureka, Illinois; Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio; and the Georgie Robertson College, now Freed-Hardeman, Henderson, Tennessee. The descriptive data reflects the continuing optimism of the founders together with the assumption by the author that each one was closely identified with the Christian Churches. As a matter of fact, the material is written as if the educational institutions existed for the benefit of the churches and for no other reason. Many of the teachers and students, however, apparently had somewhat different views even at that time.

Another section, called "College and University Presidents," lists such notable worthies as Burris A. Jenkins, Bethany graduate of 1891, President of Kentucky University, now Transylvania; J. W. McGarvey, graduated from Bethany College in 1850, President of the College of the Bible, now Lexington Theological Seminary; Edmund Burritt Wakefield who started his education at Bethany and then went to Hiram, President of Hiram College; Thomas Elsworth Cramblet, President of Bethany College; Hill McClelland Bell, President of Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa; Robert Enoch Hieronymus, President of Eureka College; Oliver A. Carr, President of Carr-Burdette College, Sherman, Texas; William Prince Aylsworth, President of Cotner College; Ely Vaughan Zollars, Bethany College 1875, President of what is now Texas Christian University; Carl Johann, President of Christian University, now Culver-Stockton; James Benjamin Jones, graduate of Kentucky University, President of William Woods College; Ashley S. Johnson, President of Johnson Bible College, Kimberlin Heights, Tennessee; Adoniram Judson Thomas, President of Louisville Bible School, Louisville, Kentucky;

J. B. Lehman, President, Southern Christian Institute, Edwards, Mississippi; F. C. Button, Kentucky University 1887, President of Morehead Normal School, Morehead, Kentucky; and William H. Cord, President, Hazel Green Academy, Hazel Green, Kentucky. This important list shows the individualism of the colleges at the turn of the century. Each president was a responsible entrepreneur for the Lord carrying on a program for the education of youth and to the best of his ability for the benefit of the Christian Churches. Practically all were ministers.

A careful reading of the 1904 report shows the colleges to be generally in the Campbell tradition but with additional problems growing out of the nature of the times. Dozens of colleges founded earlier were dead by that time and many of those mentioned in Brown's book have now perished. Only the determined leadership of the educators, the dedication of the churches, and the help of the adjacent communities enabled the schools to keep going. Even then the optimistic hope for great academic success shines through each college's report.

THE REEVES AND RUSSELL STUDY

A much more comprehensive, systematic, and thorough review of the colleges associated with the Board of Higher Education came in 1929 as a result of the strong leadership of H. O. Pritchard in the Board and at the urging of H. H. Harmon who was the secretary of the newly formed Department of Endowments. Harmon refused to begin a brotherhood campaign to endow the colleges until "a complete and searching survey of the institution had been made and accurate information obtained in a scientific manner regarding its work and needs."[8] Floyd W. Reeves of the University of Chicago was invited to direct such a survey which was carried out with the help of the Board and its staff. Both Pritchard and Harmon made significant contributions to the

study. John Dale Russell, himself an expert on college surveys, joined with his professor colleague, Floyd Reeves, in publishing the volume, *College Organization and Administration*. This volume became a bench mark in the theory of college administration as it was taught by the School of Education at the University of Chicago. This factor alone gave considerable prestige to the Disciple colleges which were the subject of the study. The book is not so much a report on the Disciple colleges, on which it supplies considerable detail, but it is a general textbook for students who intended to enter the field of college administration.

This book, still in use at the University of Chicago School of Education, asks searching questions about: (1) supporting constituency; (2) founding and early history; (3) relationship to other educational institutions; (4) character of work attempted; (5) environmental influences; (6) the field offered; (7) contributions made. With these preliminary procedures in mind the study proceeds to examine the service rendered by the institutions; the control, organization and internal administration; the physical plant and equipment; the program of studies; problems relating to students; the instructional loads; the faculties of the institutions; accounting and budgetary procedures; cost studies; effective use of financial resources; sources of revenue; scholarship and loan funds; economic factors effecting the support of institutions of higher learning; and the status of the institutions at that time. The study was confined to the four-year colleges although some reference is made to all of the institutions then affiliated with the Board of Higher Education which are listed as follows:

GROUP I—Standard Four-Year Colleges and Universities:
- Bethany College, Bethany, West Virginia.
- Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana.
- Culver-Stockton College, Canton, Missouri.
- Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa

Eureka College, Eureka, Illinois.
Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio.
Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, Virginia.
Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma.
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas.
Transylvania College, Lexington, Kentucky.

GROUP II—Four-Year Colleges Accredited by State Departments of Education or State Universities:
Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, North Carolina.
California Christian College, Los Angeles, California.
Cotner College, Lincoln, Nebraska.
Spokane University, Spokane, Washington.

GROUP III—Standard Junior Colleges:
Christian College, Columbia, Missouri.
William Woods College, Fulton, Missouri.

GROUP IV—Junior Colleges Accredited by State Departments of Education or State Universities:
Carr-Burdette College, Sherman, Texas.
Missouri Christian College, Camden Point, Missouri.
Randolph College, Cisco, Texas.
Hamilton College, Lexington, Kentucky.

GROUP V—Institutions Affiliated with Universities or Colleges for the Purpose of Rendering Special Types of Services:
Bible College of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.
Disciples Divinity House, Chicago, Illinois.
Drury School of the Bible, Springfield, Missouri.
Illinois Disciples Foundation, Champaign, Illinois.
Indiana School of Religion, Bloomington, Indiana.
Kansas Christian Foundation, Topeka, Kansas.
Nebraska Disciples Foundation, Lincoln, Nebraska.
Oklahoma Christian Foundation, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
The College of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky.
University School of Religion, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

These highly disciplined examiners found the colleges at that time to be teaching institutions in contradistinction to research institutions or general service institutions. They reported the enrollments of eight of these institutions for the year 1925-26 as:

Atlantic Christian	139
Bethany	300
Cotner	250
Culver-Stockton	260
Eureka	288
Hiram	369
Lynchburg	232
Transylvania	331

for a total of 2,169 students. This was up from 1,450 in 1920-21. Of these students 60.9% were members of the Christian Churches. One out of every two graduates of these institutions continued to live in the states where their alma mater was located. Most of them came to the college from within a radius of fifty miles.

As noted, earlier colleges in Campbell's tradition had fully or partially self-perpetuating boards of control without any restrictions with reference to church membership. The boards tended to be large with an average of more than twenty people on the theory that a larger board is helpful in the development of resources. Then, as now, large boards depended on executive committees to get things done. The boards for the most part were then performing at the appropriate level of policy rather than meddling in the administration. In two of the institutions, however, the Chicago pedagogues found board members interfering in the discipline of students. The institutions were cited for failure to organize in such a way that athletics were adequately controlled and subordinated to the academic interests of the college. Even then intercollegiate athletics appear to have been sometimes regarded as "the poison ivy on the halls of learning."

The physical plant and equipment of Disciple colleges in 1926 were not very impressive. Atlantic Christian, Bethany, Butler, California Christian, Carr-Burdette, Christian Col-

lege, Cotner, Culver-Stockton, Drake, Eureka, Hiram, Lynchburg, Missouri Christian, Phillips, Randolph, Spokane, Texas Christian, Transylvania (including the College of the Bible and Hamilton), and William Woods, valued their total assets in buildings at only $7,122,388. Drake University was then most opulent with a million dollars in buildings. Eureka claimed only $262,000. This total for the colleges, however, represented a 30% increase in value since 1922. The systematic researchers fixed the value per student in these Disciple colleges at $389. Even then the efficiency experts were complaining that the buildings they had were poorly utilized.

At the level of curriculum the colleges were already organized into departments with major and minor requirements. The examiners took exception to the fact that even graduate students were able to take freshman and sophomore courses for credit, that there were no clear distinctions between upper and lower divisions, and that upon examination most of the four-year colleges turned out to be junior colleges with small and inefficient additional enrollments in the upper divisions. There is the suggestion that the institutions then offering graduate studies might well confine themselves to the M.A. degree on account of limited resources such as faculties, libraries, and laboratories.

A weary college executive today finds satisfaction in reading the chapter entitled, "Problems Relating to Students." Life then was relatively simple, but Reeves and Russell lodged several complaints. The Thurston Psychological Tests for College Freshmen were fairly new and were utilized at nine of the institutions. These tests showed the men to be slightly superior even though the women far outstripped the men in grades—26.7 grade points to 15.2 for the men. The examiners found the students in the Disciple colleges to be about average in intelligence in comparison to the 109 colleges against which they were compared al-

though one or two unnamed institutions were cited as drawing students of considerably less intellectual ability than appear in the control group. These studies show that fraternity members and non-fraternity members earned about the same number of quality points, but that athletes earned about eight points less than the all-college average. While basketball players were only slightly less than the all-college average, football players were down by twelve points. Students who felt impelled to withdraw from college generally did so on account of lack of specialization. The Disciple colleges even then were not giving sufficient attention to professional training to hold their students.

Average teaching loads ranged from seventeen hours at Eureka to twelve at California Christian for the year 1925-26. The surveyors tried to reach a truly comparable basis for measuring teaching loads by hitting on the idea of a student-clock-hour which they defined as "one student under instruction in lecture, quiz or laboratory for at least fifty minutes net." They found wide variations within the institutions and within the departments of each institution. They found heaviest teaching loads in the departments of education, science, history, English, and foreign languages. The examiners did not charge the colleges with overloading its teachers indicating that sixteen-hour loads were about right. They made no mention of the American Association of University Professors.

Faculty salaries at Disciple institutions in 1927-28 are of considerable interest. The median for all ranks was $2,420, with professors at $2,819, associates at $2,550, assistants at $2,150, and instructors at $1,696. Five of the institutions paid their professors more than $3,000, but twenty-two of them were below $2,600 for their professors. Fourteen paid instructors only $1,545. These salaries were not badly out of line with denominational colleges of the North Central Association for 1928. The median salary for all

ranks in twenty comparable institutions was $2,522 against $2,420 for the Disciples. The highest average, however, for all ranks was lower at the Disciple institutions at $2,844 while the control group of North Central stood at $3,529. For the rank of professor the highest average salary found among the Disciple institutions was $3,300 while the North Central group enjoyed a highest average salary for professors of $4,000. The control group included Antioch, Coe, Concordia, DePauw, Earlham, Franklin, Gustavus Adolphus, Hamline, Huron, Illinois College, Illinois Wesleyan, Illinois Woman's College, James Milliken, Knox, Macalester, Monmouth, Ohio Wesleyan, St. Olaf, Shurtleff, and Wabash.

Many of the Disciple colleges had no retirement provisions for their faculty members. Turnover was fairly high with the brain drain factor to the more prestigious universities. Twenty per cent turnover was not uncommon. Faculty organization left something to be desired with too many teachers at the professorial rank. Tenure policy was spotty. Faculty training, in like manner, was uneven with only 29.8% with three or more years of graduate training; 18.9% with two years of graduate training, 40% with only one year of graduate training; and 10.8% with less than one year of graduate training. This was slightly below the average for comparable denominational colleges and substantially below the average for state universities. The examiners were astonished that the amount of scholarly research carried on by the faculty of Disciple institutions was considerably smaller than that of comparable colleges. They attributed this lack to heavy teaching loads and lack of stimulating contacts.

Accounting and budgetary procedures were found to be less than ideal without clear distinctions between capital and current income. Accounting procedures with regard to departments also were found to be spotty and generally unsatisfactory. While most of the institutions were audited in

satisfactory fashion, a more thoroughgoing system of audits appropriate to higher education was recommended.

The averages for ten Disciple institutions showed 67.19% devoted to instruction, 19.45% to administration, and 13.36% for operation and maintenance. This was for the year 1925-26. Reeves and Russell held that 70% is an ideal proportion of expense devoted to education which left the Disciple institutions in about the right proportion. For historic purposes it is interesting that thirteen Disciple institutions had educational budgets for 1925-26 of $933,166.55 for an enrollment of 3,422 students, making a cost per student of $273. The colleges reported were Phillips, Transylvania, Atlantic Christian, Cotner, Christian College, Spokane University, Lynchburg, California Christian, Hiram, William Woods, Culver-Stockton, Eureka, and Bethany.*

Reeves and Russell praised the Disciple colleges for their effective use of financial resources. The poverty of the institutions accounted for the effective use of funds. The examiners offered the opinion, however, that low enrollments were largely responsible for much of the stringent financial situation of the Christian Church colleges. Funds for the schools came from students, endowments, and gifts, but the largest percentage came from students. Sixty-one per cent of all income for educational purposes came from tuition fees in 1926 for the Disciple colleges studied; 27% came from endowments. Today the percentage from student charges would be 20 or 30% higher. The endowment funds then held were handled in commendable fashion, but the efficiency of educational management in terms of larger

*It is interesting to compare this data with our current situation. Bethany had an expenditure of $129,527 for 290 students in 1925-26 at a cost per student of $447. For 1970-71 Bethany has an educational and general budget of $2,469,422 at an average of $2,286.44 per student. Bethany's educational budget for this year is twice as much as that for thirteen Disciple institutions in 1926 with approximately one-third as many students at Bethany.

classes and better ratios came in for some criticism.

The study dealing with fifteen of the Disciple institutions shows total church membership in the general area together with per capita income for that area to be principal factors in college support. Reeves and Russell offered the opinion that the future of Disciple institutions depended on their ability to find themselves in a region populated with members of the Christian Church who have relatively high per capita income or else move to more populous locations of relatively greater opulence. It was natural that they identified the colleges located in urban areas as most likely to survive and least likely to maintain the high percentage of Disciple students.

This exemplary study sponsored by the Board of Higher Education concluded with a review of the educational deficiencies of the Disciple colleges and recent improvements. They charged the college administrators with lack of financial training and management expertise. They were critical of the lack of a clear definition of role and function on the part of the faculties and administrators, and they made major reference to the poverty of the entire lot.

In the section dealing with recent improvements they made mention of the improved physical facilities with library holdings doubled between 1922 and 1926, buildings better utilized, curricula rethought and improved, standards lifted, degrees brought into uniformity with comparable institutions, graduate work reduced in institutions unable to carry it, preparatory work discontinued, faculty better trained, teaching loads reduced, business methods improved, and instruction substantially improved. The study concluded: "Finally, and possibly most important of all, the problems of the institutions have been attacked in a scientific manner, leading to the hope that, under such a type of scientific analysis, the problems that arise in the future will be solved more satisfactorily."[9]

COLLEGES OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST AND THE BIBLE COLLEGES

While I do not have any such detailed information on the colleges associated with the Churches of Christ, I can only presume that similar conditions would have prevailed. Through the kindness of my colleague, Leroy Garrett, now professor at Bishop College in Dallas, I have a rather complete list of Churches of Christ colleges as they exist at the present time. They are:

SENIOR COLLEGES:

Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas
David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tennessee
Pepperdine University, Los Angeles, California
Florida Christian College, Temple Terrace, Florida
Lubbock Christian College, Lubbock, Texas
Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas
Oklahoma Christian College, Oklahoma City

JUNIOR COLLEGES:

Christian College of the Southwest, Dallas, Texas
Fort Worth Christian College, Fort Worth, Texas
Southwestern Christian College, Terrell, Texas
Southeastern Christian College, Winchester, Kentucky
Alabama Christian College, Montgomery, Alabama
Northeastern Christian Junior College, Villanova, Pennsylvania
Ibaraki Christian College, Japan
Great Lakes Christian College, Beamesville, Ontario, Canada
Ohio Valley Christian College, Parkersburg, West Virginia
Columbia Christian College, Portland, Oregon
Freed-Hardeman College, Henderson, Tennessee
York College, York, Nebraska
Christian College, Saskatchewan, Canada
Michigan Junior Christian College, Flint, Michigan

These Church of Christ colleges have for the most part

continued in the Campbell tradition with the same characteristics outlined for Bacon, Bethany, and Franklin. They have tended to be colleges of arts and sciences rather than seminaries and Bible colleges. All of them have been dependent upon the individual initiative of their founders and successors. Some of them have grown to considerable size and prominence. Pepperdine, for instance, now has three campuses—two in California and one in Germany. David Lipscomb of Nashville is the oldest, dating back to 1891.

The Bible college movement is of considerable interest. It belongs, for the most part, to the portion of the movement associated now with the North American Christian Convention. The Bible college is a sort of undergraduate seminary which serves very well to prepare ministers who do not have time to devote seven years to background and professional training for the ministry. The *Christian Standard* of August 17, 1946, listed a page of facts about the Bible colleges. They represent wide geographical distribution and a spread of founding dates from Johnson Bible College in 1893 to Eastern Christian and Midwest Christian founded just before the 1946 article went to press. The alphabetical list may have some historic value. They are:

Alberta Bible College, Calgary, Alberta, Canada
Atlanta Christian College, Atlanta, Georgia
Cincinnati Bible Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio
Boise Bible College, Boise, Idaho
Dakota Bible College, Arlington, South Dakota
Eastern Christian Institute, Orange, New Jersey
Johnson Bible College, Kimberlin Heights, Tennessee
Kentucky Christian College, Grayson, Kentucky
Lincoln Bible Institute, Lincoln, Illinois
Manhattan Bible College, Manhattan, Kansas
Midwest Christian College, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Minnesota Bible College, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Nebraska Christian College, Norfolk, Nebraska
Northwest Christian College, Eugene, Oregon

Ozark Bible College, Joplin, Missouri
Pacific Bible Seminary, Long Beach, California
Restoration Bible College, San Antonio, Texas
San Jose Bible College, San Jose, California

These colleges for the year 1946 list an enrollment of 1,882. This is an impressive array of young people training for the most part for the Christian ministry. Many of them, no doubt, supplemented their Bible college training by subsequent baccalaureate degrees and graduate study. Many others were happy with the shorter road into the ministry.

The Bible colleges are not strictly in the tradition of Campbell's philosophy of higher education. While he argued that Bethany was a college founded on the Bible, he had a considerable bias against seminaries as such and seminaries as substitutes for education in the liberal arts and sciences in particular. The Bible colleges have followed Campbell's tradition, however, by making the Bible the core of their studies. Some of them have introduced the sciences, social sciences, and humanities in moderate degrees even though the professional training for an effective ministry leaves little time for pursuit of the liberal arts and sciences on a concurrent basis.

The 1970 yearbook, called *A Directory of the Ministry*, published by an "undenominational fellowship of Christian Churches and Churches of Christ," lists on page F-14 a somewhat more extensive series of Bible colleges. Seventeen have been added including:

CHRISTIAN COLLEGES

Supervised by the Elders of a Local Church or Churches

Dorr Drive School of the Ministry, Rutland, Vermont
Hamburg School of the Ministry, Hamburg, Iowa
Midwestern School of Evangelism, Ottumwa, Iowa

Serving Racial Groups

Colegio Biblico, Eagle Pass, Texas
College of the Scriptures, Louisville, Kentucky
Winston-Salem Bible College, Winston-Salem, North Carolina

With Board of Trustees and Officers of Administration

Central Christian College of the Bible, Moberly, Missouri
Dallas Christian College, Dallas, Texas
Great Lakes Bible College, Lansing, Michigan
Intermountain Bible College, Grand Junction, Colorado
Louisville Bible College, Louisville, Kentucky
Maritime Christian College, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Canada
Memphis Christian College, Memphis, Tennessee
Platte Valley Bible College, Scottsbluff, Nebraska
Puget Sound College of the Bible, Seattle, Washington
Roanoke Bible College, Elizabeth City, North Carolina
So. Louis Christian College, Florissant, Missouri

The reported gross value for all Bible colleges has risen to $19,811,613. The total enrollment is listed at 4,223 with 541 faculty members. Some of these schools have expanded their offerings to include institutes, short courses, and self-study guided by correspondence. The yearbook lists in addition one liberal arts college, Milligan College of Milligan College, Tennessee, and three graduate schools, one Bible Chair, and several nursery schools, kindergartens, elementary, secondary, and adult training schools.

My opportunity to study the curriculum and academic program of these institutions has been limited to the older, established institutions such as Johnson Bible College and Manhattan Bible College. The programs at these institutions have been greatly influenced by their Campbell heritage—particularly in the field of Biblical studies which have dominated the curriculum. While the aim has been an acceptable and effective ministry without too much delay,

the teachers tend to encourage graduates to continue their studies and qualify for the more traditional baccalaureate and graduate professional degrees.

The trustees, faculty, and students of the Bible colleges are, for the most part, all members of the Christian Church. These colleges, however, are not owned by the churches except in the rare cases wherein a church starts the college and supplies its own funds to support its early development. The Bible college which grows and flourishes tends to become an independent corporation founded by individuals with the approval of adjacent churches. These institutions have prepared some very able men for the ministry of preaching, scholarship, and religious statesmanship.

IV

The Present Predicament of the Colleges

Church-related colleges in America are in a time of testing and those associated with the Christian Churches have their full share of problems. It is my purpose to examine the major difficulties now facing the institutions of higher learning associated with the Board of Higher Education. The problems facing the colleges associated with the Churches of Christ would make an equally fascinating study. The successes and difficulties of the Bible colleges associated with the North American Christian Convention are of considerable interest to members of the movement. It is not possible, however, to include the present problems of all these institutions in this lecture series. I have, therefore, deliberately limited this chapter to those colleges and universities associated with the Board of Higher Education of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ). They are eighteen in number. I have excluded the seminaries, seminary foundation houses, Bible chairs and schools of religion. The colleges and universities, therefore, under consideration are Atlantic Christian College, Bethany College, Butler University, Chapman College, Columbia College, Culver-Stockton College, Drake University, Eureka College, Hiram

College, Jarvis Christian College, Lynchburg College, Midway Junior College, Northwest Christian College, Phillips University, Texas Christian University, Tougaloo College, Transylvania University, and William Woods College.

Many of the conditions that brought these institutions into existence no longer obtain. Campbell's argument that the nascent movement should do its share in the education of young America has already been accomplished and there are tax supported colleges and universities all over the land. The Chamber of Commerce motive which called for a college in each community has in like manner turned to government sources for community junior colleges, technical schools, and other educational needs. The sectionalism of Campbell's day has little or no meaning in an age when most concerns are national by law, economy, and culture. The personal desire to teach and train young people has found satisfaction in a variety of already existent colleges, universities, and other educational ventures. The surviving institutions, however, have developed new constituencies and new impressive reasons for continued existence and service. They face, nevertheless, certain serious problems which they have in common.

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

Education, always expensive, has become almost exorbitant. Campbell was fully aware of the enormous expense involved in the creation and endowment of an institution of higher learning. He argued for fewer and better colleges in America. "We have, indeed, too many colleges and universities, too many institutions so *called,* in all the Religious denominations of our country. And we, as a *Christian* people, have, in one sense, already outgrown ourselves, as

well as outgrown other denominations of religionists in the penchant for colleges and universities."[1] Since mid-century, salaries, which constitute about one-half of each college budget, have multiplied as much as three, four or five times while the salaries and wages in business and industry have scarcely doubled. Endowment, once so promising a factor in all private education, is proportionately less productive than it was in the days of Campbell. Emily Tubman's $50,000 to Bethany College at mid-nineteenth century produced 7% and carried a large portion of the expense in modern languages. An endowment of $500,000 today would accomplish less proportionately. The 1929 Reeves and Russell study showed that 27% of the income for educational purposes came from endowments in the Disciple institutions included. Today that percentage is substantially reduced. Bethany College, for example, with an endowment of a million dollars for each one hundred students then, as now, has seen the percentage of income for current expense from endowment fall from 25% to 5%; but even if endowment were as proportionately productive it would be even more difficult to acquire. Endowments are developed from unusual gifts and bequests rather than from development campaigns. Most institutions find it necessary to spend every dollar of gift money for current expense, buildings, equipment, and other urgent needs instead of placing resources in an endowment that produces only 5% interest. Few foundations make grants to endowment funds. Most corporations have a policy against it and individuals who make substantial gifts for endowment purposes do so generally only as wills and bequests with a more modest number making some sort of deferred gift such as an annuity or a life income contract.

The principal source of current income for these colleges is student charges. The Reeves and Russell study found 61% of total receipts coming from students in 1929 while today Disciple colleges would average as much as 85 or 90%. This

means that these private colleges must have affluent students in order to survive. The old idea that any dedicated young person could attend a church-related college is true only when some unusual source of financial aid is available. With tuition charges running more than $2,000 a year at some of the schools there is a concomitant need for scholarships and grants-in-aid. Federally funded programs are of great benefit; state scholarship and financial aid arrangements are helpful; endowed scholarships are of considerable assistance; corporate grants contribute, but most schools find it necessary to use some current funds to support the student aid program. This reduces the effectiveness of high tuition charges for the support of the institution and leaves the college faced with the same old fiscal predicament of burgeoning costs and sluggish income. Many institutions now feel that they are about to price themselves out of the market. This is no groundless fear when one realizes that next door is a community college where tuition charges are meager or nonexistent.

Church support for current expense, once an important factor in the life of Disciple colleges, is now of minor importance. Bethany College, for example, receives less than $50,000 a year toward a budget which exceeds four million. Some denominational colleges receive from their affiliated churches a substantial portion of their operating budgets, but even these are facing diminishing interest on the part of their denominational leaders. The Episcopal Church, for example, has substantially phased out its colleges in favor of maintaining its seminaries. The Presbyterian Church has no systematic way of supporting its present institutions which leaves a heavy promotional burden on the colleges themselves to which the churches respond, but in a somewhat diminishing fashion. Pressures for other priorities have reduced commitments to many Methodist and even Lutheran institutions of higher learning. Church leaders fail

to see much difference between history, science, and English taught at a tax supported institution and a church supported institution. The inclination, therefore, is to urge support for the seminaries but to utilize state institutions for general collegiate education. The Christian Churches, losing population, facing reduced budgets in local as well as outreach programs, are in no position to put such massive sums of money into their numerous colleges as these institutions require. The Men and Millions Movement,[2] though only partially successful, placed buildings and endowments in Disciple colleges in larger proportions than all the Christian Churches could provide today if such a campaign were undertaken, and the likelihood for such an effort is remote.

Since students pay most of the operating expense of Disciple colleges, the admission program of each institution is its very lifeline. The drawing power of the colleges varies widely. Some of the institutions are predominantly local with most of the students coming from within fifty miles, while others enroll students from most of the states and many foreign countries. With low cost community colleges at hand in many places a college must have great appeal to the youth or face disaster. In this predicament, location becomes crucial. Institutions that have no contiguous density of population, such as a city or a high percentage of Christian Churches with strong preference for their own church-related college, are faced with dwindling enrollments and financial difficulties.

The Christian Churches once supplied most of the students for their colleges. In 1929 six out of every ten students came from the supporting communion, but that situation has changed drastically.[3] Today several institutions have only one out of four or five from the Christian Churches. As tuition fees have risen Christian Church young people have tended to go to the tax supported institutions where costs are minimal, while the few that have ample means

prefer prestige universities rather than their own institutions. The percentage of young people attending college from the Christian Churches, is moreover, less than several other denominations can claim. The Disciple colleges have been forced to appeal to other constituencies in order to keep their dormitories occupied and their faculties paid. The future of these private institutions depends as much on drawing power as any other one factor.

Management varies widely within the Disciple colleges. The days when a few scholars could assemble, surround themselves with students and conduct the affairs of the college on an informal basis are over. A college or university today is a business institution which requires the same kind of management skills as any other corporation or company. Unfortunately, many college executives do not know the financial plight of their institutions until time for correction is past. Many of the Disciple colleges which have expired have expired because the trends that led to failure were identified too late for corrective measures to be effective. Planning is a crucial factor in the survival of any human institution and it is absolutely crucial for the citadels of learning.

The future of Disciple colleges is not greatly different than the past in terms of survival power—it depends on leadership. In this time of financial crunch with burgeoning costs and retarded income the college executive becomes the major hope for institutional survival. He must learn how to manage to reduce expenditures while at the same time promoting attendance and gifts to improve income. Management qualities are somewhat difficult to find among academic people, but the survival and growth of several of these institutions demonstrates the hidden ability of some leaders which appears when a critical situation requires it. Those institutions which can identify presidents, deans, and business managers who can utilize resourcefully

the combination of personnel, plant, and equipment in such a way that education is enhanced rather than impaired and, at the same time, inspire generosity on the part of benefactors are likely to survive and prosper. Those who do not find such leadership, win it, and hold it, will end up in the tradition of those erstwhile institutions whose buildings stand as tombstones and where students go no more.

PROBLEMS OF PURPOSE

The distinctive role of the Disciple colleges is difficult to define. Many would argue that they have no distinctive role. The founding purposes have faded, leaving the expectations on the part of the church leaders and the expectations on the part of college leaders some considerable distance apart. A few of the institutions still serve the function of providing a place for Christian Church young people to study whether they intend to enter church vocations or not, but the factors mentioned earlier of high cost, increasing secular and educational tendencies within the colleges, and the meager support from the churches have reduced the importance of this function. Church leaders complain that those young people who do attend their own church colleges tend to move into other religious bodies or leave the church altogether very much as they would if they were attending secular institutions. While most of the colleges make special effort to serve Christian Church youth and to provide departments of religion taught by Christian Church teachers, the clear and self-evident advantage to the churches is difficult to establish since their percentage of enrollment within the colleges is diminishing and the churches themselves are less successful in sending students and money to support their colleges.

Thoughtful educators and church leaders alike have argued that the churches can still love, cherish, and modestly

support their higher education institutions even though the direct benefit is reduced, and that as long as the colleges are first-rate they represent institutions of prestige and meaning for the benefit of the churches. This attitude is worthy and mutually acceptable, but a thoughtful historian can but remember that Harvard was once Congregational, Columbia was once Episcopal, Brown and Chicago were once Baptist, Princeton was once Presbyterian, and Vanderbilt was once Methodist. As the Disciple colleges grow strong and prestigious, the tendency arises for less and less identity with the sponsoring churches. The Quakers, more than any other religious body, have been able to maintain close identity with their colleges and universities. Haverford and Swarthmore have become still more Quaker as they have grown in endowments and prestige. They have become more Quaker, but this does not mean the same thing that it would mean in the Christian Churches, for the central motivation of the Friends does not include increased membership, more churches, and larger budgets. The Quaker mission has more identity with the social concerns paramount at any given moment in history.

William L. Miller, President of the Board of Higher Education, and his colleagues have been working toward a redefinition of purpose for the Christian Church colleges. This effort derives partly from the restructuring efforts of the religious body with the consequent requirement that all agencies define their purposes and relate them to the restructured church. The identity crisis of the colleges with relationship to the church is apparent when one studies the "Proposed Principles Describing Relationships of Higher Education Institutions and The Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)" which was presented to the meeting of the Board of Higher Education in March, 1971. Contained within the full text which defined church-college relationships as national in character; which spelled out common

purposes and mutual goals; which found dependence upon mutual understanding and mutual programs of support, were the following interpretive statements:

> The day may come, if it has not already arrived, in which a decision must be made as to how the church can best fulfill its desired goals in higher education. Granted the limitation of funds, what criteria should the church use in the deployment of its funds? How many institutions can it viably assist? Decisions of such import should be made by the General Board of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).
>
> Higher education related to the church designs itself intentionally to make use of the Judeo-Christian faith in the learning process by providing a continuing forum in which faith and learning confront each other.
>
> The church is involved in higher education because it believes this enterprise has goals in common with the church (e.g., leadership development for church and society, lay and ordained; pursuit of truth; freedom of inquiry, etc.). It is through the attainment of mutual goals that common purposes are fulfilled.
>
> The church will establish its goals (objectives) through its General Assembly; and in the area of Higher Education through its Division of Higher Education; the educational institutions their goals through their own appropriate structures.
>
> Neither higher education institutions nor church dictates the purposes, policies, objectives, or programs of the other. Both, however, have enough in common to be allies or to be related.
>
> . . . the church and the educational institutions will develop avenues of communication on a continuing basis. . . . New methods of communication will also be sought by these two institutions, e.g., sharing of self study reports, trustee minutes on the part of the educational institutions and the sharing of minutes, projections and actions by the Division of Higher Education.

> Relatedness would not be based solely on history or dollars, but on programs of support growing out of the common purposes and mutual goals.

The Executive Committee of the Board which developed the principles had the advantage of a similar study on the part of the Presbyterian Board of Christian Education. Harold H. Viehman, Secretary of the Department of Higher Education, Board of Christian Education of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, presented as a draft effort at stating the relationship a document which contained the following:

> That the church, within the limits of its financial resources, will enable and encourage support of the colleges by committing to them a portion of its own funds;
>
> That the church and the colleges will work together, and in coalition with other concerned public, to insure that all forms of higher education receive necessary and adequate funding from both tax secured and private sources;
>
> That central to the relation of church and college are faculty members, administrative officers and trustees who are fully sympathetic with and actively engaged in the pursuit of the declared purposes of the college;
>
> That the college shall serve as a center of learning committed to provide maximum opportunities for the responsible exercise of academic freedom by those who teach and those who learn.
>
> That courses in religious studies, including study of the Judeo-Christian tradition will be offered as primary contributors to a truly liberal education.

Just how the colleges will finally relate to the restructured church is not clear. It is clear, however, that the colleges

themselves must redefine their purposes in order to survive. Tax supported institutions provide excellent educational opportunities at minimal cost which obviates the necessity for the churches to duplicate this effort. The churches have founded separate seminaries to prepare people for the ministry which reduces the responsibility of the Christian Church colleges of arts and sciences. The denominational pride which prompted competitive founding of church-related colleges has lost its appeal. The Disciple college is a going institution in search of a new church-related purpose. Its secular bearing becomes more and more apparent as students and financial support from the Christian Church congregations decline.

ALTERNATIVES OF ACTION

The several roles which a Christian Church college could play are intriguing. It has all the advantages of an independent college with the plus factor of its church relationship. The church makes and can make no demands upon it as a *quid pro quo* for support other than the moral claims which would be there anyway. The college is free to experiment with a variety of studies which occur to creative and resourceful academic leaders. Some daring new curricular ventures have been and are being tried by these institutions of higher learning. Experiments in intercultural and international studies are illustrative. Chapman College has taken on a floating university. Transylvania has explored the possibility of a Latin American Institute. The college calendar has been divided and redivided in every known way with numbers attached thereto.

Another course open to these colleges is a specialty important to the religious body and relevant enough to the current social order to attract national attention. If, for example, one Disciple college could become the nation's

best source for ecclesiastical music so that students from all over the land would seek it out as they once did the Westminster Choir School, it would perform a unique service to the Christian Churches and to all the churches of Christendom at the same time. A college which dared to undertake such a program would soon attract national notice and prestige as its directors, its singers and instrumental artists gained the respect of the nation.

Religious education which originated in these Disciple colleges in like manner could very well become the specialty of a Disciple college if it is closely related to a seminary. Students from all denominations would tend to enroll at this institution as its reputation developed and its students took charge of the various educational programs of American churches. A similar opportunity is open in any one of the commonly accepted branches of learning for a college to specialize in the Christian interpretation of that particular discipline. A college, for example, could develop a national reputation in economics with particular attention to its roots in the Old Testament and its relationship to the growth of Protestant Christianity. Specializing opportunities in English, journalism, history, sociology, and the sciences are apparent. When modern universities began in the twelfth century each was celebrated for one program. Padua was law; Salerno was medicine; and Paris was theology. A college could gain a reputation for developing Christian lawyers or Christian physicians and occupy a position of great importance in the country. The institution that deliberately sets out to specialize will soon gain a reputation with the law schools or medical schools which will facilitate the admission of its students. As its reputation grows, the ablest students will seek it out.

The college can, if it must, look to the state and the nation for support to insure its survival. Government programs have given some aid to Disciple colleges and will,

no doubt, continue to supply more. The nature of the Christian Church and its relationship to the college makes it possible for the institution to qualify for state aid as a private institution without impairing its church relationship. Over the long run, however, as the college turns to the local, secular community and the local, state, and Federal governments for support, the church relationship is, to use the fine phrase of Robert Burns about his departed sweetheart, "A lingering star with lessening ray."

Perhaps the best role open to the Disciple college is to be absolutely unique in that it is the best, most highly endowed, most prestigious institution in the nation. This solution to the predicament, while very inviting, is much more difficult to achieve. It approaches the ridiculous level when one considers the obstacles. This ideal becomes not unlike that of the canny Scot who offered a million pound reward for anyone who could swim the Atlantic Ocean.

The climate of higher education is changing. The new life styles have invaded almost every campus in the land. The mobile-upward, neatly-groomed, eager, all-American student is difficult to find. The far-out, militant wing of the modern campus seems intent on taking over the institution and remaking the world rather than mastering the elements of information available in such quantity to the oncoming generation. The modern college campus knows the "future shock" described by Alvin Toffler.

The related churches, in like manner, have felt the corrosive influence of the modern mood. Instead of emphasizing the opinions held in common there is a new demand for confrontation. An adversary culture has developed within Christendom as well as within every campus but at different speeds and in different ways. Many of the solid citizens who make up the churches take a dim view of students who show abnormal propensity for producing hair and unusual imagination for wild dress. Many of the far-out,

young clergymen take a dim view of the stuffy men charged with the administration of complicated corporations known as colleges and universities. The adversary mood is not conducive to a good relationship between colleges and churches or between church colleges and the rest of society.

Educational leaders are challenged to restore some of the most honored traditional values of the university such as the patient search for truth, tolerance for opposing viewpoints, suspended judgment, humility, vision, and quiet integrity. Academic leaders who can exemplify these venerable ideals will do much to restore faith in the collegiate enterprise.

CONDITIONS FOR SURVIVAL

The Disciple colleges which survive this present predicament of difficult students, discipline, and self-oriented teachers, disenchanted benefactors, rising costs, and diminishing income will be those who have the qualities of leadership that enabled them to survive similar difficulties in times of war and depression. The leaders who can surround themselves with dedicated and resourceful colleagues, and who can sail a tight ship on a rough sea can survive. The conditions for survival and continued service are very clear.

The college must clarify its purpose and mobilize its resources to serve its deliberately chosen objectives. David Starr Jordon was not only wise but prophetic when he said, "All the world stands aside for the person who knows where he is going."

Management of limited resources is absolutely essential now. It bears repeating that every private and church-related college must manage wisely—yes stringently—or perish. The fierce competition of tax supported institutions together with flattened incomes with spiraling costs demand

the old business formula of "the sandbag on sales and broad ax on expenses." This may mean larger classes, better deployment of teachers, more efficient utilization of plant and personnel, tighter budget controls, and a leaner operation. Only those who are willing to deny themselves will survive.

The colleges must look to promotion with a new sense of urgency. The administrators must increase the visibility of their institutions in order to draw students and money. This means to develop something to talk about and then get many people to pass the word. The meteoric success of Stephens College in the nineteen thirties and Carlton College more recently were the result of just this kind of promotion based on something solid.

Admission and development people are the crucial college personnel in this time of severe competition. State schools have become expert at student recruitment and at the development of tax deductible gifts. This, together with substantial tax subvention, creates a difficult competitive situation for the church-related college. Far ranging admission counselors must find volunteer helpers among the alumni and the churches. Development officers must find support in the traditional constituencies of church and alumni but also in the community, the government, and among friends of learning both new and old.

Endowment, despite its growing limitations, appears to be the one best guarantee of continuity and service. An all out effort for wills, annuities, and other forms of deferred giving is the most promising formula for increased endowments. The cultivation of this kind of support, even though its benefits are long delayed, is strongly indicated. Texas Christian and Bethany, for example, have considerable advantage in these troubled days because of their endowments, inadequate as they are.

The halcyon days of one year at a time are over for campus leadership. Long range planning is the only way

to stay solvent and alive. Flexible planning leaves room for creative imagination to meet new conditions but sets budgetary, curricular, and personnel guidelines which avoid fiscal and organizational crises. If a college is going broke, the president should know about it ten years in advance in order that he can either guide or avert the tragedy.

These counsels of prudence are in the tradition of Alexander Campbell. He had no interest in failing institutions. He brought wisdom to temper his vision and prudence to discipline his daring. He saw the needs of young America through the dedicated eyes of the nascent Restoration Movement and built a college to meet the exigencies of his day. The academic leadership of his heritage will do well to assess our post industrial civilization and fashion colleges equal to the challenge. To love God with the whole mind is to find common goals for both spire and tower.

NOTES

Preface

[1] *Introductory Addresses Delivered at the Organization of Bethany College, November 2d, 1841* (Bethany, Va.: Printed by A. Campbell, 1841), p. 82.
[2] Alexander Campbell, "The Rank and Dignity of Man," *The Millennial Harbinger* (1838): 531.
[3] James W. Carty, Jr., *The Gresham Years* (Athens, Ohio: Lawhead Press, 1970), p. 214. [See Review article, "Campbell Years—Gresham Years," *Discipliana* 31 (1971): 4-6,15.]
[4] Carty, *Gresham Years*, pp. 170-71.
[5] *Introductory Addresses*, p. 83.
[6] *Bethany College Bulletin*, 65, no. 5 (May, 1972): 4.

Chapter I

[1] Winfred E. Garrison, "Pioneer in Broadcloth," in *The Sage of Bethany: A Pioneer in Broadcloth*, comp. Perry E. Gresham (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1960), pp. 45-65.
[2] Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1920), pp. 2-3.
[3] Henry Van Dyke, "The Bees," quoted in Edward McShane Waits, *A College Man's Religion and Other Studies in Religion and Life* (Fort Worth, Tex.: Stafford-Lowdon, 1929), p. 399.
[4] Paul Engle, *American Song: A Book of Poems* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Doran & Company, 1934), p. 14.
[5] Educational Policies Commission, *The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association of the United States, 1937), p. 47.
[6] Ernest Sutherland Bates, *American Faith: Its Religious, Political, and Economic Foundations* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1940), p. 337.
[7] Alexander Campbell, "Colleges," *The Millennial Harbinger* (1855): 8.—Hereinafter this magazine will be designated *M.H.*
[8] Alexander Campbell, "New Institution—No. IV," *M.H.* (1840): 219-20.
[9] Alexander Campbell, "Address to the Graduating Class of Bethany College, of 1860," *M.H.* (1860): 391-92.
[10] Alexander Campbell, "Baccalaureate Address, Delivered to the Graduating Class of Bethany College, July 4, 1852," *M.H.* (1852): 362.
[11] Alexander Campbell, "Baccalaureate Address," *M.H.* (1858): 427.
[12] Mattathes [pseud.], "Education," *M.H.* (1843): 447.
[13] Alexander Campbell, "Education," *M.H.* (1837): 258.
[14] Alexander Campbell, "Reply to the Above," *M.H.* (1860): 369-70.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 372.

[16] John Locke, *The Educational Writings of John Locke,* ed. James L. Axtell (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1968), p. 325.
[17] Alexander Campbell, "Baccalaureate Address, July, 1859," *M.H* (1859): 429.
[18] Alexander Campbell, *Popular Lectures and Addresses* (St. Louis: John Burns, n.d.), p. 309.
[19] Cymro [psued.], "Knowledge Indispensable to Religion," *M.H.* (1841): 208.
[20] Alexander Campbell, "Bethany College," *M.H.* (1849): 465.
[21] Campbell, *Popular Lectures,* p. 117.
[22] R. Freeman Butts, *The College Charts its Course: Historical Conceptions and Current Proposals* (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1939), p. 164.
[23] Campbell, *Popular Lectures,* p. 294.
[24] Alexander Campbell, "Essay on the Importance of Uniting the Moral with the Intellectual Culture of the Mind," *M.H.* (1836): 583.
[25] Campbell, *Popular Lectures,* p. 295.
[26] Campbell, "Essay on the Importance" 585-87.
[27] Charles D. Hurlbott, "Self-Education," *M.H.* (1839): 594.
[28] Campbell, *Popular Lectures,* pp. 125-26.
[29] Locke, *Educational Writings,* p. 275.
[30] Campbell, *Popular Lectures,* p. 126.
[31] *Ibid.,* pp. 126-27.
[32] *Ibid.,* p. 308.
[33] Alexander Campbell, "Education—No. I. New Series," *M.H.* (1842): 17.
[34] John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (London: George Routledge and Sons, n.d.), p. 491.
[35] *Ibid.,* p. 557.
[36] Alexander Campbell, "Baccalaureate Address, Delivered to the Graduating Class of Bethany College, July 4, 1856," *M.H.* (1856): 406.

Chapter II

[1] Eva Jean Wrather, *History in Stone and Stained Glass for the Thomas W. Phillips Memorial* (Nashville: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1958), p. 20.
[2] Alexander Campbell, "A Baccalaureate Address, Delivered to ten graduates at Bethany College, July 4th, 1845," *M.H.* (1845): 319.
[3] Alexander Campbell, *Popular Lectures and Addresses* (St. Louis: John Burns, n.d.), p. 301.
[4] Alexander Campbell, "Address to Graduates—Third Session—Bethany College," *M.H.* (1844): 359.
[5] *Ibid.,* p. 354.
[6] "Intermediate Examinations in Bethany College," *M.H.* (1857): 173.
[7] Alexander Campbell, "Baccalaureate Address. Delivered July 4th, to the Graduating Class of Bethany College," *M.H.* (1849): 433.
[8] Alexander Campbell, "Bethany College," *M.H.* (1841): 378.

[9] R., "Commencement at Bethany College," *M.H.* (1866): 323-24.

[10] Leroy Garrett, *Alexander Campbell and Thomas Jefferson: A Comparative Study of Two Old Virginians* (Dallas: Wilkinson Publishing Co., 1963), p. 19.

[11] Alexander Campbell, "Bethany College," *M.H.* (1855): 227.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 228.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 229.

[14] R. Freeman Butts, *The College Charts Its Course: Historical Conceptions and Current Proposals* (New York: McGraw Hill Publishing Company, 1939), p. 93.

[15] See Leroy Garrett's study on *Alexander Campbell and Thomas Jefferson.*

[16] Campbell, *Popular Lectures*, pp. 307, 486.

[17] Alexander Campbell, "Education," *M.H.* (1837): 201.

[18] Alexander Campbell, "Bethany College," *M.H.* (1841): 272.

[19] Campbell, *Popular Lecturers*, p. 255.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 301.

[21] Alexander Campbell, "An Address," *M.H.* (1841): 447.

[22] Campbell, *Popular Lectures*, p. 254.

[23] Alexander Campbell, "Baccalaureate Address Delivered to the Graduating Class of Bethany College: July 4, 1851," *M.H.* (1851): 442.

[24] Campbell, *Popular Lectures*, p. 301.

[25] Alexander Campbell, "Baccalaureate Address, Delivered to the Graduating Class of Bethany College, July 4, 1853," *M.H.* (1853): 426.

[26] Campbell, *Popular Lectures*, p. 503.

[27] Alexander Campbell, "Woman and Her Mission: An Address delivered before the Henry Female Seminary, New Castle, Ky., May 30, 1856," *M.H.* (1856): 301-314.

[28] Campbell, *Popular Lectures*, p. 511.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 298.

[30] Alexander Campbell, "Ninth Commencement of Bethany College," *M.H.* (1850): 462.

[31] Alexander Campbell, "Bethany College," *M.H.* (1855): 229.

[32] Alexander Campbell, "Our Colleges," *M.H.* (1855): 538.

[33] Alexander Campbell, "A New Institution," *M.H.* (1839): 446-451; (1840): 60-66, 130-132, 155-158, 219-221.

[34] Alexander Campbell, "Antioch College: Ohio," *M.H.* (1854): 434.

[35] Alexander Campbell, "A Good Library," *M.H.* (1834): 490.

[36] Robert Richardson, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1868), p. 510.

[37] Alexander Campbell, "Bacon College," *M.H.* (1837): 571.

[38] William Thomas Moore, *A Comprehensive History of the Disciples of Christ* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1909), p. 358.

[39] James Shannon, "Inaugural Address," *M.H.* (1841): 126.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

[41] *Ibid.*

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 128.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 130.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 154.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 129.
[47] Donald G. Tewksbury, *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War* (New York: Teacher's College, 1932), p. 80.

Chapter III

[1] Henry K. Shaw, *Hoosier Disciples: A Comprehensive History of the Christian Churches (Disciples of Christ) in Indiana* (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1966), pp. 112-13.
[2] Floyd W. Reeves and John Dale Russell, *College Organization and Administration, A Report Based Upon a Series of Surveys of Church Colleges* (Indianapolis: Board of Higher Education, 1929), p. 22.
[3] Alexander Campbell, "The North-Western Christian University," *M.H.* (1850): 331.
[4] Winfred Ernest Garrison, *Religion Follows the Frontier: A History of the Disciples of Christ* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1931), p. 218.
[5] Alexander Campbell, "Our Colleges," *M.H.* (1855): 580-81.
[6] Winfred Ernest Garrison, speaking on film "Frontiers of Faith."
[7] John T. Brown, *Churches of Christ: An Historical, Biographical and Pictorial History of Churches of Christ in the United States, Australasia, England and Canada* (Louisville, Ky.: John P. Morton and Company, 1904).
[8] Reeves and Russell, *College Organization*, p. 5.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 315.

Chapter IV

[1] Alexander Campbell, "The Corner-Stone Address of Bethany College," *M.H.* (1858): 363.
[2] The Men and Millions Movement, launched during the 1913 International Missionary Conventions in Toronto, set out to raise $6,000,000 for missions, benevolence, and education, and to enlist a thousand men and women for Christian service. When concluded in 1929, the Movement achieved its financial goal, in spite of the interruption caused by World War I and economic conditions which would precipitate the Great Depresson in a few years. The final total of $6,010,750.64 raised was a record unequaled by any other religious body up to that time. Cf. *Final Report of Men and Millions Movement*: 1913-1929 (n.p., 1929).
[3] Reeves and Russell, *College Organization*, p. 53.