

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/2198

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUNDS IN THE FOUNDING OF ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

RAYMOND OTHEL CORVIN

Norman, Oklahoma

1967

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUNDS IN

THE FOUNDING OF ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY

APPROVED BY

Herbert R. Hengst

Claude Kelley

Jack T. Parker

Franklin Parker

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

To my wife, Eula K. Corvin, who has been a constant inspiration and encouragement to me in all my educational efforts, this dissertation is dedicated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was initiated and conducted under the supervision of Dr. Herbert Hengst to whom a deeply felt gratitude is expressed for his wise and sympathetic counsel.

Expression of appreciation is extended to Dr. Claude Kelley and to Dr. Franklin Parker who expressed willingly their constructive suggestions in both the formative and final stages of the dissertation.

Grateful acknowledgements are expressed to Oral Roberts, a life-long friend, whose encouragement and inspiration will be long remembered, and to William W. Jernigan and Miss Juanita Walker whose library services were most helpful during the research.

Gratitude is expressed to Mrs. Leylan Rogers for services rendered beyond the call of duty as secretary and typist.

Thanks to the many who have been considerate.

R. O. Corvin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE COLONIAL COLLEGES	8
III.	EDUCATIONAL HISTORY PIVOTS ON THE DARTMOUTH CASE	22
IV.	DENOMINATIONAL RIVALRY AND COLLEGE PROLIFERATION	32
V.	UNIVERSITIES BEGIN IN THE UNITED STATES	50
VI.	HIGHER EDUCATION DEMOCRATIZED	68
VII.	SCRIPTURAL HOLINESS IS A DIVISIVE ISSUE	97
VIII.	PENTECOSTALISM BECOMES THIRD FORCE IN CHRISTENDOM	119
IX.	THE BIBLE SCHOOL MOVEMENT AND PENTECOSTALISM	135
X.	DEVELOPMENT OF ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY	145
XI.	RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUNDS IN THE FOUNDING OF ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY	163
BIBLIOGRAPHY		190

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Oral Roberts University is developing in Tulsa, Oklahoma. It is named after the son of an Oklahoma Pentecostal Holiness minister. The founder is known internationally as a world leader in religion. And the university is a bright spot on the educational horizon.

It opened September 7, 1965 with a multimillion dollar campus, with a philosophy of supernaturalism, and with a faculty characterized by efficiency and academic excellence. It had a library containing 50,000 volumes and a learning center that has attracted national and international interest. Its educational program was accredited by the Oklahoma Board of Regents for Higher Education in January, 1967.

It was dedicated to the service of Almighty God and to the training of the whole man on April 2, 1967. Speakers participating in the dedicatory service were Evangelist Billy Graham, Evangelist Oral Roberts, Oklahoma Governor Dewey Bartlett, Chancellor of Higher Education in Oklahoma E. T. Dunlap, Mayor of Tulsa James Hewgley, Chairman of the Board of Regents S. Lee Braxton, President of the Student Body Eric Fiscus, Dean of the Graduate School of Theology R. O. Corvin, and Executive Vice President John D. Messick who served as master of ceremonies.

The university was partially conceived in the minds of two young men who stood under an oak tree in the yard of a farm home near Ada, Oklahoma in 1935. A question was asked, "How can we make our greatest contribution to God and to our generation?" One said, "I can by being an evangelist." The other one said, "I can by entering Christian education." Both of these men, Roberts and Corvin, spoke during the dedication service.

The Oral Roberts University is a four-year liberal arts college with a theological seminary as its first graduate school. It envisions additional graduate schools when it is deemed wise and feasible.

The university is a product of this age, but it is also a product of history and has grown out of the stem of American higher education. Great awakenings and spiritual revivals in the United States have always produced schools of higher learning. Differences in Christian doctrine and religious rivalry have played no little part. Colonial America had its old lights and new lights with supporting churches and schools. The pre-Civil War era had the college-building Presbyterians and the preaching Baptist who evangelized and educated. Wesley's doctrine produced the Methodist Church and its colleges and later the Holiness Movement with its churches and schools. The Pentecostal Revival grew out of Wesley's emphasis on scriptural holiness. It began at the turn of the century, 1901, and has resulted in a proliferation of churches and schools throughout the world. Today the Pentecostal

Movement is known as the "Third Great Force in Christendom." It is taking a place along by the side of Roman Catholicism and Historic Protestantism. The Pentecostal Movement with the genius of an evangelist has produced the Oral Roberts University.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this investigation is to examine the origin of the Oral Roberts University in the perspective of American higher education as related to the founding of colleges. To achieve this objective it is necessary

A. To examine the development of American higher education and especially the role of Christian churches,

B. To trace the religious background of Oral Roberts University and

C. To relate Oral Roberts University in its historic perspective.

LIMITATIONS IN THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to present only enough history of higher education and of the Christian churches in the United States to show why church related colleges were founded and how the founding of Oral Roberts University is in historic perspective.

No other study has been made that embraces these objectives, nor is the information contained herein common knowledge. An increasing trickle of literature related to the origin, scope and influence of the Pentecostal Movement is beginning to be published. Everett Leroy Moore has written an unpublished thesis in the Department of

Religion at Pasadena College, Handbook of Pentecostal Denominations in the United States, 1954. Related also is The Small Sects in America by Elmer T. Clark, revised edition published in 1949 by Abington-Cokesbury Press, New York. A work was produced by Stanley Howard Frodsham, With Signs Following, published by Gospel Publishing House, Springfield, Missouri, 1946. It is a brief story of the Pentecostal Revival in the twentieth century. Gordon Francis Atter wrote The Third Force published in 1962 by the College Press, Peterborough, Ontario, Canada. The historian, Donald Gee, published his revised edition of The Pentecostal Movement in 1949 (Elim Publishing Company Limited, Clapham Cresent, London, S. W. 4). A history written by John Thomas Nichol on Pentecostalism was published in 1966 by Harper and Row, New York. By far the most extensive work in the field is the seven volume work, Handbuch der Pfingsbewegung, by Walter Hollenweger who now serves as Chairman of the Department of Evangelism, World Council of Churches in Geneva, Switzerland. This work is written in German and is still in mimeograph form. Copies are in the ORU library. An extensive collection of both general and denominationally oriented books have been produced relating to Pentecostalism. Listed are a few:

Carl Brumback, Suddenly From Heaven and What Meaneth This - Gospel Publishing House
Joseph E. Campbell, History of Pentecostal Holiness Church 1898-1948 - Advocate Press
Charles W. Conn, Evangel Reader, Like a Mighty Army, Pillars of Pentecost, Where the Saints Have Trod - Church of God Publishing House

James A. Cross, Healing in the Church - Church of God Publishing House
Klaude Kendrick, The Promise Fulfilled - Gospel Publishing House
Ira Jay Martin, Glossolalia - Berea College Press
Irwin Winehouse, The Assemblies of God - Vantage Press

In this research there has been open access to the "Pentecostal Room," a part of the library of the Oral Roberts University where there are related materials from more than forty countries of the world. It has some 3,200 book titles, 270 current magazines and many out-of-date and out-of-print magazines, minutes and documents, all of which relate directly or indirectly to Pentecostalism. With the possible exception of the library in Zurich, Switzerland under the supervision of Walter Hollenweger, this is the largest collection in the world on Pentecostalism.

In addition, there is a wealth of material relative to the other fields covered in this research.

Use was made of the archives of the Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association that contain all important records of both Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association and Oral Roberts University from the beginning.

SCOPE OF THIS RESEARCH

This dissertation presents the reasons why religious schools of higher learning in the United States have been established and places ORU in historic perspective. In doing this, a brief resume of each historical period is discussed with special attention given to a promin-

ent school of the period. There are no typical colleges, yet the college selected and discussed will provide general insights into the historical educational problems.

Additional issues which are considered relevant are discussed. They include the Bible School Movement and the democratization of American higher education.

Placing ORU in historic perspective, emphasizing particularly the why, and showing how all these streams of interest and influence are relative has been a most difficult task.

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

Four major methods of procedure for gathering data were used. First, the historical method of research was followed in securing information and verifying data with a careful checking of primary sources against secondary ones and vice versa. Use was made of relative books from the libraries of The University of Oklahoma and from ORU. Second, extensive use was made of the rare collection of primary and secondary materials located in the special "Pentecostal Room" in the Learning Resources Center of the Oral Roberts University. Third, use was made of the archives of Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association and Oral Roberts University. And fourth, when it was deemed necessary, personal interviews were conducted with individuals who could best furnish information.

ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION

Chapter two discusses higher education in the Colonial period showing when and where the nine colleges were established. Emphasis is placed upon their purpose for existing. Yale is taken as an example. Chapter three follows the new and independent nation as it struggles for educational guidelines. The Dartmouth Supreme Court Case settles the issue. Chapter four embraces the period from the Dartmouth Case to the Civil War and presents a nation in revival with religious rivalry and college proliferation. Chapters five and six present the rise of the American university, emphasizing the German influence with democracy as the philosophical objective. The University of Chicago is an example. More immediate religious influences upon ORU are presented in chapters seven through nine embracing Methodism and Holiness, the rise of Pentecostalism and the Bible School Movement. Chapter ten relates to the personal history and evangelistic ministry of Oral Roberts and the origin and development of the Oral Roberts University. The summary chapter evaluates the university in its historic perspective.

CHAPTER II

THE COLONIAL COLLEGES

Higher education during the colonial period was molded by influences characteristic of that age. The colonies constituted the border of an expanding English frontier. Though emigrants from many countries found their place in the thirteen North American colonies, the majority were of English culture, influence, language, religion, and education. Within ten years after the founding of the first English colonial college, there were approximately one hundred Cambridge University men together with about thirty Oxford graduates who had selected New England as their place of service. [1]

In 1636 when Harvard was established as the first colonial college, the school's first president, Henry Dunster, [2] a graduate of Cambridge, adopted a curriculum in complete accord with his alma mater and set a pattern of classical education which was to prevail in America for more than 200 years, not only in the first college but in almost all other schools of higher education.

---

[1]John S. Brubaker and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition, An American History 1636-1956 (New York: Harper and Bros., 1958), p. 391.

[2]Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith, American Higher Education: A Documentary History, Vol. I (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 16-18.

In determining why the colleges of the colonial period were established, one must become cognizant of the dates when they were established, the places where they were organized, the political and religious interests of their founders, and the process of change that occurred between 1636 when Harvard, the first one, came into being and 1769 when Dartmouth, the last, was organized.

The nine colonial colleges were established according to the following order: Harvard, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1636; William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1693; Yale, New Haven, Connecticut, 1701; University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1740; Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, 1746; Columbia University (King's College), New York, New York, 1754; Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island, 1764; Rutgers University (Queen's College), New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1766; and Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, 1769. [1]

The first colony, Virginia, was established in 1607; the last, Georgia, by Oglethorpe in 1733. When Georgia became a colony only three of the nine colleges were organized--Harvard, William and Mary, and Yale. These three schools were all organized by direct support of the colonial governments in which they were established. While in session the General Court, acting as the legislative body of Puritan Massachusetts, on October 28, 1636, passed the resolution that led to

---

[1] Ibid., p. 109.

Harvard College.[1] The Rev. James Blair, Commissary for the Bishop of London and head of Virginia's Anglican Church, went to London and secured the royal charter that authorized the creation of the college of William and Mary.[2] Though Yale's origin dates back to 1701, its charter was granted on October 10, 1723, and further enlarged and confirmed on May 9, 1745, by the General Court of Connecticut.[3]

According to the charters of these three colleges, the purpose for their establishment is sufficiently clear. The purpose as embraced in the Harvard charter is "for the advancement of all good literature, arts and sciences. . . to the education of the English and Indian youth. . . ."[4] The purpose as stated in the charter of William and Mary was that "the Church of Virginia may be furnished with a seminary of ministers of the gospel, and that the youth may be piously educated in good letters and manners, and that the Christian faith may be propagated amongst the Western Indians, to the glory of Almighty God; to make, found and establish a place of universal study, or perpetual college of Divinity, Philosophy, Languages, and other good arts and sciences. . ."[5] In the General Court of the colony of Connecticut, they being assembled on October 9, 1701, in session in New Haven approved a charter for the establishment of Yale College. Listed as the purpose is that "youth

---

[1]Fredrick Rudolph, The American College and University (New York: Alfred A. Knoph, 1962), p. 4.

[2]Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education, Vol. I, p. 33.

[3]Ibid., p. 50. [4]Ibid., p. 10. [5]Ibid., p. 33.

may be instructed in the arts and sciences who through the blessing of Almighty God may be fitted for public employment both in church and civil state."[1]

These schools were founded and sustained financially by the colonies in which they were located. During this early colonial period when resentment against the mother country was not pronounced, it can be observed by the charters, the governmental control of the college, the curriculum that was adopted, the organization of the administration and faculty, the classes and the names given to them, the requirements for entrance, plus many other characteristics that the founders were attempting to reproduce the plan and procedure of education that had been learned at Cambridge and Oxford.[2]

There were rivalries between Harvard and Yale. Connecticut, like Massachusetts, determined to have its own college to train its own ministers and civil leaders. Disgruntled Harvard men supported the founding of Yale and hoped that it would become what they had thought Harvard should be.[3]

These rivalries were mild compared to the full-blown conflicts that grew out of the Great Awakening in which George Whitefield was a leading figure. He and John Wesley were religious contemporaries.

---

[1]Franklin B. Dexter, Biographed Sketches of the Graduates of Yale College With Annals of the College History (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1885), p. 3.

[2]Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education, Vol. I, pp. 49-53, 82-91.

[3]Rudolph, The American College and University, pp. 8-9.

Wesley's influence on higher education did not mature until after the Revolutionary War and the rise of the Methodist Church. However, since both of them influenced higher education--Whitefield in the colonial period and Wesley in the pre-Civil War period--information regarding them is here introduced.

Colleges established during the later colonial period had in general the same major purposes as those established earlier; however, the immediate impetus that brought them into being was within a different framework.

To understand the impetus that became such an influence that played no little part in the organization of Princeton, Brown, Dartmouth, and Queen's it is necessary to mention a small band of religious students in Oxford University.

WHITEFIELD AND THE WESLEYS

During the absence of John Wesley from Oxford in the spring of 1729, Charles, his brother, with two fellow students, Robert Kirkham and William Morgan, formed a club primarily for the purpose of improving their studies. Soon they engaged in reading helpful books. Frequently they took communion. Upon John's return to Oxford in November, 1729, he became the leader of the group. Under his guidance they sought to realize William Law's ideals of a consecrated life. The club increased in number, but was never very large or influential. In their quest to fulfill Law's ideals they visited prisoners in the Oxford jail. They prayed, fasted, and followed high churchly ideals. They

were derided by fellow students who called them the "Holy Club." Later they were nicknamed the "Methodists." This little company was painfully bent on working out the salvation of their own souls. An important person who became a member of the little club early in 1735 was George Whitefield. He was born December 16, 1714, to a poor innkeeper in Gloucester; however, he entered Oxford in 1733. Like the Wesleys, his struggle for an assurance regarding the salvation of his soul was great. All members of the club were vitally concerned about the state of their souls. None was absolutely sure of his salvation. [1]

Whitefield's assurance came during a severe siege of illness in the spring of 1735. [2] He came to a crisis in his religious experience from which he emerged in a joyous consciousness of peace with God. He was a converted man and he knew it. It was not until May 21, 1738, that Charles experienced his "conversion." So did John three days later. Both John and Charles served as missionaries in Georgia. They accompanied General Oglethorpe with a group of twenty Moravians and others sailing in October, 1735. A storm at sea tested their faith. The Moravians had inward assurance, but John was afraid. Having served two years as a missionary he returned to England where he met with a Moravian, Peter Bohler, who taught a complete self surrendering faith, an instantaneous conversion and a joy in believing. On

---

[1]Williston Walker, A History of the Christian Church (New York: Charles Scrivner's Sons, 1942), p. 510.

[2]Ibid.

Wednesday, May 24, the transforming experience came to John. That evening he went unwillingly to an Anglican service in Aldersgate Street, London. During the service there was read "Luther's Preface to the Commentary on Romans." John tells it in his words: "About a quarter before nine, while he (Luther) was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given to me that he had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death."[1]

Both the Wesleys and Whitefield received Episcopal ordination. All three of them exerted great influences in America. The Wesleys were founders of the Methodist Church and George Whitefield led in the Great Awakening of New England.[2]

Until the second quarter of the eighteenth century, religion in America was essentially a continuation of European religious bodies. With the exception of New England, religion had lost its original enthusiasm. In the colonies as a whole there was no one church that was dominant, though in various colonies there were denominations that held preeminence. This diversity of religious interest established the pattern for both religious freedom and denominational rivalry.[3]

The Great Awakening brought benefits of an inestimable value to the religious life of the colonial period, but with it came sharp divisive issues and denominational rivalry which had significant

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 509-511. [2]Ibid., p. 512. [3]Ibid., p. 570.

influence upon colonial higher education. Harvard, Yale, and William and Mary taught and practiced Christian nurture and obedience to spiritual concepts which in European churches had long been the procedure for one's entrance into the kingdom of God. This procedure began at birth through family faith and developed by parental instructions, baptism, confirmation, church membership, church attendance, worship, Christian education, and life adjustments both to the will of God and moral standards in society. The Great Awakening established a different belief regarding one's entrance into the kingdom of heaven. It emphasized the conception of a transforming regenerative instantaneous change, a "conversion" as the normal method of entrance into the kingdom of God. [1]

The Great Awakening began at various places in New England and the middle colonies. In 1720, Jacobus Frelinghuysen began an active program in the vicinity of Raritan, New Jersey. Influenced by his ministry was Gilbert Tennent whose powerful ministry began showing great results in 1728 in New Brunswick. More prominent and intellectual was Jonathan Edwards who began a revival in 1734 in Northampton, Massachusetts. The Great Awakening was climaxed in the eloquent and successful preaching of George Whitefield.

At the age of 22, Whitefield sought and received ordination as an Episcopal minister and began his career. No Anglo-Saxon of the eighteenth century showed such persuasive powers as a speaker. He

---

[1] Ibid., p. 570.

was ready to preach anywhere and in any pulpit open to him. In nature he was simple and unself-seeking, though at times censorious of the other man's religious experience if it were unlike his. The heart of his message was salvation through the gospel of God's forgiving grace, and of peace through acceptance of Christ by faith followed by a life of joyful service. The audiences of two continents melted before his dramatic, pathetic, and appealing voice like wax subjected to the hot fires of the furnace. The first of his seven trips to America was in 1738; the last in 1769. He died in Newburyport, Massachusetts, on September 30, 1770.[1]

His conflicts with Harvard and Yale and beliefs practiced by them divided the colonial religious constituency into opposing camps. The "new lights" of the New England colonies and the "new sides" of the Middle Colonies advocating instantaneous conversion and a joyful spiritual life led to the organization of Princeton University, and ultimately, though there were many other additional causes, to that of Brown, Dartmouth, and Queen's.

The Great Awakening had little influence upon the founding of the University of Pennsylvania which grew out of the influences of Benjamin Franklin, or the Columbia University (King's College); though the latter had as one of its major objectives the teaching of religion.

Though none of the nine colonial colleges may be taken as a typical example of why the others were established, Yale College has

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 510-511.

been selected for detailed analysis which will give a deeper insight as to why they were organized.

YALE COLLEGE, AN EXAMPLE

The Yale purpose may be detected in the revised and approved charter of 1745 in which the school was commended for past accomplishments in that it "under the blessings of Almighty God had trained up many worthy persons for the service of God in the state as well as in the church:. . . and for promoting all good literature in the present and succeeding generations."[1] Bringing Yale into being was difficult. Having been chartered in 1701, it was located in Gaybrook, Killingsworth, Hartford, Wetherfield, and finally in New Haven. It functioned in three places at the same time. Then in 1716 with the help of a disgruntled Harvard fellow it was located in New Haven. An appeal was made to Eliho Yale, a Boston-born Englishman of considerable wealth who then lived in London. Cotton Mather of the Harvard Cooperation, dissatisfied at the liberal religious views at Harvard, wrote to Mr. Yale beseeching him for funds and indicating that "what is forming at New Haven might wear the name of Yale College." Such a monument in his honor might "indeed be much better than an Egyptian Pyramid." The contribution made by Eliho Yale succeeded in naming the college in his honor.[2]

---

[1]Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education, pp. 49-50.

[2]Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 9.

The dynamic Rector Thomas Clap who served as president of Yale during the hectic days of the Great Awakening, whose revised charter was approved by the General Assembly of Connecticut in New Haven in 1745, thus giving himself as president the central role of authority in the affairs of the college, and whose decisions and writings gave expression to the purposes of the college, states that "Yale College in New Haven does not come up to the perfection of the ancient established universities in Great Britain; yet, would endeavor to imitate them in most things as far as its present state will admit of it." In addition to the purpose of reproducing the culture and education of the English universities in Yale, "their main design in that foundation was to educate persons for the ministry of these churches, commonly called Presbyterian, or Congregational, according to their own doctrine, discipline, and mode of worship."[1]

Though the training of ministers was the major design of the college, it was by no means the only one. The charter made it clear that the school would teach the arts and sciences and prepare learned men for both the state and the church.[2]

Yale became unique in its sectarian rigidity. The administration of Yale felt that infractions of their policies in faith and practice was a violation of the law of God, colony and college.[3] Other colonial

---

[1]Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education, p. 112.

[2]Ibid., p. 56

[3]Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 17.

colleges granted a broader liberality in doctrine, discipline, and worship. The college of New Jersey, though predominantly controlled by the New Light Presbyterians, held religious liberty, stating, "This Charter places the Society upon the most catholic Foundation: All Protestants of every Denomination, who are loyal Subjects of our most Gracious Sovereign . . . are admitted to the Enjoyment of all its Privileges, and allowed the unlimited Exercise of their Religion."[1] Brown University in its charter states, "It is hereby enacted and declared, that into this liberal and catholic institution shall never be admitted any religious tests; but, on the contrary, all the members hereof shall forever enjoy full, free, . . .absolute, and uninterrupted liberty of conscience. . . . Youth of all religious denominations shall and may be freely admitted to the equal advantages, emoluments, and honors of [this] the college or university; and shall receive a like fair, generous and equal treatment during their residence therein. . . ."[2]

This freedom was no part of the early Yale program. Thomas Clap, the rector, and three of his tutors on May 1, 1745, expelled John and Ebenezer Cleveland from the college because "the said John and Ebenezer Cleveland, in withdrawing and separating from the public worship of God, and attending upon the preaching of a lay-exhorter, as aforesaid, have acted contrary to the rules of the gospel, the laws of this colony and of the college; and that the said Clevelands shall be

---

[1]Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education, p. 93.

[2]Ibid., p. 135.

publicly admonished for their faults, aforesaid; and if they shall continue to justify themselves and refuse to make an acknowledgement they shall be expelled."[1] They were expelled.

To protect themselves from the hot winds of adversity that blew out of the Great Awakening, both students and faculty were required beginning in 1748 to subscribe to the Westminster Confession of Faith. The rigid unbending policy of Yale was felt again in the following century when President Jeremiah Day and Professor James L. Kingsley in 1828 defended the classical college curriculum against its critics who were exponents of vocational studies and opposed to the retention of the "dead" languages.[2]

In spite of the views held by Yale in its outset, it became virtually impossible to hold back the tide of academic and religious freedom. By 1765, religious freedom was accepted as the practice at Yale.[3]

During the colonial period the colleges operated on a small scale, producing some 3,000 graduates still living in 1776 among the approximately 3,500,000 inhabitants who lived in the colonies at the outbreak of the Revolutionary War.[4] According to these figures one can see that the purpose was not to educate the masses nor to produce leaders for all the vocations.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 80. [2]Ibid., pp. 275-291.

[3]Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 18.

[4]Ibid., p. 22.

SUMMARY

The primary purpose in establishing the colonial colleges was to train men for the ministry. Almost equal in importance was the transporting of European culture and wisdom to posterity, making it possible for the new world to have at least some of the advantages of the mother country. Religious rivalry regarding how one enters the kingdom of God plus the new awakening that it produced was the cause for a new crop of schools. Yale College, the third of the colonial schools of higher learning, came into being because of a dissatisfied Harvard constituency and because of the contribution of a man who desired to perpetuate his name. Due to the scholastic curriculum and the purpose of producing an elite aristocracy, only a very limited number of the colonial inhabitants ever attended college, and those who did were men.

The American Revolution brought a new set of circumstances that created new purposes in higher education.

CHAPTER III

EDUCATIONAL HISTORY PIVOTS ON THE DARTMOUTH CASE

CHANGING PURPOSES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Higher education in America has been transplanted from England with all of its scholastic, humanistic, and aristocratic ideals. Amalgamated in the curriculum were the medieval arts and sciences and an interest in the Renaissance. The fundamental vehicle for opening the treasure houses of the past and drinking from the fountains of wisdom was the language of Latin. Through it one learned law, theology, and medicine. Even Aristotle's Greek had been translated into Latin, making possible his three philosophies--natural, moral, and mental development of the whole man. It was through Greek which took its place beside Latin that students had access to a new humanism where they could revel in the lyrics and idylls and in Homer and Hesiod. [1]

However, to gain knowledge through these languages one had to be extremely mentally disciplined, and furthermore, scholasticism was not the "sack of seed" from which the thoughts were sown that produced the Revolution. In it was not sufficient elasticity to embrace

---

[1]Rudolph, The American College and University, pp. 24-26.

a Descartes, a Bacon, Newton, Locke and Hume.[1] The Revolution came. It damaged colleges, decreased enrollments, cut endowments and shook the foundations of college purposes. With American independence the ties with England were severed, respect for the King was lost, the system of monarchy crumbled and a democracy was born where belief began to spread that all men were created equal, where one could look any man in the eye with a feeling of equality before the law and before God. Education should be for a larger number; thus, there blossomed an immediate post war interest in a broader curriculum where more students could be educated. Between 1782 and 1802 nineteen colleges were chartered which are in existence today. This was more than twice as many schools as had been established during 150 years preceeding the Revolution.[2]

Many of the highest leaders of the Revolution such as Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson had been drinking from the thoughts of the French Condorcet and Rousseau as well as the British Locke. Their principles of democracy and equality absorbed by Jefferson caused him to plan for an American system of democratic education. He had plans of moderating the colonial college to serve a broader constituency of the state.[3]

WHO CONTROLS

The issue was keen as to who would control the colonial

---

[1]Ibid., p. 33. [2]Ibid., p. 35. [3]Ibid., pp. 40-41.

college. Most of the schools had received financial support in one way or another from the colonial governments. Harvard was not authorized by a charter from Great Britain. Its organization and support came from Massachusetts. William and Mary bore its name because of the king and queen and had royal approval, but Virginia supported it by more than one source of income, not the least of these was a tobacco tax. Dartmouth came into existence in 1769 and was hardly on its feet during the Revolution. It needed and secured some aid from the New Hampshire Legislature. Though Harvard began in 1636, its first charter was not issued until 1650, and even this charter was of uncertain authority, being granted only by the Massachusetts Legislature without first contacting British royalty. When Massachusetts in 1684 had its colonial charter revoked, any legality for Harvard's incorporation also vanished. A new charter was prepared, sent to England for approval, but was rejected because the King was not granted the power to appoint the visitors. Consequently, Harvard's charter was never approved by the crown. [1] Both Harvard and Yale, being schools that represented religious dissenters, had anxieties of British interference, lest the Church of England would thwart the purposes of the schools. By silence and subterfuge plus British indifference the schools managed their freedom from episcopal and royal domination. [2]

Pressures arose against Yale that began a struggle between

---

[1]Brubaker and Rudy, Higher Education in Transition, pp. 32-36.

[2]Ibid., pp. 31-35.

colonial political authorities and collegiate trustees that did not terminate until the Dartmouth College Case. Enemies of President Clap in 1763 appealed to the Connecticut Legislature to appoint visitors to make Yale more responsive to other interests in the colony. In that skirmish the argument of President Clap prevailed. That was the first round. The second round after the war went to the state. A succeeding president, Ezra Stiles, due to the financial condition of the school, sought financial support from the legislature. He received it, but only after a compromise where new visitors, "civilians," were appointed to the board that controlled Yale, even though they were a minority. [1]

THE DARTMOUTH SUPREME COURT CASE

Unlike Harvard and Yale, the New Hampshire college, Dartmouth, sought and secured a royal charter from the English crown. Provisions were granted in the charter not only for a self-perpetuating board of trustees but for the president to appoint his successor. Upon the death of the president and founder, the board of trustees learned that Eleazer Wheelock had appointed his son, John, as his successor. [2] The son, being a military man and not possessing the theological scholarship nor solemnity of manner usually characterizing a college president, found himself soon in opposition to the local Congregational Church, and later with the Dartmouth faculty. His quarrels, loss of

---

[1] Ibid., p. 34.

[2] Hofstadter and Wilson, American Higher Education, pp. 202-213.

prestige, and appeal to the New Hampshire Legislature vexed the board of trustees into voting the president's dismissal. Jeffersonian Republicans, then out of office, took advantage of the Dartmouth debacle and making political capital of the conflict, secured sufficient votes to plant themselves back in office. It was a matter of early legislature business in 1816 that Dartmouth College was changed to Dartmouth University. To implement their purpose, they had to capture the board of trustees and change the charter. They attempted this by enlarging its number to a point where a majority favored John Wheelock.

The new enlarged board of trustees met and elected Wheelock president. Soon afterward, he died but was succeeded by his son-in-law. The legal conflicts became extremely complicated when the original trustees of the college disobeyed the demands of the new law. For a time, both Dartmouth College and Dartmouth University operated side by side with different administrations. Which administration was entitled to the college seal and records? The original secretary-treasurer, a Wheelock man, refused to surrender these valuable items to the original trustees. They sued to recover them. [1]

The point of legal issue was more than the recovery of the college seal, it was an uncertain anxiety that tantalized college authorities incessantly, frightening not only Harvard and Yale, but all other colleges throughout the colonies. Were these incorporated institutions of higher learning public corporations? Would they henceforth be con-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 205.

trolled by the state and its changing political parties, or would they remain private corporations free to implement their purposes and promote their religion? Some of the colleges--Yale, Harvard, and Princeton--had partially solved the question by allowing political influence to appoint members to their boards of trustees. Dartmouth was caught in a position where the issue had to meet head-on.

The case was brought first before the New Hampshire Supreme Court. Those representing the State contended that if Dartmouth lay beyond the reach of the public will, the trustees might forget the public trust reposed in them and could exercise their powers to promote narrow sectarian and even political views. The court then controlled by Republicans and encouraged by the governor and state legislature of New Hampshire, as well as Thomas Jefferson who made his views known in writing, upheld the case as supported by the State and rendered a decision that Dartmouth was a public corporation and, therefore, its charter was subject to amendment by the legislature. [1]

Daniel Webster, a member of Dartmouth's 1801 graduating class, argued, and according to his expectation, lost the case of his alma mater before the New Hampshire court. He could not beat the influence of the Jeffersonian Republicans in his state. His hope was in an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States where he could plead his points before Chief Justice John Marshall who politically was

---

[1]Brubaker and Rudy, Higher Education in Transition, p. 35.

a Federalist. In the attempt, the plaintiffs, to uphold their case before the Supreme Court of the United States on behalf of the state of New Hampshire, contended that the opposition policy was against common right, against the constitution of New Hampshire and repugnant to the constitution of the United States. Webster met these contentions and emphasized the issue of public control. On this point he reasoned that the college was an eleemosynary cooperation, a private charity, originally founded and endowed by an individual, with a charter obtained for it at his request, for the better administration of his charity. The case was not one of ordinary importance since it would affect every college and all the literary institutions of the country. They all have one common principle of existence--the inviolability of their charters. To hold these institutions subject to the fluctuations of public opinion or the rise and fall of political parties would be a most dangerous experiment. If the franchise of the charter may at any time be taken away, or its use perverted, such would divert the will of benefactors in the investment of their charitable bounties and learned men would be deterred from devoting themselves to the services of such institutions.

Chief Justice Marshall sided with Daniel Webster and carried the majority of the members of the court in the decision. Dartmouth and all similar institutions of higher education became private rather than public cooperations. [1]

---

[1]Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education, pp. 210-211.

Two great national interests converged in the Dartmouth Supreme Court Case. Thomas Jefferson expressed his opinion before the case reached the Supreme Court and took the view that "the idea that institutions established for the use of the nation cannot be touched or modified even to make them answer their end, and because of rights gratuitously supposed in those employed to manage them in trust for the public may, perhaps, be a salutatory provision against the abuses of a monarch but it is most absurd against the nation itself."[1] It is not strange that Jefferson would think this way or so exert his influence. He had already attempted and was further hoping to gain control of his alma mater, William and Mary, and redesign it for the service of his beloved state of Virginia. The Dartmouth decision forced him to change the course of his thinking. Soon he laid the groundwork for the University of Virginia that became a shining example of an institution that was state owned and controlled. The religious denominations on the basis of this decision realized that their objectives and investments in the organization and building of colleges were secure and charted their course in the conquest of the Mississippi Valley. The decision was a blow to the forces seeking public control of established institutions of learning and long postponed the movement for state universities in New England. The decision impeded the progress of state universities and land-grant colleges for almost half a century. On the other

---

[1]Cited in Charles Warren, The Supreme Court in United States History, Vol. I (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1922), p. 484.

hand, it released and encouraged a zealous and unbridled religious and denominational rivalry in the most extensive proliferation of college building that has ever been known in the history of higher education. Their territory extended from Ohio to the Rockies, from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico.

The American Revolution hatched a new breed of chickens. Prevalent among the educational thinkers was a feeling that the strong relationships with the past should be broken; dead languages should be abandoned; the Christian religion should be substituted by a heady mixture of French deism and naturalism; all persons are on a dead level and the voice of unruly students should bear equal authority with the learned and aristocratic administrations. The scholastic curriculum must be shattered to give way to new utilitarian and scientific advancements. Narrow limitations benefiting the wealthy and federalist aristocratic elite must be replaced by educational objectives that would prepare the masses for self government. Men must be free to believe or not to believe, to drink at the fountain of enlightenment, to flirt with atheism or to adopt indifference to any or all religion. Guiding this new enlightenment was a thrifty and seasoned band of Americans whose names became familiar among the early post revolutionary population. They were James Otis, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Cooper, Joseph Priestley, Benjamin Rush, Thomas Paine and Richard Price. [1]

---

[1]Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 40.

This new nation "conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal" began its national responsibilities for the development of higher education with purposes almost as diverse as the needs and interests of man. South Carolina advocated a broad social purpose to unite a state seriously divided by up-country and down-country rivalries, to release the bitterness generated by the internal oppositions of the Revolutionary era. The aristocrats of the lowlands would educate the leadership of the Piedmont majority which threatened aristocratic control of the state. In 1831 Chapel Hill was organized to "form lasting friendships and associations among those who are to constitute no small portion of our future rulers."[1]

SUMMARY

Following the Revolutionary War the new nation found itself in education foment. It could no longer give allegiance to the British Crown, thus it was forced to reconsider its purposes, giving grave considerations to the free democracy. The big issue dealt with authority. Who would control the colonial college? The decision was made in the Dartmouth Case before the Supreme Court of the United States. The decision impeded the progress of the state universities, may have impeded the process of democratizing American higher education. It gave the "go" signal to competing religious denominations which produced a proliferation of American Colleges.

---

[1]Luther L. Gabbell, Church-State Relationships in Education in North Carolina Since 1776 (Durham: 1938), p. 42.

CHAPTER IV

DENOMINATIONAL RIVALRY AND COLLEGE PROLIFERATION

It was a strange mixture of purposes that set the pre-Civil War America on its tip toes. New inventions, better and longer railroads, new river boats and broader trails over mountains and valleys, increasing know-how in industrial output, a land with vast wealth to be conquered blended to animate a growing population. Wherever the American went he needed food, clothing, and shelter. He needed a job, a means of transportation, religion, culture, and education.

Diversified religious denominations competing for the minds of men and seeking survival with prestige in a free society became the dominant cause that led often through rivalry to the attempt and successful establishment of hundreds of colleges during the sixty years preceding the Civil War. Following the negotiations that made the Louisiana Purchase a part of the United States there began the great westward movement. The social and religious forces with clear resolution pulled stakes and headed toward the West. It was a day of great enthusiasm where the hearts of many of both the new and old worlds expressed themselves by meeting the challenge of adventure and courage. The golden age was dawning on the frontiers of the new

world and unlimited opportunity was just beyond the next river or at the base of the distant mountain. Optimism was the watchword and nothing, they felt, was any longer impossible.

BUILDING COLLEGES

The building of colleges would be undertaken with the same confidence as the clearing of new ground for settlements, the construction of railroads, canals, towns, and states. Those on the frontiers looked to the East for financial help and new recruits. Those in the East looked westward with missionary zeal and a desire to assist in the conquering of the boundless Mississippi Valley.

Ministers from the frontier solicited assistance from the wealthy and political leaders of the eastern states. John W. Brown representing the Miami University in Ohio laid his case before the U. S. Senators and President. They did not pass a new bill or appropriate funds from the treasury; yet they gave him a listening ear, an assenting approval and a few books. He returned to Miami with a wagon load of books and seven hundred dollars. His life ended prematurely when he drowned in the Little Miami River; however, his work went on. [1]

Easton, Pennsylvania, citizens received a charter for a college in 1826. They would make their town famous with a college called Lafayette by bringing an academy from Philadelphia and con-

---

[1]Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 45.

verting it into a college of learning. This would bring new citizens, new business and new prestige. On November 22, 1832, five young Presbyterian ministers found a soft spot on new fallen snow in the woods of Crawfordsville, Indiana, and prayed for the establishment of a college. Wabash College was begun. Six years later it was destroyed by fire.[1] On a westward trek, eight French priests, members of the order of the Holy Cross, few of them able to speak English, made their way to Northern Indiana and planted Notre Dame in 1842 at South Bend.[2]

Approximately a thousand attempts were made in the organization of colleges in the United States before the Civil War. The majority of these failed. In a survey made by Tewksbury covering sixteen states, he found that there were 516 colleges organized before the Civil War in 16 states. Of this number, 412 were listed in the institutional mortality column. This left surviving 104. In the remaining 18 states which have 78 surviving colleges, we can assume if we use the same ratio, that there were approximately 309 college failures. These figures would account for some 903 college organizational attempts. The number of colleges organized between the Revolutionary and Civil Wars still surviving today including state colleges is 198.[3]

---

[1]Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 46.

[2]Ibid., p. 47.

[3]Donald G. Tewksbury, The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1965), p. 28.

The missionary enterprise stemming from restless and concerned Yale and Princeton graduates may be considered among the leading causes for college building in the early nineteenth century. These Presbyterian and Congregationalists ministerial educators spent sleepless nights conceiving plans for planting colleges to tame the West for Christianity. The first four colleges in Indiana--Vincenne, Hanover, Indiana, and Wabash--were developed, not because local communities were bidding for them but because missionary zeal impelled men to see what could be done regarding benighted conditions of life on the western frontier. [1]

As the population moved westward, so did denominations and Christian colleges. During the colonial era and the early part of the nineteenth century, the Congregationalists and Presbyterians were the busiest denominations in college building. The Methodists and Baptists were late starters, but they came up fast. The state of Ohio may serve as an example of denominational diversity in college building. Franklin was Presbyterian; Western Reserve, Congregational; Kenyon, Episcopal; Denison, Baptist; Oberlin, Congregational; Marietta, Congregational; Muskingum, United Presbyterian; St. Xavier, Roman Catholic; Ohio Wesleyan, Methodist; Mount Union, Methodist; Baldwin, Methodist; Wittenberg, Lutheran; Otterbein, United Brethren; Heidelburg, Reformed; Urbana, Swedenbargian; Antioch, Christian; Hiram, Disci-

---

[1]Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 52.

ples. These with others were established before 1850.[1] It was pointed out that England when it had 23,000,000 people supported four universities, and Ohio with 3,000,000 boasted thirty-seven institutions of higher learning.

For some forty years following the Revolutionary War there was an increasing spirit of toleration in educational institutions. The colonial colleges with the state institutions opened their doors without religious tests to students and for the most part to faculty members. Along with the toleration, there was a pronounced increase in scepticism, unbelief, deism, and atheism. During the third and fourth decades of the nineteenth century there was a second great national evangelistic awakening. The churches took a vital and progressive role in the organization of Sunday Schools, the conducting of revivals, the development of churches, the promotion of foreign and home missions, and the establishment of colleges. They stemmed the tide and rolled back atheism. However, in their success they became dogmatic and sectarian.

OBERLIN AN EXAMPLE

Oberlin College, like the majority of the denominational colleges of the pre-Civil War era, grew out of the soil of a young nation whose people were adventurous, prolific, inventive, religious, daring, and practical. There was a strong sprinkling among them of

---

[1]Ibid., p. 54.

the quixotic, utopian, and charlatanic. The new nation having broken the relationships extending from the divine right of monarchs and the priestcraft of theological directions, was set adrift to sail on the troubled sea of freedom. These waters were never free from the fury and clash of the untrained and the uncertain.

During the first half of the nineteenth century there was a desperate cry for religious help. In the first thirty years there were approximately 1, 100, 000 members added to four churches. The Congregational membership was increased twofold, the Baptist threefold, the Presbyterians fourfold, and the Methodist sevenfold. [1]

John J. Shipherd and Philo Penfield Stewart founded Oberlin College in 1832. The ministerial training of neither was on the academic level of the Yale or Princeton graduates. Both were interested in missionary activities in the Mississippi Valley. The former served as a promoter of the Sunday School movement in the state of Ohio, the latter as a missionary to the Choctaw Indians in the state of Mississippi.

To Zebulon R. and Elizabeth B. Shipherd on March 28, 1802, was born their son, John J., in West Granville, Washington County, New York. He attended school at Pawlet, Vermont, and prepared to enter college at Middlebury, Vermont. Immediately before his enrolling, by accident he took poison instead of medicine and only by vigorous measures was his life saved. The experience impaired his health

---

[1]D. L. Leonard, History of Oberlin (Chicago: The Pilgrim Press, 1898), p. 60.

for life, leaving him with a stomach irritation and partial blindness which prohibited his college training.[1] His religious life marks its beginning in early adolescence by an intense instantaneous crisis experience that resulted in great peace and joy. To him this was his conversion and from this time to the end of his days his character and life were marked by prayerfulness and energetic activities. Though his handicap prohibited his enduring the strenuous ministerial college studies, he did spend a year and a half in the studies of Rev. Josiah Hopkins of New Haven, Vermont, and acquired a general theological knowledge. Having this training he entered the ministry and served the Shelburne, Vermont, Presbyterian church for a year. This was followed by two years of Sunday School work with headquarters in Middlesburg where he edited a Sunday School paper and traveled throughout the state organizing new Sunday Schools. Later, feeling a strong conviction that the Mississippi Valley, as the whole country west of the mountains was then called, was to be the field of his Christian work, he took a commission from the Home Missionary Society and traveled west. His first assignment there was the pastorate of the Presbyterian Church in Elyria located on the frontier in northern Ohio. It began in February, 1831.[2]

Having served faithfully in Mississippi, Stewart journeyed

---

[1]James H. Fairchild, Oberlin, The Colony and the College (Oberlin, Ohio: 1883), p. 10.

[2]Ibid., pp. 10-14.

northward to meet again his former friend with whom he had attended school at the Pawlet Academy. Their meeting was at the home of Shipherd in the spring of 1832. These two men were in consecration and objective similar, believing that the church and the world needed to be elevated to a higher plane of life and action and that their own lives should be spent for this purpose. Their lives also manifested differences. Mr. Shipherd was ardent, hopeful, sanguine, and often underestimated difficulties; while Mr. Stewart was overly cautious, apprehensive, and prepared in advance for difficulties. The two men complemented each other. [1]

During the summer of 1832 the two men conceived a plan of establishing a community of Christian families from which they would exclude worldly influences, would include God-fearing people who were interested in the training of Christian laborers. They held that the members of the colony were

> ". . . to establish schools of the first order, from the infant school up to an academic school which shall afford a thorough education in English and the use of languages: and if Providence favors it, at length instructions in theology--I mean practical theology. They are to connect workshops and a farm with the institution, and so simplify diet and dress that, by four hours' labor per day, young men will defray their entire expenses, and young women working at the spinning-wheel and loom will defray much of their expenses, and all will thus save money, and what is more, promote muscular, mental and moral vigor.
>
> "In these schools all the children of the colony are to be well educated, whether destined to professional or manual

---

[1] Ibid., p. 14.

> labor; for those designed to be mechanics will learn their trades while in the course of study. These schools will also educate school teachers for our desolate valley and many ministers for our dying world; also instruct the children and youth of the surrounding population. To do this we want some twenty-five or more good families and two thousand dollars' outfit for the schools."[1]

Shipherd's resignation was accepted by his church on October 29, 1832, and the two men set themselves to the task of building the colony and college. Suggestions were made to them of various locations. They would have none of them. The place had to be large enough for several farms with enough left over for the community and school. Knowing of the level clay land in the southern part of the Russian township that was still in its primitive state, the two men after a day of prayer mounted their horses, took their course and rode about eight miles before coming to the undisturbed portion of the forest. They entered the forest on a line running north to south that was previously cleared by surveyors who felled the trees for a breadth of about four rods, though it was then completely grown over with bushes. At a point deep in the forest on the west side of the clearing the two men dismounted, tied their horses to a tree and knelt under the boughs of another and prayed for divine guidance. The prayer under the elm tree was historical. It marked the place where Oberlin College and community would begin. Having decided upon the location and learning that the owners of the property lived in the East, in November Mr. Shipherd mounted his horse and rode toward the rising sun with ambitions to

---

[1]Ibid., p. 19.

secure the land, money, and people. [1]

On the day of his departure grave problems were encountered by him. Mrs. Shipherd's record gives us some insight of his struggle:

> "He had his horse saddled at nine o'clock in the morning, but was unable to proceed before three in the afternoon. The adversary assailed him and presented every possible thing to discourage him; he prayed and agonized for light, but the temptation continued. He finally started, but had to return; he had forgotten something, and we had to have a second parting. The third time he had to turn back, but I was not aware of it. He finally proceeded on his way a few miles until he came to a piece of woods, where he dismounted and fell upon his knees and acknowledged to the Lord that he had no desire for the work if it was not His will, and that he could not proceed until he had a 'thus saith the Lord.' He arose from his knees with his heart full of praise, and remounted his horse with these words: 'with Jesus at home'; and this assurance followed him through all his years of traveling without a cloud crossing his mind.
>
> "He accomplished the journey and arrived in New Haven in about two weeks, where he stopped with friends of ours. The day after his arrival he called on Messrs. Street and Hughes, and laid his plan before them, and asked the gift of five hundred acres for a Manual Labor School, proposing to gather a colony of families who should pay a dollar and a half an acre, for five thousand acres in addition, representing that this would bring their lands into market, and thus prove a mutual benefit. But they could not see the prospect. He called on them day after day unsuccessfully, until at length he came down from his room one morning, and remarked to the lady of the house, our friend, 'I shall succeed today'; and she told me afterwards that his face shone like the face of Moses. He accordingly went over to the office, and after the morning salutations one of the firm said, 'Well, Mr. Shipherd, we have concluded to accept your proposition.' They adjusted matters, and he was prepared to proceed with his work of collecting a colony." [2]

The eastern tour occupied Mr. Shipherd through the winter and spring and following summer while Mr. Stewart assumed the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 21. [2] Ibid., pp. 23-24.

general supervision of the work at Oberlin. He met new colonists as they came from the East and assisted them with information and encouragement. The colonists, upon deciding to participate with colonial endeavor, agreed to the following covenant:

" THE OBERLIN COVENANT

"Lamenting the degeneracy of the Church and the deplorable condition of our perishing world, and ardently desirous of bringing both under the entire influence of the blessed Gospel of peace; and viewing with peculiar interest the influence which the valley of the Mississippi must exert over our nation and the nations of the earth; and having, as we trust, in answer to devout supplications, been guided by the counsel of the Lord: the undersigned covenant together under the name of the Oberlin Colony, subject to the following regulations, which may be amended by a concurrence of two-thirds of the colonists:

"1. Providence permitting, we engage as soon as practicable to remove to the Oberlin Colony, in Russia, Lorain County, Ohio, and there to fix our residence, for the express purpose of glorifying God in doing good to men to the extent of our ability.

"2. We will hold and manage our estates personally, but pledge as perfect a community of interests as though we held a community of property.

"3. We will hold in possession no more property than we believe we can profitably manage for God, and His faithful stewards.

"4. We will, by industry, economy, and Christian self-denial, obtain as much as we can, above our necessary personal or family expenses, and faithfully appropriate the same for the spread of the Gospel.

"5. That we may have time and health for the Lord's service, we will eat only plain and wholesome food, renouncing all bad habits, and especially the smoking and chewing of tobacco, unless it is necessary as a medicine, and deny ourselves all strong and unnecessary drinks, even tea and coffee, as far as practicable, and everything expensive, that is simply calculated to gratify the palate.

"6. That we may add to our time and health money for the service of the Lord, we will renounce all the world's expensive and unwholesome fashions of dress, particularly tight dressing and ornamental attire.

"7. And yet more to increase our means of serving Him who bought us with His blood, we will observe plainness and durability in the construction of our houses, furniture, carriages, and all that appertains to us.

"8. We will strive continually to show that we, as the body of Christ, are members one of another; and will, while living, provide for the widows, orphans, and families of the sick and needy, as for ourselves.

"9. We will take special pains to educate all our children thoroughly, and to train them up, in body, intellect and heart, for the service of the Lord.

"10. We will feel that the interests of the Oberlin Institute are identified with ours, and do what we can to extend its influence to our fallen race.

"11. We will make special efforts to sustain the institutions of the Gospel at home and among our neighbors.

"12. We will strive to maintain deep-toned and elevated personal piety, to provoke each other to love and good works, to live together in all things as brethren, and to glorify God in our bodies and spirits, which are His.

"In testimony of our fixed purpose this to do, in reliance on Divine Grace, we hereunto affix our names."[1]

This was not a church, but a colonial covenant which committed the colonists to a way of life. The covenant at times was the cause of community dissention and was finally abondoned, leaving personal duty and practical affairs to individual conscience.

The institution opened on December 3, 1833, with 34 students. Its grand objectives were to give the most useful education at the least

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 26-27.

expense of health, time, and money; and to extend the benefit of such education to both sexes and to all classes of the community as far as its means would allow. Its system embraced thorough instruction in every department, from the infant school up through a collegiate and theological course. While care was taken not to lower the standards of intellectual culture, they attempted to combine with it the best physical and moral education. Prominent objects of this seminary were the thorough qualification of Christian teachers, both for the pulpits and for the schools; and the elevation of female character by bringing within the reach of the misjudged and neglected sex all the instructive privileges which had hitherto unreasonably distinguished the leading sex from theirs. [1]

After the first winter they abandoned the primary school and left the people to provide for their children in connection with the common school system of the state. [2]

The first college class opened near the end of October, 1834, consisting of four young men who entered as freshmen by way of taking an examination. It was indicated that they could have qualified for entrance into any American college. The examination tested their knowledge of Latin, Greek, and mathematics. The college of Harvard had begun almost two hundred years before (1636). The entrance require-

---

[1]The first circular issued by Oberlin officials, dated March 8, 1838.

[2]Fairchild, Oberlin, The Colony and The College, p. 38.

ments in both schools were about the same. [1]

The term of school continued through the summer with a twelve weeks' vacation in the winter. This permitted the advanced students to teach in various schools during the winter. This order was continued with some variations until 1878.

The development of a theological seminary was listed as one of the initial objectives of the founder. It was primarily the dream of a dreamer, but to the surprise of many its coming was sudden and unexpected. It was brought to pass by the cooperation of various movements which were national in their scope. Contributing factors were the rapid westward movement of people, the development of transportation, an intellectual quickening, a broad belief that manual labor was indispensable for students, a prevalence of tremendous revivals throughout the nation, an unprecedented missionary activity destined to assist the developing of the westward movement and the beginning of a national reform against slavery that led to the Civil War. [2]

The primary cause that hastened the development of the Oberlin Seminary was due to bitter dissention that developed in Lane Theological Seminary. The latter seminary was established in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1829. The school was split asunder over the issue of slavery. When it was over, the majority of the faculty and students went to Oberlin. Ever after Oberlin was a hot bed of anti-slavery feelings and plans.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Leonard, The History of Oberlin, pp. 126-127.

When the Civil War began, Oberlin men were among the first to take up arms against the South. They proved to be gallant soldiers and many of them died defending what they believed to be morally right.

From the inception of the school, co-education was conceived as one of the major educational objectives. This was an educational innovation where Oberlin became a pioneer. Harvard and Yale planned exclusively for men in their educational endeavors. A few schools had developed primarily for the education of young women such as the academy established by Mrs. Emma Willard in Middleburg, Vermont, in 1807; one by Catherine Fiske at Keene, New Hampshire; one by Joseph Emerson in eastern Massachusetts and a seminary by Katherine Beecher in Hartford, Connecticut, but they were not co-educational. Oberlin took the leadership in opening its doors and making possible its educational values to men and women alike. [1]

When Oberlin came into being, higher education for negroes in an integrated school, like co-education, was non-existent in America and almost unheard of among college administrators. Serious anti-slavery feelings were taking root in many parts of the North. A significant debate occurred in 1833 in Lane Theological Seminary over the slavery issue where free discussion was considered not only a right, but a duty. The anti-slavery position was soundly defended by Theodore D. Weld, a convert of Charles G. Finney, and believed by Dr. Lyman Beecher, President of Lane, to be a genius. This debate lasted for

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 154-160.

weeks and resulted in a storm that almost destroyed the school. During the following school vacation, the board of trustees of Lane Theological Seminary voted a policy prohibiting any further discussions either by faculty or students on the slavery issue. The faculty members and students who refused to abide by the decision found themselves without a place to learn. They were invited to Oberlin by Mr. Shipherd. They came, but on their own terms: Rev. Asa Mahan would serve as president; Rev. Charles G. Finney would be campus preacher and head the Theological Seminary; and the school must be opened to all people "irrespective of color."[1]

Oberlin was born when our nation was in a restless, turbulent and progressive era. The school developed out of religious, social, and political fermentation to help meet religious and educational needs of a new and expanding democracy.

The founding of Oberlin exemplifies the rugged, individualistic, and daring methods that were so prevalent and often so unsuccessful in the pre-Civil War period. Often the only prerequisites necessary to attempt the organization and construction of a college were a man, a prayer, a vision, possibly a log cabin, a denominational interest, a burning religious zeal, and a willingness to work hard.

Contributing factors both in the cause of Oberlin's origin and its success stem from the general need for higher education where young men and women should be trained for vocational, civil, and

---

[1]Fairchild, Oberlin, The Colony and The College, pp. 50-55.

religious services; from the basic religious interest of Mr. Shipherd and Mr. Stewart who felt that their lives should be spent in helping meet the requirements of evangelizing and educating the masses who were then populating the Mississippi Valley; and from a strange and possibly providential set of circumstances, including the slavery debate at Lane Seminary from which came both President Mahon and the flaming evangelist, Mr. Finney, who served as head of the school of Theology.

The college was organized and developed financially on the basis of unique resources such as could be secured in a free non-tax supported enterprise. It included the securing of a large tract of underdeveloped land, the hard work of families and especially young men, and contributions from the colony and friends from New England.

SUMMARY

The Dartmouth Supreme Court Case set the stage for the proliferation of Christian colleges by legally guaranteeing the rights and investments of college founders and donors. The greatest contributing factor in this era to the college building enterprise was a revival embracing missionary zeal where denominations were competing for their own prestige and for the glory of God. To exemplify the extensive college building endeavor, Oberlin was selected. The men who organized it were educationally of sub-college levels, but were zealous with willingness and courage to promote the cause which they considered to be of greater value than themselves. The issue of the Civil

War affected Oberlin College and possibly every other college in America.

CHAPTER V

UNIVERSITIES BEGIN IN THE UNITED STATES

Following the Civil War the purpose for organizing the Christian higher institution changed, but not completely. The older college, rather narrow in objective, had been hampered by limited support and by its own rigidity. The curriculum was inadequate and the teaching methods unimaginative and dogmatic. Change was inevitable; scholasticism was to be relegated to a position of lesser importance, national interest was to be granted a place of importance, and increasing numbers were to avail themselves of higher learning.

In a survey made by F. A. P. Barnard in 1870, he found an alarming condition regarding the limited number of prospective American students who were attending college. His report shows that there was an increased enrollment in colleges during the twelve years preceding 1838. In that year it had reached an amazingly low figure of one boy in every 1,294; but in 1869 it was even lower, a ratio of one in every 1,927. Part of the decline may be attributed to the Civil War; however, since the population in New England had grown about fifteen percent in the previous fourteen years, there had been only three and one-third percent increase in college enrollment.

Harvard was the only school in New England that had a significant enrollment increase which was 216 in 1838-39 to 563 in 1870. [1]

The static condition of the American college demanded a revolutionary change. The curriculum had changed but little during the past two hundred years. The Latin, Greek, logic, mathematics, and geography usually dominating the course of study were not sufficient to meet the demands of an expanding nation where mechanics, agriculture, business, and other fields were important interests clamoring for the benefits of higher education. The educational revolution came, but not primarily by ecclesiastical influences. It brought in its wake practical and technical developments that were undergirded with a variety of new philosophies.

An increasing number of American college graduates in quest for desired higher education had their desire fulfilled in the German universities since the American colleges were still bound by their scholastic curriculum. Upon returning to America, these new educators were eager to share their experiences. George Bancroft as early as 1819 while studying in Göttingen was thinking, "How nobly all good literature would thrive, if we could transplant it to America, if we could engraft it on a healthy tree, if we could unite it with a high moral feeling, if learning would only go to school [sic] to religion." [2] The following year George Ticknor attempted an abortive reform at Harvard

---

[1] Annual Report of the President of Columbia College (New York: 1870), pp. 40-62, cited in Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education.

[2] Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education, I, p. 264.

fashioned after the German system.[1] Contributing also to the German influence on American education was a healthy-minded group of educational innovators including Francis Lieber, J. Leo Wolf, Francis Wayland, and Henry P. Tappan.

INFLUENCE OF MORRILL ACT

Though German education possibly made the greatest intellectual contribution toward the American university, it was the Morrill Act signed into law by Abraham Lincoln in July, 1862, that made the greatest financial contribution.

The assignment of lands for higher education dated back to an early congress in America when an ordinance, adopted in 1787, gave a grant of land to the Ohio Company to support higher education. By the time the Morrill Land Grant Act was introduced into congress in 1857, it had become a common practice for the federal government to set aside part of its vast lands for the support of education with some four million acres having already been granted to fifteen states for the endowment of state universities.[2] The Morrill Act was first passed by congress in 1859, but was vetoed by President Buchanan because of powerful opposition from Southerners who were supported by some of the Midwesterners. When it was adopted again under Lincoln's administration, little significance was given to it, even though it changed the

---

[1]Ibid., p. 269.

[2]Carl Becker, Cornell University: Founders and the Founding (New York: Ithaca, 1943), p. 25.

course of educational history in America. It provided that every state should receive 30,000 acres of public land for each senator and representative in congress. Every state was expected to found at least one college within five years or forfeit the proceeds of the land-script sales. The first university to take advantage of the new law was Cornell of New York. A gift from Ezra Cornell in the amount of $500,000 greatly stimulated the project. [1]

BEGINNING OF LARGE UNIVERSITIES

With the organization of Cornell University, the movement toward bigness was on its way. Older colleges were strengthened and great new universities were organized and endowed often by a single eleemosynary stroke and by a single millionaire philanthropist. It was a $1,000,000 gift that give birth and a name to Vanderbilt University. A $3,500,000 donation did the same for Johns Hopkins. A larger sum of $20,000,000 ultimately came from the Stanford estate for Stanford University, and more than $30,000,000 from Rockefeller to the campus of the University of Chicago. [2]

Why build the great universities? Henry P. Tappan who was elected to the presidency of the University of Michigan in 1852 can give us insights. He held that German universities were model institutions with freedom, great libraries and professors of eminence in all

---

[1]Richard Hofstadter and C. DeWitt Hardy, The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press), pp. 39-40.

[2]Ibid., p. 32.

branches of knowledge. According to Tappan, American colleges were deficient and narrow and too much like the British. American colleges promised too much and did too little. They had no genuine appeal to the manufacturer, the merchant, the gold digger, or even the politician. They did not need a multiplication. They were already too many and too poor. Latin and Greek needed less discussion, productive professions more. The nation had only colleges. It wanted universities. Too many American students were forced to seek satisfaction to their quest for knowledge in foreign universities. Said Tappan, "We have delayed this great work of founding universities too long. We cannot well afford to wait for any new sign from heaven before we begin this work. . . . May we not now create at least one great institution of learning that may vie with the best of the old world?"[1] Tappan's opportunity to have a dream come true was granted him in the state of Michigan where he was elected as president of the University of Michigan. The ongoing of the university still testifies of his success as a wise designer and a university builder.

In this rising tide for educational bigness, Christian influences were not asleep; however, serious considerations to meet university competition required the religious planners to be aware of their surroundings. A new university would have to exist to teach, to treasure, and to transmit knowledge. It would also have to investigate through

---

[1]Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education, Vol. II, pp. 448-511.

research and add new knowledge. An ear would have to be open to the hum of industry and an eye would have to be kept on corporate business, urbanism, social complexities, the prestige of professional schools, and the advancement of science.

Graduate studies above the college level became the goal of an increasing number of schools. Yale in 1847 was distinguished as the first to offer graduate courses. The first Ph.D. was granted by Yale in 1861. In 1872 a graduate department of philosophy and arts was established. In the same year Harvard inaugurated its graduate department. The first American university to be organized exclusively as a graduate school was Johns Hopkins. Graduate enrollments in America became prominent with amazing speed. In 1871 it stood at 198. By 1890 it was 2,382 and by 1910 the enrollment increased to 9,370. Research and publication became more the watchwords of universities than teaching. [1]

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

When one considers the University of Chicago and why it was organized, he looks in three different directions. He sees John D. Rockefeller, William Rainey Harper, and the Baptist Church.

John D. Rockefeller (1839-1937) became one of America's foremost industrialists and philanthropists. His vast holdings were developed by strict economy, mergers with his competitors, and the

---

[1]Hofstadter and Hardy, The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States, pp. 62-64.

development and control of Standard Oil Company. Philanthropies other than his investments in the university amounted to more than $500,000,000. His denominational affiliation was with the Baptist Church and he had enough friends and interest in it to desire that at least part of his contributions would help its cause. [1]

On July 24, 1856, William Rainey Harper was born in New Concord, Ohio. His parents were Scotch Covenanters. While still wearing short pants, Willie breezed right through Latin and Greek, trigonometry, psychology, and physiology. Three of his classmates desired to study Hebrew as they prepared for the ministry. Willie joined them. He gave the Salutatory at his graduation. He was thirteen years old when he received his A.B. degree. Two years later he received his Ph.D. from the graduate school of Yale.

Harper's career took him to Masonic College at Macon, Tennessee, where he began at the age of sixteen serving as principal and organized a band. He accepted a position as tutor in Davidson University, Granville, Ohio, at the age of twenty. At this age he also married Ella Paul, became successful in teaching Hebrew, and became a convert to Christianity. One night in 1876 the language teacher appeared at a Baptist prayer meeting in Granville. Most of the faculty of Davidson University were present. Though Harper had been born a Presbyterian, he was not a church member. That night he arose from

---

[1]The Columbia Viking Desk Encyclopedia (New York: Columbia University), p. 1564.

his pew on the back row and said, "I want to be a Christian. I do not know what it is to be a Christian, but I know I am not a Christian and I want to be one." He became a convert and was received into the membership of the Baptist Church. [1]

Harper's next teaching assignment took him to the Baptist Union Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois, where he at the age of twenty-two taught men Hebrew who were older than he. At the end of his first year he was given the degree of Bachelor of Divinity and promoted from instructor to professor. Teaching Hebrew was his chief delight. His elementary course was the most popular in the seminary. It consisted of four hours' study a day for five days a week in a ten weeks' course. His students pursued the course as though their final success in the ministry depended upon a thorough knowledge of the entire Hebrew Bible. His enthusiasm caused students to form extra classes and read more than was prescribed. His work led him to teach during the summer. He gave resurrection to a dead language. His summers were soon booked solidly and thousands were by 1886 taking Hebrew from him by correspondence. He wrote the correspondence courses. He wrote the text books in Hebrew. He wrote the two journals, "The Hebrew Student" and "Hebraica." He founded the American Institute of Hebrew. [2]

---

[1]Milton Mayer, A Young Man In A Hurry (Illinois: University of Chicago Press), pp. 5-12.

[2]Ibid., pp. 14-15.

The college connected with the seminary where he was teaching, like so many institutions of his time, found itself in financial difficulties. The school had been established by Stephen A. Douglas. It bore an imposing name, The Chicago University; however, it was neither a university nor of Chicago. The value of its first public subscription was wiped out by the panic of 1857. The Civil War made fund raising impossible. The big fires of 1871 and 1874 brought the school to the verge of bankruptcy. [1]

A rumor reached Rockefeller that the Congregationalists were planning to entice Harper away from the Baptists. His concern was expressed in a letter to Thomas W. Goodspeed who was trying to save the Christian outpost for higher education. Goodspeed proposed to the trustees of the expiring college that they elect Harper as president, which they immediately did. Then Goodspeed answered Rockefeller's anxiety by saying that Morgan Park saw no way of holding Harper unless he could be induced to accept the presidency of the college, which in turn would have to be put on its feet. Rockefeller replied that he "didn't know what to say" about the college, but he felt deeply that young Harper should be retained by the seminary and he was ready to make a special grant for the purpose. Harper was not interested in being president of a good college, much less a questionable one. At the age of 29, he left Union Theological Seminary and went to Yale where he taught Hebrew under the presidency of Timothy

---

[1] Ibid., p. 18.

Dwight. [1]

During the years that he was at Yale he gave seminars in Assyrian, Arabic, Aramaic, Chaldee, Sanskrit, and Syriac. He offered courses in the English Bible to undergraduate students. Before long the entire student body was interested in his historical study of the prophets. As many as twelve hundred townspeople of New Haven attended his lectures. Every other Sunday he lectured before the entire student body of Vassar. He often spoke to schools and congregations at New York, Philadelphia, and Boston. He wrote a textbook on Hebrew and another on Greek. He edited a series of volumes on the inductive method of teaching Latin and Greek. He wrote articles for learned journals and reports on his various enterprises and carried on a running dispute in "Hebraica" on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, taking the liberal position against the traditional position of his distinguished opponent, Dr. W. Henry Green of Princeton. He was offered the presidency of Brown, Rochester, and South Dakota. [2]

In the late summer of 1887, Dr. Strong visited Harper at Yale and then wrote to Rockefeller: "My dear Mr. Rockefeller, if we let that man get out of our hands, it will be the greatest loss our denomination has sustained during this century." [3] Rockefeller made an appointment to meet Harper at Vassar. After the meeting, they traveled together to New York. Harper spent the evening with him. Rockefeller talked. He talked and talked. He talked as if he had

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 20-21. [2] Ibid., pp. 29-42. [3] Ibid., p. 32.

never had a chance to talk before. His visitor listened and smiled and answered questions.

The history of these two men from their first meeting until William Rainey Harper signed the agreement to become president of University of Chicago is a fascinating "cat and mouse" story that leaves a person confused as to who is the cat and who is the mouse--who caught whom.

Why was the University of Chicago organized? We find the answer in the philosophy of William Rainey Harper, in the gold of John D. Rockefeller and in the ambition of the Baptist Church!

Harper was interested in a great university only. It must be born grown. American education had been spreading before and since the Civil War, but it had not been improving. He wanted an institution new enough to pioneer and strong enough to set the educational pace. Its task would be not merely to teach, but primarily to learn. Its business would be discovery and the training of discoverers. Every instructor would be an investigator; for, said Harper, "It is only the man who has made investigations who may teach others to investigate."[1] He wanted original minds pioneering in a world whose limits would be the farthest reaches of man's inquiry. The students should not be boys and girls, but mature men and women, candidates for world scholarships. The professional schools of divinity, law, and medicine would not exist primarily for the preparation of lawyers, doctors, and

---

[1]Ibid., p. 22.

ministers, but for the "purpose of discovering and the training of discoverers in each field." Harper knew the difficulties of being both a teacher and a scholar. He chose scholarship. His university would be primarily theoretical, not practical. The "groundwork for discoveries" would be the goal of science. "In education it would give the country new methods and produce a steady stream of teachers to introduce these methods into the schools and colleges in which they would teach." His university would "water the tree of knowledge at the roots."[1]

Harper's university would not be sectarian. Educators of his day such as President White of Cornell had long maintained that the sectarian spirit was the worst enemy of higher education. Denominational intolerance went all the way back to the ousting of Henry Dunster, the first president of Harvard. Harper advised Rockefeller that the university must separate theology from the other departments, and they must follow the liberal tradition of indifference to the orthodoxy of the teachers.[2]

The ideas of a university as advocated by Harper were not completely original with him. The Berlin University at that time had some 5,000, and Oxford half as many graduate students. Attempts had been made, or were in progress, toward the development of university plans in America such as Andrew D. White at Cornell, Francis Wayland at Brown, Timothy Dwight at Yale, Seth Low at Columbia, G. Stanley

---

[1]Ibid., p. 24. [2]Ibid., p. 26.

Hall at Clark University, Daniel Coit Gilman at Johns Hopkins, Henry P. Tappan at the University of Michigan, and Charles William Eliot at Harvard. A host of others were interested and dreaming. [1]

Harper consented to take the presidency of the proposed University of Chicago on February 16, 1891; but when he did, one eye was on the Lord and the other on the gold in the vaults of John D. Rockefeller. He insisted upon millions to start and a blank check with the signature of the nation's richest industrialist.

John D. Rockefeller, the wealthy and liberal industrialist, used two hands to give his money away, but the "Oil King" had many more taking it in. His first contribution was $600,000 for the educational institution in Chicago, but within a year an amount of $400,000 had to be raised by the people of Chicago. In order to open the school by October, 1892, Harper needed more money. Rockefeller's second gift was $1,000,000. This meant that tools at the disposal of Harper were $2,000,000, ten acres of land that had been contributed by Marshal Fields, and an ardent scattering of Baptists. This was not enough. Harper needed a minimum of $4,000,000. He got it. Marshal Fields gave $100,000. Chicago raised an additional $900,000. Rockefeller gave his second million.

The University of Chicago opened according to plan and was born almost full grown. It was a beginning, but only a beginning. Rockefeller did not realize that the enterprise would ultimately cost

---

[1]Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education, Vol. II, pp. 488-601.

him and his foundations a modest sum of $80,000,000. Only Harper could realize and believe it. [1]

The Baptist Church leaders were impressively interested and participated actively in the origin and development of the university. A lifelong friend of Rockefeller, Dr. Augustus H. Strong, had advised him to build a $20,000,000 university in New York. Too often, he thought, the Baptists have built churches on back streets and colleges in country towns. He wanted Rockefeller's twenty million dollar university to be established on Morningside Heights where Columbia now stands. It would be militantly Christian, closed to "infidel" teachers, and strictly controlled by the church. Rockefeller, like Strong, was a fundamentalist, but his gifts often reached the needs of Catholics, Negroes,and Jews. The vacillating opinion in Rockefeller's mind as to whether the university would be in New York or in Chicago had to be decided. Strong wanted it in New York, and Harper wanted it in Chicago.

Fredrick T. Gates was appointed as Executive Secretary of the American Baptist Education Society. The purpose of the society was to canvass the educational needs of the denomination. Though Gates sometimes preached, he was primarily a businessman and a go-getter, sharp, and cynical. He had observed Harper closely for a long time and was convinced that the place for Rockefeller's contribution was Chicago. He prepared a paper entitled "A New University in Chicago,

---

[1]Mayer, A Young Man In A Hurry, pp. 40-60.

A Denominational Necessity, As Illustrated By a Study of Western Baptist Collegiate Education." Some of the Baptist brethren were astonished at the report and others were amazed and bewildered. Harper was pleased. Rockefeller, having read the report, sent for Gates. It was in the meeting between the two that Rockefeller pledged his first gift and Gates promised that Chicago would raise the $400,000.[1]

The American Baptist Church transferred their Union Theological Seminary from Morgan Park where Harper had spent some eight years of his life as a professor of Hebrew. With the transfer Harper again occupied the position of Head of Old Testament Criticism and the Department of Hebrew in addition to his serving as president of the university.[2]

The University of Chicago was about as free from denominational rivalry as any denominationally oriented college or university; yet, one can detect their motivating influence in Rockefeller, the other Baptist leaders, and to a lesser degree in Harper.

It may be concluded that the reason why the University of Chicago came into being was the desire of William Rainey Harper to build a new, superior, pace-setting institution that would do excellent teaching, thorough research, and extensive publishing; because John D. Rockefeller had the finances and was willing to invest them in the university; and because the American Baptist Church desired to propagate

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 38-39. [2]Ibid., p. 45.

their message to the world and elevate their prestige among the peoples of the earth. Thus they would magnify God and do His service.

When classes opened on October 1, 1892, President Harper welcomed a student body of 594 and the strongest faculty in America. Included in the 103 faculty members were many men of intellectual renown, including nine former presidents of universities and colleges. Listed also among them was the nation's first dean of women and the first professional football coach.

For its size, the undergraduate school of the University of Chicago is today the nation's best source of graduate students for the major professions and for the arts and sciences. From 85 to 90 percent pursue advanced work. The University of Chicago ranks as the largest per capita producer of college and university teachers, contributing 108 teachers for every 1,000 undergraduates earning degrees. [1]

On higher education in America, the University of Chicago has exerted profound influence. Listed among its contributions are the junior college concept and equal educational opportunities for women at all levels.

The university is made up of the undergraduate college, seven graduate professional schools, four graduate divisions, and seven institutes. There are more than ninety student organizations active on the campus, including seven honorary and nine national fraternities. More than 40,000 have graduated with degrees.

---

[1] Collegiate Challenge Magazine, Vol. 4, No. 1, January 1965.

The Rockefeller Chapel dominates the campus with its tower rising 207 feet above the quadrangles. This tower gives testimony of the Christian faith of its founders and the chapel serves the university community where the fundamental issues of Christian faith are constantly proclaimed, making faith relative to culture, vocation, and learning. [1]

SUMMARY

Religious colleges and universities were established in America with one major purpose and a multiplicity of minor purposes. The basic purpose was to propagate the gospel of Jesus Christ and to magnify God in teaching the arts and sciences to the youthful constituency of the nation. The minor causes fluctuated with the changing interests and necessities as they developed during the various eras of the national history.

In the colonial period colleges were organized to perpetuate the culture and learning of the mother countries, to meet the need of filling pulpits with learned ministers, and to prepare trained professionals, primarily in law for the state. Between the Revolutionary War and the Dartmouth Supreme Court Case there was uncertainty regarding whether final authority resided in the state or in the charter of the private school. Before the issue was determined, accelerated interest developed in higher education with the organizing of new state colleges and universities while some states exerted a stronger hand

---

[1] Ibid.

in the existing colonial colleges. The uncertainty regarding school control was settled by the Supreme Court, and policies for future development were made clear even though the progress of the state system of higher education was impeded. Leading to the Civil War was an avalanche of diversified Christian interest to the point of evangelistic fever that spread over the Mississippi Valley planting Christian colleges in its wake. Following the Civil War, the tendency was toward the university where research and publication took places equally as important as teaching. It was a time when administrators began to emulate European universities in a deadly serious attempt to develop superiority in academic excellence. The new Christian universities were not greatly different in purpose from that of the expanding state universities.

CHAPTER VI

HIGHER EDUCATION DEMOCRATIZED

Religious interest dominated American higher education from the founding of Harvard College in 1636 until the Civil War. During this time the primary purpose of the college founders was to train ministers through classical education by exercising the mind in mental discipline. The early abortive interest in utilitarian higher education became a non-resistible force after the Civil War. The utilitarian force with the latent influence of revolutionary ideals, the German successes in learning and teaching, plus the rise of big business and industry fired the ambitions of educational leaders that gave birth to the American university. By the beginning of the twentieth century religious domination had lost its control and new streams of philosophical interest flowed into the American system of higher education. This called for answers to a new set of problems embracing academic freedom, the federal government and its contribution, student selectivity and increased enrollment, the necessity for a broader administrative base, new methods of instruction, incessant conflicts and counter-revolution, the production of multipurposed educational goals, and the production of the multiversity.

Up to the time of the Civil War, American higher education was founded and nurtured by religious interest. Still existing as permanent institutions from 1862, the date of the Morrill Act, are 207 colleges and universities. Of this number 180 are listed as denominational colleges, 21 as state universities, 3 semi-state, and 3 municipal.[1] The Great Awakening in colonial history and the intensified revivals between 1830 and 1860 brought in their wake a birth of colleges. These periods of religious fervor needed trained ministers. The 15 competing denominations of those periods attempted to meet this need by building colleges in which their ministers would be trained.

Contributing factors in the founding of denominational colleges can be traced to the religious culture that flowed into the colonies from Europe, and to the desire of new churches to grow in a new country and survive with prestige and leadership. Contributing greatly to their founding was the supreme court decision in the Dartmouth Case that protected the rights of educational institutions from political and governmental interference. The separation of church and state as a policy placed free men in a free country where grass-roots citizens could attempt ambitious projects, and where an army of ministers was needed on an expanding Western frontier. Denominations developed new churches, organized additional congregations, planted Sunday Schools, raised more funds, and fulfilled the missionary enterprise

---

[1]Tewksbury, The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War, p. 90.

only because they trained men in their schools where their doctrines were taught.

The fifteen denominations that became college builders during the pre-Civil War period were divided into two groups. One group from the beginning advocated an educated ministry. The other group in their early history opposed the ideal of a highly educated ministry and depended on the self-made men who had a special call from God to preach. The denominations that were influenced by European culture and that advocated a well educated ministry entered early in the task of college building, among them were the Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Catholics, Lutherans, German Reformed, Dutch Reformed, and the Unitarians. [1]

Among those who stressed education less and evangelism more were the Methodists, Baptist, Disciples, Friends, United Brethren, Christian, and Universalists. Their message and appeal was within the experience, language, and learning of a frontier society. Their highest regard was not for learning or scholarship. Their growth was rapid, especially among the Methodist, Baptist, and Disciples. [2]

The Methodist Church was typical and numerically more successful among those churches that thrived with the "eastern poor and the western frontiermen." By January, 1830, their membership numbered approximately a million. Their circuit-riders and lay

---

[1] Ibid., p. 89. [2] Ibid.

preachers went to the remotest places preaching in wagon camps, in court houses, on street corners, under brush arbors, in log cabin houses, in small and large churches. Among them there was not a college. They saw little need for a trained ministry. They were doing a better job than others; and yet, the competition of other denominations which had built up colleges of their own began to be keenly felt in the struggle to recruit young men for the ministry and the church. Criticisms to which the ministers of the Methodist Church were increasingly subjected by the more highly educated clergy caused a deep soul searching and a new analysis on the part of Methodism. Statements made in 1831 and 1839 reflect the transition of their educational philosophy:

> "These young men, generally the most promising of our best families, will be educated somewhere. If there be not proper and elevated institutions under our own patronage, they will be sent to others. What is the consequence? Many of them return with prejudice against the religious opinions and practices of their parents; not only injured themselves, as we think, but prove a great mortification to their parents. They frequently forsake our assemblies, and become able and efficient supporters of other people. Let me ask you, my brethren, if these things ought to be so? Think of our immense loss in this way, and then think of the means to remedy it. An active, unanimous effort throughout the connection would set this matter right in less than ten years."[1]

> "Those of our youth who were in pursuit of an education were obliged to seek it in institutions under the influence and control of other denominations. As might be expected, many became alienated, or were drawn from us. The ranks of our ministry were often impoverished by young men of piety and promise going out among others to seek literary advantages which we could not give them, and finally connecting themselves with other ecclesiastical bodies. . . . To see our young men drawn away from us in this way--young men for

---

[1]John Durbin, Quarterly Register, August, 1831, p. 16

> whom we had labored and prayed, and over whom we had rejoiced as children born into our spiritual household--was by no means agreeable."[1]

The movement for founding Methodist colleges began by establishing Randolph-Macon College in Virginia in 1830 and the Wesleyan University in Connecticut in 1831. These two schools, one in the North and one in the South, became the parent colleges for the rapid development of college building by the Methodist Church. Between 1830 and 1860, the Methodist Church established more than an average of one new college per year. A hundred years later, in 1930, there were listed thirty-four Methodist colleges that were founded before the Civil War. They are listed below:[2]

Present Name and Location	Charter-Degree Date
Randolph-Macon College Ashland, Va.	February 3, 1830
Wesleyan University Middletown, Conn.	May 26, 1831
Allegheny College Meadville, Pa.	March 24, 1817
Dickinson College Carlisle, Pa.	September 9, 1783
McKendree College Lebanon, Ill.	February 9, 1835
Emory University Atlanta, Ga.	December 10, 1836
Wesleyan College Macon, Ga.	December 23, 1836
DePauw University Greencastle, Ind.	January 10, 1837
Greensboro College Greensboro, N. C.	December 28, 1838

---

[1]Methodist Magazine, July, 1839, p. 272.

[2]Tewksbury, The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War, pp. 104-105.

Emory and Henry College Emory, Va.	March 25, 1839
Ohio Wesleyan University Delaware, O.	March 7, 1842
Centenary College of Louisiana Shreveport, La.	February 18, 1825
Baldwin-Wallace College Berea, O.	December 20, 1845
Lawrence College Appleton, Wisc.	January 15, 1847
Taylor University Upland, Ind.	January 18, 1847
Lagrange Female College Lagrange, Ga.	December 17, 1847
Albion College Albion, Mich.	February 18, 1850
Northwestern University Evanston, Ill.	January 28, 1851
College of the Pacific Stockton, Cal.	July 10, 1851
Wofford College Spartanburg, S. C.	December 16, 1851
Duke University Durham, N. C.	November 21, 1852
Willàmette University Salem, Ore.	January 12, 1853
Illinois Wesleyan University Bloomington, Ill.	February 12, 1853
Cornell College Mt. Vernon, Ia.	February__, 1854
Hamline University St. Paul, Minn.	March 3, 1854
Columbia College Columbia, S. C.	December 21, 1854
Iowa Wesleyan College Mt. Pleasant, Ia.	January 25, 1855
Wheaton College Wheaton, Ill.	February 15, 1855

Central College Fayette, Mo.	March 1, 1855
Adrian College Adrian, Mich.	April 16, 1839
Birmingham-Southern University Birmingham, Ala.	January 25, 1856
Upper Iowa University Fayette, Ia.	April 5, 1856
Mt. Union College Alliance, O.	January 9, 1858
Baker University Baldwin, Kan.	February 12, 1858

The Methodist Church in its early American history followed the English pattern of lay ministers and was late in conceiving its need for an educated ministry; yet, seeing the need in the decade of the 1830's, the church became as zealous in college building as it was in soul winning. It assumed a program as broad as that of the Presbyterians and Baptists and established colleges before the Civil War in nineteen of the thirty-four states then composing the United States. Of those states, twelve were east and seven west of the Mississippi River.

The Methodist Church is used as an example of the pre-Civil War college building. There were fifteen denominations involved in the tremendous program. Below is a summary of permanent colleges and universities founded before the Civil War arranged by denominations:[1]

1. Presbyterian	49
2. Methodist	34
3. Baptist	25
4. Congregational	21
5. Catholic	14
6. Episcopal	11
7. Lutheran	6
8. Disciples	5

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 129-132.

9.	German Reformed	4
10.	Universalist	4
11.	Friends	2
12.	Unitarian	2
13.	Christian	1
14.	Dutch Reformed	1
15.	United Brethren	1

The purpose of preparing ministers was implemented by a large number of schools as indicated by the following statements that are listed in Tewksbury's report:

> "More than half of the graduates of Harvard, for the first sixty years of its existence, became ministers of the Gospel. Nearly three-fourths of the graduates of Yale for the first twelve years, entered the ministry, and a trifle less than one-half during the first thirty years.
>
> "About seven out of ten of the graduates of Marietta have become professional teachers or preachers of the Gospel.
>
> "Of the eight hundred graduates of Middlebury, nearly one-half have devoted themselves to the ministry.
>
> "Of the first 65 graduates of Wabash, 45, or more than two-thirds have devoted themselves to the Christian Ministry.
>
> 'Of the first 94 graduates of Illinois, 45 have devoted themselves to the work of the ministry.
>
> "Of Knox in 1850 it was stated that 'of 25 alumni, 11 have devoted themselves to the work of the ministry.'
>
> "Dartmouth gave from her first ten classes of 99 graduates, 46 to the ministry.
>
> "Amherst gave 'from its first six classes of 106 graduates, 68, or 15 more than one-half of the entire number to the ministry.'
>
> "Of Western Reserve in 1849 it was stated that 'of its 153 graduates, about one-half of those living are either in the ministry or in actual preparation for it.'

"In a statement issued in 1847, it was said that 'Since its charter, ninety-two students have graduated from Hanover; of these forty-seven are now preachers of the Gospel.'

"As late as 1923, it is stated of Davidson that 'among the graduates the number of ministers ranks highest.'

"Of Hampden-Sidney in 1916 it could be said that 'fifty percent of all its graduates have entered the ministry of the Gospel. This record cannot be matched by any other college in America.'

"It was said that Washington and Jefferson 'from 1802 to 1865 contributed to the ministry an average of 45 percent of their graduates.'

"It is said today of the total alumni of Monmouth that 'almost 40 percent have entered the ministry.'

"It was said of Erskine, as late as 1888, that 'one-fourth of its graduates up to 1880' were ministers."[1]

It was estimated that of the first 40,000 American college graduates 10,000 of them entered the ministry.[2]

The seed for the state controlled university were planted early in American colonial soil and watered slightly during the pre-Civil War era, but there was no real fruit until after the Morrill Act and the land grant program. The church generally assumed the responsibility for higher education in the colonial period, but where an established religion prevailed the financial assistance of the state was depended upon. There was legal recognition of a state religion in nine of the

---

[1]Tewksbury, The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War, pp. 86-87. (For the original sources of these quotations, please see footnotes on pages 86-87.)

[2]Ibid., p. 84.

thirteen colonies.[1] The colonial governments of New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Massachusetts were identified with the Puritan Church as were the three colleges that were founded in them.[2] There were six colonial governments (Virginia, New York, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia) identified with the interests of the Anglican Church and the two colleges founded in these states. The four colonies of Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware were not identified with a church nor did these states substantially support financially the colleges that were founded in them.[3] Harvard was controlled more like a modern state university than any of the other colleges, yet it may be concluded that none of the colonial governments maintained a relationship with colleges that was completely analogous to that maintained by the state governments with their state universities. In every case the colonial governments placed primary responsibility for the support and control of the college upon self-perpetuating boards of trustees without state representation or legal control.[4]

New winds of controversy blew into the arena of higher education. These winds of secular and republican sentiment disestablished

---

[1]Sanford H. Cobb, The Rise of Religious Liberty in America, cited by Tewksbury, The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War, p. 136.

[2]Tewksbury, The Founding of American Colleges . . . p. 136.

[3]Ibid., p. 137.

[4]Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education, Vol. I, pp. 4, 33, 49, 82.

the traditional colonial churches and projected new theories for the control and support of higher education. Numbered among the leaders of the American Revolution were men who demanded radical reconstruction of existing colonial colleges so that they would be directly and fully responsible to the state governments. The new revolutionary theories were tested in six of the nine colonial colleges. Harvard underwent extensive legislative agitation in 1810-1814 over state representation.[1] William and Mary was more deeply affected by the influence of Thomas Jefferson and the Virginia legislature of 1799. Yale yielded, and in 1792 there was added to its board the governor, lieutenant governor, and six state officials.[2] In the case of Dartmouth, the issue came to a climactic conclusion before the Supreme Court of the United States. Tested in this case were the vested rights of all private corporations. The Federalists and Republicans lost. Thomas Jefferson lost. The purpose to convert colonial colleges into state universities was defeated, yet Thomas Jefferson had an argument.

> The idea that institutions established for the use of the nation cannot be touched or modified, even to make them answer their end, because of rights gratuitously supposed in those employed to manage them in trust for the public, may, perhaps, be a salutary provision against the abuse of a monarch, but it is most absurd against the nation itself. Yet our lawyers and priests inculcate this doctrine, and suppose that preceding generations held the earth more freely than we do; had a right to impose laws on us, unalterable by ourselves;

---

[1]W. L. Bartlett, State Control of Private Incorporated Institutions of Higher Education (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1926), p. 83, citing Tewksbury, The Founding of American. . . , p. 143.

[2]Ezra Stiles, Ecclesiastical Constitution of Yale College, p. 423.

> and that we, in like manner, can make laws and impose burdens on future generations, which they will have no right to alter; in fine, that the earth belongs to the dead, and not to the living. [1]

When the twentieth century was ushered in, vast changes in higher education had taken place compared with the time of the Civil War. Possibly no one could give a better historical review of it than Daniel Coit Gilman who was born in Connecticut in 1831, and graduated from Yale in 1852. In 1855, he returned to Yale and participated in planning what later became the Sheffield Scientific School where he subsequently served for many years as librarian, secretary, and professor of physical and political geography. In 1872, he accepted the presidency of the University of California, but found himself somewhat in philosophical conflict with the board of regents. When the board of trustees of Johns Hopkins extended the invitation, he accepted their offer and became president in 1875. In 1902, after twenty-seven years as president of Johns Hopkins, he gave a review of the accomplishments of the university era. [2]

Though he did not list an event or give a time that marked the beginning of the university era, he indicated that some place its origin at the founding of the Lawrence Scientific School in Harvard and almost simultaneously the beginning of the Sheffield School of Science at Yale. A new impulse was given to the effort by the passage of the Morrill Act

---

[1]B. P. Smith, History of Dartmouth College (Boston: 1878), p. 101, quoted in Tewksbury, The Founding of American Colleges . . ., p. 152.

[2]Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education, II, 596.

in 1862. The founding of Cornell University in 1865 was significant in a triple sense in that it made use of a $500,000 gift from Ezra B. Cornell who became an example of future millionaire philanthropists, became the first to use the benefits of the Morrill Act, and instituted into its curriculum a broader democratic utilitarian program to meet the greater educational interest of the American people. [1]

Significant additions in the rapid rise of the university were the universities founded and developed by the gifts of men such as Johns Hopkins, Rockefeller, Stanford, and Tulane who were in sympathy with the older colleges, yet were freer to introduce new methods and subjects. As the nation moved westward and wealth increased, the state universities of the Northwest and the Pacific Coast became important factors. Gilman's personal experiences in Yale, the University of California, and Johns Hopkins gave him a particular grasp of the changing processes in the various types of higher educational institutions.

> Yale was a colonial foundation, wedded to precedents, where an effort was made to introduce new studies and new methods. California was a state institution benefited by the so-called agricultural grant, where it was necessary to emphasize the importance of the liberal arts, in a community where the practical arts were sure to take care of themselves. Baltimore afforded an opportunity to develop a private endowment free from ecclesiastical or political control, where from the beginning, the old and the new, the humanities and the sciences, theory and practice, could be generously promoted. [2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 596.

[2] Ibid., p. 597.

In Gilman's discussion on the significant changes that took place in higher education during the last half of the nineteenth century there is presented here a condensed summary of the twelve ideas that may be most significant:

1. Science receives an amount of support unknown before.

2. The old-fashioned curriculum has disappeared.

3. In conservative institutions many combinations of studies are permitted.

4. In many places absolute freedom of choice is allowed--elective system.

5. Historical and political science has come to the front.

6. Investigation now embraces original sources of information and consultation with many books.

7. Some knowledge of German and French is required of everyone.

8. English literature receives an amount of attention never given to it before.

9. Medicine is no longer taught by lectures only. Supplementary training requires continual practice in biological laboratories and the subsequent observation of patients in hospitals and dispensaries.

10. Women were admitted to the benefits of higher education.

11. More than one institution has an endowment larger than that of all the institutions that were in existence in 1850.

12. The term "university" has become reputable even among

scholars returning from Germany. The curriculum of the university now includes four faculties: liberal arts or philosophy, law, medicine, and theology. [1]

There were many other significant changes that Gilman could have mentioned, nevertheless, he felt

> It has been a delightful and exhilarating time in which to live and to work, to observe and to try. All the obstacles have not been overcome, some mistakes have been made, much remains for improvement, but on the whole the record of the last forty or fifty years exhibits substantial and satisfactory gains. [2]

DEMOCRATIZING AND HIGHER EDUCATION

The seeds of democracy were planted by the British John Locke, watered by the French Jean Jacques Rousseau and scattered throughout England, the United States, and France by a host who fought for the belief that:

> Man being born, has been proved, with a title to perfect freedom, and uncontrolled enjoyment of all the rights and privileges of the law of nature, equality with any other man, or number of men in the world, hath by nature a power, not only to preserve his property, that is his life, liberty, and estate, against the injuries and attempts of other men; but to judge of and punish the breaches of that law in others. [3]

These natural rights of man as opposed to the divine rights of kings set Great Britain on edge, plunged America into a Revolutionary War and gave France a blood bath. Governments were changed and new

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 596-599. [2] Ibid., p. 598.

[3] John Locke, Of Civil Government, Book II (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1924), p. 87.

freedoms and equalities were exercised by common men. These men were in quest for democracy, but what really is democracy as it relates to education?

The first eight amendments to the Constitution of the United States contain the fundamental rights and freedoms of every citizen, and amendments nine and ten forbid congress to adopt laws that would violate these rights, but they do not make clear man's right to education.[1] Four score and seven years later President Abraham Lincoln affirmed that "our fathers brought forth, upon this continent, a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."[2] When the Civil War was concluded the thirteenth amendment guaranteed that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."[3] The nineteenth amendment was proposed June 4, 1919, and proclaimed August 26, 1920. It was a battle fought by American women for forty years. They won their rights as citizens of the United States, "to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex." The rights of citizens regardless of race, color, sex, or religion are protected in

---

[1]Amendments to the United States Constitution.

[2]Abraham Lincoln, "Gettysburg Address."

[3]Amendment 13 to the U.S. Constitution, proposed January 31, 1865, and proclaimed December 18, 1865.

the twenty-five amendments to the United States Constitution, but nowhere do they actually make clear what "democracy" is or what the educational rights of the citizens are.

Two of the leading men who framed the Constitution of the United States, Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin, had definite ideas about education, but who would conclude that their ideas were genuinely democratic? Franklin advocated and practiced the policy of developing the self-made man:[1] and Jefferson, who after a visit to France returned with a belief that "we hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal." Possibly he was more influential than any other person for the first amendment:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

The essential elements of Jefferson's educational policy were presented by him to the Virginia State Legislature in 1779. In his program one finds an ambivalence between aristocracy and democracy. His idea of an intellectual elite is aristocratic; and his idea of recruiting this elite from the talented youth, even from the poorest homes, is democratic. He insisted on the elimination of the department of theology from William and Mary, excluded it from the University of Virginia, supported academic freedom especially when the curriculum

---

[1]Robert Ulich, History of Educational Thought (New York: American Book Company, 1945), p. 225.

was void of religion, and when political science was taught strictly according to his views. Many of Jefferson's democratic ideals were gleaned by him in his European travels and especially from the French philosopher, Condorcet. [1]

The democratic idea for higher education came into focus in 1828 when Andrew Jackson was elected President of the United States. During this year Jeremiah Day, President of Yale, and Professor James L. Kingsley produced the famous Yale Report which because of the prestige of these two men and their college warded off the broad democratic Jacksonian influences and entrenched for another fifty years the fixed and rigidly preserved curriculum that supported classical education. [2]

By no means were all Americans satisfied with the Yale Report and the rigid classical system of higher education. Demand was abortively made in 1842 by Francis Wayland who as President of Brown University gave a searching appraisal of the aims and services of American colleges in which he displayed a keen insight and anxious concern for the whole pattern of American college life. He proposed a radical expansion in the Brown curriculum to meet the needs of merchants, farmers, and manufacturers. He opposed vigorously the position of the Yale Report and demanded a broader democratic base

---

[1] Ibid., p. 250.

[2] Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education, Vol. I, p. 274.

for higher education, but little came of his demand until the Morrill Act twenty years later. [1]

The two men and their universities who made significant contributions toward democratizing American higher education were Andrew D. White of Cornell University and Charles W. Eliot who served as president of Harvard for forty years. Cornell was founded in 1868 with White as its first president. The following year, 1869, Eliot was inaugurated for his long term at Harvard. They were both good friends of Daniel Coit Gilman, but had little friendship among themselves. Each thought of himself as being the leader in democratizing the American university and at times White was openly resentful of Eliot's pretensions. [2] Cornell and Harvard were two different types, the former being founded financially by land grants from the Morrill Act plus the contributions of Ezra Cornell, the later an old prestigeous colonial college.

The democratization of Cornell had its origin in the mind of the Quaker, Ezra Cornell, who announced, "I would found an institution where any person can find instruction in any study." The implementation of this aim was more the responsibility of White. Cornell University had not gone far until it faced the serious problem of how far in fact it would bend toward the "low" or grass-roots version of "come one,

---

[1]Francis Wayland, Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System in the United States (Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, 1842), pp. 22-75, 108-112, 132-160.

[2]Lawrence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 81-83.

come all."[1] There were many educational problems for which White had no answer, but in his tempermental bluster he was a certain supporter of Darwinism and knew how to make sharp attacks on clerics. He had three guiding ideas upon which he operated the university. It was to be non-sectarian in religious matters with freedom of choice among various courses of study, and equality in position and privilege among such courses. At the beginning the students, including "slouchy careless"[2] farm boys, were expected to wear uniforms and march in companies to meals and chapels. Because of the unpopularity of his rigid policies his program including work responsibilities were abandoned. In spite of all the weaknesses at Cornell, White still believed that Eliot at Harvard simply did not go far enough in merging the college with the "real life" of the nineteenth century.

Eliot was born a Unitarian[3] and his early training became the ultimate pattern of his life. He developed these early serene premises into a system of seeking concrete data for decision-making. His manner was an air of certainty that became disarming to his associates especially when he used his storehouse of statistics. When he became president of Harvard, there was only one major innovation in his planning: he would institute the elective system. It became educationally revolutionary, even exceeding Cornell. Both White and Eliot combined

---

[1]Ibid., p. 82. [2]Ibid., pp. 83-85. [3]Ibid., p. 91.

social and moral traditionalism with a scientifically based belief in pronounced educational reform. White promoted pharmacy. Eliot championed Harvard's Business School.

Eliot was less democratic than White in the matter of equality. The equality Eliot accepted was in constitutional and legal rights. He once declared, "Rich people cannot be made to associate comfortably with the poor people, or poor with rich. Their common interests are unlike, and their pleasures are as different as their more serious occupations."[1] To Harvard, Eliot admitted Negroes but considered it too early to accept women. Eliot welcomed the presence of poor boys, boys from divergent interests and social background. He demanded that they be persons of brains whether they have much money, little money, or no money. He welcomed the poor intelligent boys more than he did the stupid sons of the rich. His democratic nature led him to advise students not to join clubs, but remain free in order to think and decide independently. His ideal democracy did not coincide with Jacksonian policies, but rather extended back to John Adams and Thomas Jefferson.[2]

Both White and Eliot missed the mark inthat they spent their energies on the undergraduate rather than on the graduate school such as did Johns Hopkins. Both men were friendly to science and improved it in their schools, but not to the success of making it of genuine re-

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Eliot to E. P. Wheeler, Sept. 3, 1893, cited by Veysey, The Emergence of the University, p. 91

search quality.[1] The two men were utilitarian and democratic. Both held that the majority should rule and that education should be extended especially to those who have brains.

In higher education it has been difficult to discover a clear and complete definition of "democracy." Ezra Cornell's view was that an institution should be one "where any person can find instruction in any study."[2] Democracy later referred to the equality of all fields of learning, no matter how novel or how technical.[3] To some democracy came to mean equality of treatment or conditions socially of all students who attend a university at any time. This belief was designed to combat intellectual and social snobbery at the undergraduate level. In a term used more broadly than the institution but related to it, democracy was used with reference to the ease of admission to the university, the absence of tuition fees, the acceptance of mediocre or eccentric preparatory backgrounds, the acceptance of students from all ethnic origins and both sexes, the abandonment of all class and caste in society, as well as required knowledge of classical languages. In 1907, President Andrew S. Draper, University of Illinois, stated: "The universities that would thrive must put away all exclusiveness and dedicate themselves to universal public service. They must not try to keep people

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 21-22.

[2]Ezra Cornell, "Address" in Cornell University Register, 1869-1870, p. 17, quoting Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, p. 63.

[3]Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, p. 63.

out; they must help all who are worthy to get in."[1]

In some circles "democracy" was used to describe the university as an agency for individual success, and again it referred to the desire for a wide diffusion of knowledge throughout the society assuming that learning flowed downward and outward from the university. The policy of "trickle-down" democracy, however, was replaced by a more radical view that the university should take its orders from the non-academic mass of citizens and that it should not diffuse culture in a condescending spirit. The feeling was that America does not need an aristocracy of any kind. The common people should set the tone of intellectual action since among them resides a wisdom of common sense.[2] This folk wisdom became fashionable during the progressive era.

A rebellion against this type of educational democracy was voiced by Abraham Flexner and Robert Maynard Hutchins. Flexner, a graduate of Johns Hopkins, made a reforming impact upon the American medical schools in 1910 with his famous survey, "Medical Education in the United States and Canada." He made comparisons of medical schools with the medical school of Johns Hopkins and with a critical eye wrote his findings. It resulted in the improvement of medical schools throughout the nation. He having succeeded in this

---

[1]A. S. Draper, "The American Type of University," Science, XXVI (1907), pp. 37-40, quoting Veysey, The Emergence . . ., p. 64.

[2]E. E. Brown, "The University in Its Relation to the People," N. E. A. Proc., (1892), pp. 398-399, 402-405, cited by Veysey, The Emergence . . ., p. 65.

endeavor, and filling the role of secretary for the Carnegie Foundation, made a second attemptas educational reformer. This attempt made in 1930 was not as successful as his work with the medical schools. He evaluated the American university as being composed of three parts:

> The great American universities which I shall discuss are composed of three parts: they are secondary schools and colleges for boys and girls; graduate and professional schools for advanced students; 'service' stations for the general public. The three parts are not distinct. The college is confused with the 'service' station and overlaps the graduate school; the graduate school is partly a college, partly a vocational school, and partly an institute of university grade. [1]

Robert Maynard Hutchins, president of University of Chicago, in 1936 took up the same cry of Flexner and stated that "the most striking fact about the higher learning in America is the confusion that besets it."[2] He criticized American higher education and enumerated the cause of its confusion as vulgar, the love of money, a confused notion of democracry, an erroneous idea of progress, vocationalism, and anti-intellectualism.[3]

In his democratic concept of education he advocated that all should be permitted to take a prescribed course of study consisting of a study of the great books of the western world. This unified course in general education should continue through the sophomore year in college

---

[1]Abraham Flexner, Universities: American, English, German (New York: Oxford University Press, 1930), p. 45.

[2]Robert Maynard Hutchins, The Higher Learning in America (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936), p. 1.

[3]Ibid., pp. 1-32.

at which time the A.B. degree should be granted. The proliferation of vocational courses including professional schools should be abandoned or separated from the university curriculum. [1] He contended that the "pursuit of truth for its own sake" and the aim to "prepare men and women for their life work" are two different kinds of education.

Both Flexner and Hutchins were clear in their analysis and biting in their remarks. They were strong innovators for a change that would place more emphasis upon cultural heritage. Hutchins particularly would re-establish metaphysics and turn the course of education back to Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas. Try as they did, their efforts were not sufficiently successful to change the course of the democratic utility in higher education.

The conflict between the position of general and vocational education was thoroughly analyzed with an attempted synthesis by the Harvard Report of 1945.

> Our conclusion, then, is that the aim of education should be to prepare an individual to become an expert both in some particular vocation or art and in the general art of the free man and the citizen. Thus the two kinds of education once given separately to different classes must be given together to all alike. [2]

The recommendations of the Harvard Report were amplified by the President's Commission on Higher Education for Democracy in

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 33-36.

[2] Quoted by Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education, Vol. II, p. 969.

1947. World War II having been concluded with hundreds of thousands of veterans returning with hopes of continuing their education, the necessity for increased and improved facilities for higher education became clearly apparent. To meet this need, President Truman appointed a Presidential Commission on Higher Education for the purpose of re-examining the American system of higher education regarding "its objectives, methods, and facilities; and in the light of the social role it has to play." The Commission consisting of twenty-eight educators and laymen headed by the president of the American Council on Education, George F. Zook, immediately began their research and produced the following year a report in six volumes. In the first volume, they recommended the goals for democratic higher education.[1] The Commission recommended these educational priorities:

> "In the light of this situation, the President's Commission on Higher Education has attempted to select, from among the principal goals for higher education, those which should come first in our time. They are to bring to all the people of the nation:
>
> "Education for a fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living.
>
> "Education directly and explicitly for international understanding and cooperation.
>
> "Education for the application of creative imagination and trained intelligence to the solution of social problems and to the administration of public affairs."[2]

---

[1]Higher Education for Democracy: A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, Vol. I, Establishing the Goals, cited by Hofstadter and Smith, American Higher Education, Vol. II, p. 970.

[2]Ibid., quoting Hofstader and Smith, American Higher Education, Vol. I, p. 975.

Discussed by the Commission on Higher Education were the issues of aristocratic and democratic, of liberal and specific, of general and vocational education. Part of their discussions and conclusions are presented as follows:

> "Today's college graduate may have gained technical or professional training in one field of work or another, but is only incidentally, if at all, made ready for performing his duties as a man, a parent, and a citizen. Too often he is 'educated' in that he has acquired competence in some particular occupation, yet falls short of that human wholeness and civic conscience where the cooperative activities of citizenship require.
>
> "The failure to provide any core of unity in the essential diversity of higher education is a cause for grave concern. A society whose numbers lack a body of common experience and common knowledge is a society with a fundamental culture; it tends to disintegrate into a mere aggregation of individuals. Some community of values, ideas, and attitudes is essential as a cohesive force in this age of minute division of labor and intense conflict of special interests.
>
> "The crucial task of higher education today, therefore, is to provide a unified general education for American youth. Colleges must find the right relationship between specialized training on the one hand, aiming at a thousand different careers, and the transmission of the common cultural heritage toward a common citizenship on the other.
>
> "There have already been many efforts to define this relationship. Attempts to reach conclusions about the ends and means of general education have been a major part of debate and experimentation in higher education for at least two decades.
>
> " 'General education' is the term that has come to be accepted for those phases of nonspecialized and nonvocational learning which should be the common experience to all educated men and women.

"General education should give to the student the values, attitudes, knowledge, and skills that will equip him to live rightly and well in a free society. It should enable him to identify, interpret, select, and build into his own life those components of his cultural heritage that contribute richly to understanding and appreciation of the world in which he lives. It should therefore embrace ethical values, scientific generalizations, and aesthetic conceptions, as well as an understanding of the purposes and character of the political, economic, and social institutions that men have devised.

"But the knowledge and understanding which general education aims to secure, whether drawn from the past or from a living present, are not to be regarded as ends in themselves. They are means to a more abundant personal life and a stronger, freer social order.

"Thus conceived, general education is not sharply distinguished from liberal education; the two differ mainly in degree, not in kind. General education undertakes to redefine liberal education in terms of life's problems as man faces them, to give it human orientation and social direction, to invest it with content that is directly relevant to the demands of contemporary society. General education is liberal education with its matter and method shifted from its original aristocratic intent to the service of democracy. General education seeks to extend to all men the benefits of an education that liberates.

"This purpose calls for a unity in the program of studies that a uniform system of courses cannot supply. The unity must come, instead, from a consistency of aim that will infuse and harmonize all teaching and all campus activities."[1]

The Committee in its democratic relationship of education for the people concluded that "the time has come to make public education at all levels equally accessible to all, without regard to race, creed, sex, or national origin."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 47-49.

[2] Ibid., p. 49.

SUMMARY

Higher education in the Colonial and pre-Civil War America was classical and almost aristocratic. During these periods, higher education was influenced by the crosswinds of democratic philosophy. Franklin and Jefferson gave expression to their democratic beliefs by the type of influence they exerted. The democratization of education developed slowly. It broke the "log jam" in 1862 when Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act into law. Since then the process of educational democratization has moved more rapidly, however, it has been contested at every step of advancement.

Christian education and democratic education have a multitude of similarities, yet they cannot be considered as completely congruous. The difference is detected in values. The theistic Christian supernaturalism placed Jesus Christ at the apex of all good. In democratic education, the rights and equal opportunities of man take first place. In one of these, God is placed at the top, in the other, man. In this mental struggle we might be reminded that Jesus said in Matthew 25:40, "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

CHAPTER VII

SCRIPTURAL HOLINESS IS A DIVISIVE ISSUE

RELIGIOUS TRENDS - RISE OF METHODISM

Colonial America from the beginning developed a multi-denominational pattern. Nine of the thirteen colonies had state churches. By law the Congregational Church was established in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire. The Church of England was the state church of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and in sections of New York. There were no state churches in Rhode Island and the Quaker colonies of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. In the four religiously free states there developed a great variety of religious sects though in the colonies with state churches there was by no means complete religious uniformity. [1]

The Great Awakening of New England led by Jonathan Edwards came with shocking suddenness. Northampton was electrified by the Calvinistic preaching of the philosopher-theologian who pictured "sinners in the hands of an angry God." [2] Central New England was

---

[1] William Warren Sweet, Methodism in American History (New York, Nashville: Abington Press, 1953), p. 9.

[2] Ibid., p. 12.

caught in the throes of a great spiritual and emotional upheaval. It was contagious. Connecticut divines joined in the revival. Soon twenty-five thousand new members were added to the churches.

The change from state churches to pluralism in American history is as exciting to lawyers and political scientists as it is to religious leaders.[1]

The Wesley brothers, John and Charles, with another member of their Oxford "Holy Club" joined the religious forces in America where they found fertile soil to sow their gospel seeds. Wesley's methods were established and tested in England before they came to America. His original plan was not to organize a new church, but to establish righteousness in the hearts of men. He organized small "bands" to support his financial program, and classes in which religious instructions were given. He also began a program of lay preaching, and developed the system of circuit preaching.[2] These methods were practiced for some thirty years in England before they became effective in America. Though John and Charles came to Georgia in 1735, they, not being very successful in their missionary endeavors, returned to England on February 3, 1738.[3] It is strange that Methodism did not

---

[1] Franklin Hamlin Littell, From State Church to Pluralism: A Protestant Interpretation of Religion in American History (Chicago: Adline Publishing Company, 1962), pp. 29-62.

[2] Sweet, Methodism in American History, pp. 27-46.

[3] Ibid., pp. 33-34.

take root in American soil until more than thirty years later. Some Irish Methodists had immigrated to America, but the official beginning of Methodism in America may be traced to a conference in Leeds, England, when John Wesley in August, 1769, stated from the chair, "we have a pressing call from our brethren of New York to come over and help them."[1] A collection of seventy pounds was taken and two men, Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor, volunteered to go. They arrived at Gloucester Point, a few miles below Philadelphia, on October 24, where a little group of Methodists were awaiting them, having been informed by letter of their coming. Pilmoor began his preaching mission on the steps of the old State House, now known as Independence Hall, on Chestnut Street. By some, this is known as the official beginning of American Methodism, but actually small groups were previously established in Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York and when the two missionaries stepped ashore, a British Army Officer, formerly converted in one of Wesley's meetings, Captain Thomas Webb, placed in their hands a plan for the American circuit.[2]

The little work being established in 1769 began to grow. The following year the names of four missionaries were listed embracing the two previously sent plus Robert Williams and John King. Next year,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 47.

[2] Ibid., p. 59.

the English Minutes recorded 316 members in the American societies. By the year 1774, Wesley's missionaries numbered eight and listed among them were very successful men such as Francis Asbury and James Dempster. Their work was primarily in the South. At the opening of the Revolution in 1775, there were 3,148 members with 2,384 south of the Mason and Dixon line.[1]

The first Methodist Conference was organized in 1784 following the Revolutionary War. In attendance were 61 of their 81 ministers. The finalizing of the conference began on December 24 and continued until January 2, and thus they became an organized church in America. This was later referred to as the "Christmas Conference."[2]

The purpose here is not to trace the history of the Methodist Church, but to present information about Wesley's teaching on "holiness" and how it has ultimately influenced the organization of ORU.

THE HOLY CLUB

The "Holy Club" at Oxford marks the beginning of the Holiness Movement within the Church of England. Neither John nor Charles Wesley in the beginning of their quest for holiness in heart and life conceived the origin of a new church. They thought only of salvation of their own souls and those whom they helped.[3] It developed otherwise, and at

---

[1] Ibid., p. 65.

[2] Ibid., pp. 106-113.

[3] Delbert R. Rose, A Theology of Christian Experience (Wilmore, Kentucky: The Seminary Press, 1958), p. 24.

the last conference attended by Wesley in 1789, his fifty years of holiness preaching had produced in England 240 Methodist societies, 541 itinerant preachers, with 134,549 holding tickets as evidence they were in good standing. In the new country of America, Methodism flourished to a point in 1790, that there were 57,811 members, 97 circuits, and 165 preachers.[1]

According to the Methodist Discipline, adopted in 1787, the ministers were "to save as many souls as you can, to bring as many sinners as you possibly can to repentance, and with all your power to build them up in that holiness without which they cannot see the Lord."[2] The aims of the church were made clear in the original organizational conference at which time it was written that "the purpose of God in raising up the people called Methodists was to 'spread Christian holiness over these lands.'"[3] Many, and perhaps most, of the early Methodist preachers took the proclamation of holiness as their motto and using it for a battle cry scaled the Allegheny Mountains and marched over the Mississippi Valley at war against sin in act and sin in heart. With this democratic message of "whosoever will" for the people and their autocratic government (Episcopalian) the Methodist preachers, though generally in that day ignorant as compared with the Presbyterian, Congregational, Episcopalian, and Lutheran, engaged

---

[1] Ibid., p. 26.

[2] Methodist Discipline, 1787, p. 22.

[3] Ibid., pp. 13-14.

in the contest for success in the religious conquest of the American continent. Theirs was a militant and aggressive quest, not completely free from religious rivalry or desire for political, economic, and social prestige. They outstripped all other denominations by the time of the Civil War and became as strong numerically almost as the two other leading denominations combined, the Baptist and Presbyterian, though they did not surpass the Presbyterian in college building. According to the census of 1860, 54,745 churches had been built up during this era of sectarian effort, and seating accommodations in the churches had been provided for 18,958,686 persons out of a population of 31,040,840.[1] The membership of the churches was much less than their seating capacity. The following chart will give information about the rapid growth of Methodism up to 1860:

Religious and Educational Statistics for 1860[2]

Denominational Group	Number of Churches	Seating Accommodations	Permanent Colleges
1. Methodist	19,816	6,238,014	34
2. Baptist	12,139	4,039,928	25
3. Presbyterian	6,379	2,555,299	49
4. Catholic	2,442	1,314,462	14
5. Congregational	2,230	955,626	21
6. Episcopal	2,129	837,596	11
7. Lutheran	2,123	755,637	6
8. Christian (Disciples)	2,066	680,666	5
9. German Reformed	676	273,697	4
10. Friends	725	268,734	2

[1] Tewksbury, The Founding of American Colleges, p. 69.

[2] United States of America, United States Census, Vol. for 1860, quoted in Tewksbury, The Founding of American Colleges, p.69.

11. Universalist	664	235,219	4
12. Dutch Reformed	440	211,068	1
13. Unitarian	263	137,213	2
14. Other Groups	2,653	455,527	2
Totals	54,745	18,958,686	180

The spiritual experience of holiness which was preached as a second definite instantaneous work of grace, subsequent to regeneration became the symbol that enabled the Methodist ministers to be inspired, zealous, and successful. Elmer T. Clark states that "It was largely this doctrine, in contradistinction to the sterner Calvinism, which gave Methodism its power in the frontier regions of the West where Presbyterianism was so largely helpless except as it toned down its severe determinism."[1] He also holds that "Wesleyan perfectionism has exerted the most far-reaching influence of any type of doctrine ever presented, and while it has not remained vital in Methodism, it has persisted in numerous smaller bodies."[2]

Most of the groups in America and throughout the world that emphasized holiness in heart and life as a second work of grace are offshoots of the Wesleyan Movement. These draw their doctrinal positions from Wesley's A Plain Account of Christian Perfection and Brief Thoughts on Christian Perfection.[3]

A hundred years after Methodism was planted on American soil, the church was still ardently proclaiming the message of holiness.

---

[1] Elmer T. Clark, The Small Sects in America (New York, Nashville: Abington Cokesbury Press, 1949), p. 57.

[2] Ibid., p. 55. [3] Ibid.

Mr. John McClintock expressed it at the century celebration of American Methodism held in New York City, January 25, 1866. McClintock later became the first president of Drew Theological Seminary, but on that occasion in speaking on "The Distinctive Features of Methodism" he declared:

> Methodism . . . takes the old theology of the Christian Church, but it takes one element which no other Christian church has dared to put forward as a prominent feature of theology. In ours it is the very point from which we view all theology . . . . Knowing exactly what I say and taking the full responsibility of it, I repeat, we are the only church in history from the Apostles' time until now that has put forward as its very elemental thought--the great central pervading idea of the whole book of God from beginning to the end--the holiness of the human soul, heart, mind, and will. Go through all the confessions of all the churches; you will find this in no other. You will find even some of them that blame us in their books and writings. It may be called fanaticism, but dear friends, that is our mission.[1]

The doctrine of Christian perfection has been briefly summarized by Elmer T. Clark in five sections as follows:

> "1. Christian perfection is the product of faith and means freedom from all sin, both outward and inner, including 'evil thoughts and tempers,' though it does not insure against such human frailties as ignorance, mistakes, temptations, and the common infirmities of the flesh.
>
> "2. It is not the same as, nor does it ever accompany, justification, but is always subsequent thereto. 'We do not know a single instance, in any place, of a person's receiving, in one and the same moment, remissions of sins, the abiding witness of the Spirit, and a new, clean heart,' Wesley wrote.

---

[1] Quoted in Olin A. Curtis, The Christian Faith (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1905), p. 372.

"3. It is always an instantaneous experience, though there may be gradual growth both previous and subsequent thereto. Wesley's statements to this effect are explicit, though his exact meaning is not entirely clear.

"4. It may be at the moment of death, as Calvinists claimed; but Wesley combats this idea and holds that it might be attained long before death. While exhorting all persons to 'press on' to the ideal, he seems to concede that the experience is relatively rare among Christians.

"5. Once obtained, the blessing may be lost, in which case there is no insuperable obstacles to securing it again."[1]

METHODISM CHANGES EMPHASIS

Almost at the same time the Methodists began to develop their system of higher education there came a decline in their interest in evangelism and their stress on the doctrine of holiness. In their methods of evangelism they had developed a strong autocratic episcopacy in administration, the circuits for their pony-riding preachers, the class meetings for their converts, the selling of books for their constituency, and the church and camp meeting revivalism. The camp meeting originated among the Presbyterians, but was repudiated by them because of emotionalism.[2]

The Methodist took over and by 1812 they were conducting no

---

[1]Clark, The Small Sects in America, pp. 59-60.

[2]Rose, A Theology of Christian Experience, p. 28. There is discrepency as to the beginning date of the American camp meeting. G. F. Beardsley in A History of American Revivals, p. 192, gives the year 1799; Paul H. Douglas, The Story of German Methodism, p. 90, has set 1796 as the date of the first camp meeting.

less than 400 annual camp meetings. They spread from the western frontier to the conservative East; thus the nation was sowed down with holiness camp meetings where the experience of perfect love became the focal point of expectancy and conversation.[1]

The beginning of the Methodist change from a supreme emphasis on holiness is related to the anti-slavery agitation, to doctrinal controversies between the denominations, to religious fanaticism in the name of perfection, and reactions to the autocratic character of the Methodist episcopacy.[2] The Methodist bishops warned their members in 1840 of the dangerous trends, but the trends were not checked. "It is not enough," they said, "to have this doctrine in our standard."[3] It must be implemented in heart and life. The issue was expressed by John S. Inskip in the 1860's:

> "Camp meetings, which had been a great power in the Methodist Church, and in which tens of thousands had been converted and sanctified, had so far fallen into disrepute, that the church papers were earnestly discussing the propriety of wholly abandoning them.
>
> "For several years prior to 1867 . . . there was a growing opposition to the subject of entire sanctification as a distinct experience. This opposition came from both pulpit and pew, and was often met with at the local camp meetings.

---

[1] Paul H. Douglas, The Story of German Methodism (New York, Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern, 1939), p. 90.

[2] Merrill E. Gassis, "Christian Perfectionism in America." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation at the University of Chicago, June, 1929, pp. 217-218.

[3] Ibid., pp. 375ff.

> The opposition became at times so violent that in many places the professors of this experience found little or no sympathy or encouragement at these annual meetings."[1]

Additional appeals were made in 1870 by the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church South in their General Quadrennial Conference. They deplored the low spiritual condition of the people and advised "an increase of inward, genuine, scriptural holiness." Their anxiety was that "the doctrine of perfect love, a prominent theme in the discourse of our fathers" was being "overlooked and neglected." The bishops contended, "Nothing is so much needed at the present time throughout all these lands as a general and powerful revival of scriptural holiness."[2]

During the next twenty-four years great changes continued within the Methodist Church. These were accelerated by many factors. The nation was becoming industralized and masses of the rural people were being urbanized. Railroads had taken circuit riders from their horses. Methodist colleges had "hatched" a new breed of preachers whose sophisticated nerves were set on edge by shouts of "hallelujah" that were uncontrolled and overly emotional. Methodist higher education was being influenced by higher criticism, by the German University system, by naturalism and evolutionalistic tendencies, by the rise of big universities, by freedom in the elective

---

[1] Rose, A Theology of Christian Experience, p. 29.

[2] Clark, The Small Sects in America, pp. 57-58.

system, by a wealthier constituency including the millionaire philanthropist, by the narrowing gap between the normal citizen of the American democracy and a church member, and by their inabilities to force conformity on their large and growing membership in belief, purpose and way of life. Because of these trends and because of the constant clash between the advocates of the holiness doctrine and those who enjoyed preaching truths from more than "one string" the bishops in 1894 "pointed out that Methodism had ever taught the privileges of entire sanctification though few had attained the experience, but let the doctrine still be proclaimed, and the experience still be testified."[1] With this positive encouragement, there also came a slight denunciation and a repudiation of a church within the church, or to the "party with holiness as a watchword," and the holiness associations and others related. "The bishops were seeking to bring under control the perfectionist advocates who, true to form, were finding themselves uncomfortable in the complacent congregations which in their sophistication had outgrown the doctrine dear to the heart of the naive and ardent enthusiasts."[2] It was in this meeting that the Methodist Church made its general break with the doctrine that had for over a hundred years in America been its greatest distinguishing factor. The bishops warned against unauthorized holiness meetings and went to the point of suggesting litigation against "such interferences."[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 58. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

The bishops felt that genuine holiness in doctrine and experience in the Methodist Church was good for the past, but not for the present or the future. Carefully there was eliminated from their writings and songs references to holiness. For example, in 1935, the great hymn of Charles Wesley, "Love Divine, All Loves Excelling," which had appeared in all Methodist hymnals since 1747 was changed from "Let us find that second rest" to "Let us find the promised rest." Thus, the second work of grace passed from Methodist pre-eminent interest and the church is no longer identified as a perfectionist movement.[1]

THE RISE OF NEW CHURCHES

Before the Civil War there had been five schisms in Methodism. All of these came about over the episcopal form of church government and/or the issue of perfectionism, with the exception of the Methodist Episcopal Church South and certain colored churches. Almost every split from Methodism has had as its issue Wesley's teachings regarding holiness. In addition to those that broke with Methodism there are a dozen or more which are Wesleyan in doctrine and owe their origin and success to the genius of Methodism. Clark believes that:

> "Methodism is directly or indirectly responsible for over fifty of the existing American sects. These have a combined membership of over ten million persons. All may be called perfectionists so far as their official doctrines

---

[1] Ibid., p. 59.

> are concerned, and at least thirty of them make sanctification one of their central principles.
>
> "In addition to these perfectionist sects there are many Negro groups which should be included in the same category. Some are avowedly perfectionist and others are such to all intents and purposes. In fact, one would not be far amiss in including most of the colored groups of the nation in that classification."[1]

The first sect that grew out of the Methodist fold was a schism in 1792, when James O'Kelly led a large group out because the conference rejected a motion that would have given the pastors the right of appeal from the episcopal appointment. The next was the Methodist Protestant Church formed in 1830, when the General Conference in 1828 refused the admittance of laymen to all conferences of the church. Then came slavery, the major issue that split the North and South in 1844. In 1939, unification of three Methodist churches led to the formation of America's largest protestant church at that time with some 40,000 churches and 8,500,000 members in the United States.[2]

Smaller Methodist churches were organized which were: the Reformed Methodist Church in 1814, the Primitive Methodist Church in 1810, the Wesleyan Methodist Church in 1843, the Free Methodist Church in 1860, the Holiness Methodist Church in 1900, the Congregational Methodist Church in 1825, the New Congregational Methodist in 1881, the Apostolic Methodist Church in 1931, the Holiness Methodists in 1913, the Reformed New Congregational Methodist Church in 1916, the Evangelical Methodist Church in 1946, and many others.[3]

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid., p. 61. [3] Ibid., pp. 62-72.

THE NATIONAL HOLINESS ASSOCIATION

As the emphasis on holiness decreased in the Methodist Church, the doctrine began developing in ways separate from or beyond the control of the Church. A number of ministers and laymen met in Vineland, New Jersey, in July, 1867, and sponsored "The National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Christian Holiness." The purpose of the camp meeting was set forth in a statement of publicity prepared by a noted Methodist pastor, The Reverend Alfred Cookman.[1]

> "A general camp-meeting of the friends of holiness, to be held at Vineland, Cumberland County, New Jersey, will commence Wednesday, July 17, and close Friday, 26th instant.
>
> "We affectionately invite all, irrespective of denominational ties, interested in the subject of the higher Christian life, to come together and spend a week in God's great temple of nature. While we shall not cease to labor for the conviction and conversion of sinners, the special object of this meeting will be to offer united and continued prayer for the revival of the work of holiness in the churches; to secure increased wisdom that we may be able to give a reason of the hope that is in us with meekness and fear; to strengthen the hands of those who feel themselves comparatively isolated in their profession of holiness; to help any who would enter into this rest of faith and love; to realize together a Pentecostal baptism of the Holy Ghost, -- and all with a view to increased usefulness in the churches of which we are members.
>
> "Come, brothers and sisters of the various denominations, and let us, in this forest-meeting, as in other meetings for the promotion of holiness, furnish an illustration of evangelical union, and make common supplication for the

---

[1]Rose, The Theology of Christian Experience, p. 52.

descent of the Spirit upon ourselves, the church, the nation, and the world."[1]

During the services of this camp, various ministers expressed their belief that the camp meeting was ordered of God and destined to exert an influence over all Christendom and would initiate a new era in Methodism.[2] Inherent in the camp were seeds of division, yet most of those present felt it was successful since Bishop Matthew Simpson brought his family with his unconverted son, Charles, who was converted and many others were "converted or entirely sanctified."[3]

To perpetuate the purpose and interest of those attending the Vineland camp a committee of twenty-one persons was elected to arrange for future meetings. They pledged themselves to pray for each other and make use of all possible methods of propagating the doctrine of entire sanctification, and "never to answer the criticisms from others even if misrepresented." The first president of the organization known as the "National Camp Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness" was John S. Inskip and the first secretary was George Hughes.[4]

---

[1]W. McDonald and John E. Searless, The Life of Rev. John S. Inskip, pp. 186-187.

[2]Ibid., p. 192.

[3]Ibid., p. 73.

[4]Ibid., p. 53.

The Vineland Camp Meeting marked a new trend both in the Methodist Church and the Holiness Movement. The Civil War was over and there swept over the country a wave of immorality, secularism, and religious indifference. Some held that the churches had lowered their moral position, compromising their higher Christian standards with a general decline in vital piety and holiness of life.

The National Holiness Movement was formed out of the Vineland Camp Meeting which began an immediate appeal to extensive segments of Methodist constituency who were of the perfectionist tradition. The implementation of the movement embraced the revival, class meetings and testimonies. The new interest seemed to indicate that the perfectionists were on the march again. Other holiness unions were formed. Periodicals appeared. Then came holiness colleges, some of which still remain. The new and widely separated "holiness bands" began in a significant way to drain off from the Methodist Church many village and rural people. Out of the movement there came into being a large new crop of holiness sects, possibly the most successful of which is the Church of the Nazarene. [1]

In the same year, 1894, that the Methodist bishops threatened the Holiness Movement with their displeasure, there were organized three "Pentecostal Tabernacles" in Brooklyn, New York, which formed the following year the Association of Pentecostal Churches of America. Another movement developed almost

---

[1]Clark, The Small Sects in America, p. 73.

simultaneously in New England resulting in the Central Evangelical Holiness Association. The two merged to form the New York Association.[1]

The First Church of the Nazarene in Los Angeles was organized by Phineas F. Breeze in 1895. The year before in Milan, Tennessee, the First Church of Christ was brought into being by R. L. Harris. In 1898, the Holiness Church was organized in Texas. This church with the Independent Church of Christ united in 1904 to form the Holiness Church of Christ. In 1898, there was formed the Pentecostal Alliance, later known as the Pentecostal Mission, in Tennessee. In 1907, there was perfected in Chicago a union of the Association of Pentecostal Churches of America and the Church of the Nazarene. The two amalgamated groups were named the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene. One year later the Holiness Church of Christ joined the union and in 1915 the Pentecostal Mission became one with it. Due to a doctrinal difference between the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene and others, the term "Pentecostal" was dropped from the name in 1919.[2]

Though the Church of the Nazarene became most progressive, it was by no means the only new church that came out of the perfectionist conflict. There were organized the Pilgrim Holiness Church in 1897, the Christian Missionary Alliance in 1887[3], plus a band of evangelistic associations.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 74. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid., p. 76.

THEOLOGY OF HOLINESS

Selecting as an example one who characterizes the Holiness Movement, Delbert R. Rose selected Joseph H. Smith (1855-1946) and summarized his theology. He held that Smith's doctrine is representative of that which has been "proclaimed in the literature through the schools, at camp meetings, and in the churches at home and abroad which have emphasized the Wesleyan interpretation of the 'New Testament standard of piety'."[1] Part of his summary of Smith's theology is as follows:

> Central to the whole of his system was the thought of holiness--holiness in God, in angels, in original man, in redeemed man, and in the society of the eternal future. Like Wesley he presented Christianity as essentially a religion of salvation from sin, experientially available to all men by faith in Jesus Christ but to be successively appropriated as justification, entire sanctification, and glorification. Denying that entire sanctification is received at regeneration, and declaring that it may be experienced before death, Smith's strong emphasis was upon the instantaneousness of entire sanctification by an act of faith and the patient persistence in that grace by a fixed attitude of faith. Holding that each work of divine grace is in some degree a foretaste of and analogous to the next degree of salvation to be obtained, Smith incessantly held out the inescapable necessity for progress and advancement from faith to faith, from grace to grace, from victory to victory, and from glory to glory in the Christian life.[2]

HIGHER EDUCATION OF HOLINESS MOVEMENT

From the early beginning of the Holiness Movement emphases were placed upon the necessity of schools of higher learning.

---

[1]Rose, A Theology of Christian Experience, p. 8.

[2]Ibid., p. 266.

Rose lists the following as those schools which have developed out of and embrace the doctrinal teachings of the scriptural holiness:[1]

Allentown Bible Institute - Allentown, Pennsylvania
Asbury College - Wilmore, Kentucky
Asbury Theological Seminary - Wilmore, Kentucky
Bethany Peniel College - Bethany, Oklahoma
Bethel College - Mishawaka, Indiana
Cascade College - Portland, Oregon
Central Academy and College - McPherson, Kansas
Central Wesleyan Methodist College - Central, South Carolina
Chicago Evangelistic Institute - University Park, Iowa
Cleveland Bible College (Malone Col.) - Cleveland, Ohio
Colorado Springs Bible School and Academy - Colorado Springs, Colorado
Eastern Nazarene College - Wollaston, Massachusetts
Faith Home and School - Mitchell, South Dakota
Fort Wayne Bible Institute - Fort Wayne, Indiana
George Fox College - Newberg, Oregon
God's Bible School - Cincinnati, Ohio
Great Commission Schools - Anderson, Indiana
Greenville College - Greenville, Illinois
Holiness Bible School - Gravette, Arkansas
Houghton College - Houghton, New York
Huntington College - Huntington, Indiana
Immanuel Missionary College - Colorado Springs, Colorado
Jabbock Bible School - Thomas, Oklahoma
Kentucky Mountain Bible Institute - Vancleve, Kentucky
Los Angeles Pacific College - Los Angeles, California
Marion College - Marion, Indiana
Messiah Bible College - Grantham, Pennsylvania
Miltonvale Wesleyan College - Miltonvale, Kansas
Mt. Carmel High School - Lawson, Kentucky
Nazarene Theological Seminary - Kansas City, Missouri
Northwest Nazarene College - Nampa, Idaho
Oakdale Vocational School - Oakdale, Kentucky
Olivet Nazarene College - Kankakee, Illinois
Owosso Bible College - Owosso, Michigan
Pacific Bible College (Azusa Col.) - Azusa, California
Pasadena College - Pasadena, California
People's Bible School - Greensboro, North Carolina
Pilgrim Bible College - Kearnersville, North Carolina
Pilgrim Evangelistic Institute - El Monte, California

---

[1]Ibid., p. 271.

Roberts Wesleyan College - North Chili, New York
Seattle Pacific College - Seattle, Washington
Spring Arbor Junior College - Spring Arbor, Michigan
Taylor University - Upland, Indiana
Trevecca Nazarene College - Nashville, Tennessee
Upland College - Upland, California
Union Bible Seminary - Westfield, Indiana
Wessington Springs Junior College - Wessington Springs, South Dakota
Western Evangelical Seminary - Portland, Oregon

SUMMARY

The Christian religion in early America was predominantly state controlled or vice versa. Some states were church controlled during the colonial period, however, the state churches after American independence changed to pluralism. The Methodist Church in the United States was only beginning at the time of the Revolutionary War, but with its applicable methods with one central purpose to spread scriptural holiness across the country, it became numerically almost as large by the time of the Civil War as the two other leading denominations combined, the Baptist and Presbyterian.

After the Civil War and the rise of the Methodist educational program, the doctrine of holiness receded from the position of highest emphasis. This change left in its wake a broad harvest of perfectionist sects and churches. The Holiness Movement became the harbor for the dissenters and the Church of the Nazarene an example.

The new holiness churches were educationally minded and produced some 48 schools, colleges, universities, and seminaries.

It was out of the Holiness Movement that the Pentecostal

Movement was born as shall be seen in the next chapter. This is the religious revival that has given birth to ORU.

CHAPTER VIII

PENTECOSTALISM BECOMES THIRD FORCE IN CHRISTENDOM

The holiness people of America developed the feeling that they were unwanted as members of the Methodist Church after 1894. They became loosely associated almost as "sheep without a shepherd."

For more than a century one of the disturbing factors of the second blessing movement was how to develop distinguishing criteria by which the individual and his associates would have undeniable evidence that he had the spiritual experience of sanctification. Even before the birth of Christ it was believed that Isaiah had received the second blessing when the seraphim took the live coal from the altar and touched Isaiah's lips and said, "thy sin [is] purged."[1] Isaiah had prophesied as a servant of God during the reign of Uzziah,[2] but after the king's death Isaiah still needed heart-cleansing. Isaiah's blessing came when the angel touched his lips with fire. He responded, saying, "here am I; send me."[3]

Not every person received a visit by an angelic being such as Isaiah, or such as Jacob when his name was changed to Israel. The

---

[1]Isaiah 6:7. [2]Isaiah 1:1. [3]Isaiah 6:8.

holiness people knew that Christ taught "blessed are the pure in heart";[1] "be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect";[2] and that Paul taught "the very God of peace sanctify you wholly."[3] But how to know that one had the blessing of a pure heart was the question. Nowhere does Wesley himself or Francis Asbury boast in a pharisaical way of their holiness experience, yet they constantly encouraged believers to "go on" unto perfection.

If one received the second blessing, did he know for sure that he had it? What evidence was there? Was it evidenced by one who bowed at a wooden altar and wept because his heart was strangely moved? Did it occur when one quit doing certain questionable habits as in the use of strong drink or tobacco? Did it develop when one's inward nature was so changed that thereafter his temper and spirit were under control? Did the women bear witness of it by their "hairdos," length and style of dress, and less gossip about neighbors, or was its greatest manifestation a positive perfect love for Christ and people? One may claim the crucified life, the perfect love experience, the second definite work of grace subsequent to regeneration, but how was he to know absolutely with unquestioned evidence?

It was in Topeka, Kansas, that this question of evidence was under serious consideration. The Bible school which opened in the fall of 1900 used only the Bible as the textbook. An extensive research was made on the subject, "What is the Bible Evidence of the Baptism in the

---

[1]Matthew 5:8. [2]Matthew 5:48. [3]I Thessalonians 5:23.

Holy Ghost?" Their unanimous conclusion was speaking in other tongues as the Holy Spirit gives utterance. [1]

This conclusion was based on a number of scriptures. In Acts 2:4 it says, "and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." Luke, reporting this experience in Acts 10:44-46 says:

> While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God.

A similar experience occurred in Acts 19:6: "And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied." These plus other scriptures especially in I Corinthians, chapters 12 and 14, were sufficiently convincing that the students in the Bible school of Topeka, Kansas, concluded that the "initial evidence" that gave proof that one had received the baptism of the Holy Ghost was the "speaking in tongues" as the Spirit gave utterance.

The belief turned into a spiritual experience as witnessed by Mrs. Agnes N. O. LaBerge, formerly Miss Agnes N. Ozman. In reporting her experience she said:

> "In October 1900, I went to this Topeka school which was known as Bethel College. We studied the Bible by day and did much work downtown at night. Much time was

---

[1]Evert Leroy Moore, "Handbook of Pentecostal Denominations in the United States" (Pasadena, California: Unpublished Dissertation, April 31, 1964, Studies in Religion, Pasadena College).

spent in prayer every day and all the time.

> "Like some others, I thought I had received the Baptism in the Holy Ghost at the time of consecration, but when I learned that the Holy Spirit was yet to be poured out in greater fullness, my heart became hungry. At times I longed more for the Holy Spirit to come in than for my necessary food. We were admonished to honor the blood of Jesus Christ and to let it do its work in our hearts, and this brought great peace and victory.
>
> "On watchnight we had a blessed service, praying that God's blessing might rest upon us as the new year came in. During the first day of 1901 the presence of the Lord was with us in a marked way, stilling our hearts to wait upon Him for greater things. A spirit of prayer was upon us in the evening. It was nearly eleven o'clock on this first of January that it came into my heart to ask that hands be laid upon me that I might receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. As hands were laid upon my head the Holy Spirit fell upon me, and I began to speak in tongues, glorifying God."[1]

It is incredible that a world movement would grow from such a small beginning that had neither outstanding leaders around whom it could be built, nor an organized structure to give it guidance.

This new religious belief regarding the baptism of the Holy Spirit has struck a mighty blow for the advancement of Christianity and produced a proliferation of denominations that has been unparalleled in Christian history.

Out of this emotional, spiritual experience grew four streams of Christian influence that produced a harvest of new church bodies. The stem of this four-way stream flowed out of Wesley's doctrinal views on perfectionism. They are:

---

[1]Stanley H. Frodsham, With Signs Following (Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Publishing House, 1946), pp. 19-20.

1. Those who hold that sanctification and the baptism of the Holy Ghost are terms used for the same spiritual experience which is definite, instantaneous, and subsequent to regeneration, but is not evidenced by speaking in other tongues.

2. Those who hold the above view, but believe the experience may be accompanied by "speaking with tongues" along with other scriptural evidences.

3. Those who teach that sanctification is a second definite instantaneous work of grace subsequent to regeneration, but distinctly preceding the baptism with the Holy Ghost and that the latter is evidenced initially by speaking with tongues.

4. Those who hold the above view with the exception of sanctification which they do not teach as instantaneous, but as a progressive work.

Of the several Holiness churches that are characterized in the first-mentioned category, the Pilgrim Holiness Church is selected as an example. Its origin embraces the date of 1898 when Martin W. Knapp, a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, organized a group in his home in Cincinnati, Ohio, under the name of International Apostolic Holiness Union. From 1906 to 1916 it went by the name of International Apostolic Church. There was a union of this body in 1919 with the Holiness Christian Church; and then in 1922 it united with the Pentecostal Rescue Mission of Binghamton, New York, and adopted a new name, the Pilgrim Holiness Church.[1] This church teaches the doctrine of

---

[1]Walter J. Hollenweger, "Handbuch der Pfingsbewegung," II Hauptteil ona Nordamerika (unpublished seven volume dissertation for the University of Zurich, 1966), p. 437.

sanctification and makes clear its views in statement thirteen of its "General Statement of Belief":

> "13. Speaking in the Congregation in Such a Tongue as the People Understand:
>
> > "1. It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God and the custom of the Primitive Church to have public prayer therein or to administer the sacraments in a tongue not understood by the people. (I Cor. 14:1-40).
> >
> > "2. In sanctification, which is synonymous to and simultaneous with the baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire (Acts 14:8, 9; I Pet. 1:22), we hold that any teaching which gives to it any other distinctions as to its time, or that holds any particular manifestation, as by the gift of tongues, so-called, as proof of this baptism, is opposed to the explicit Word of God (I Cor. 14:1-4, Rom. 8:9, I Cor. 1:30) and shall not be tolerated among our people."[1]

In the second classification, the example selected is the Christian and Missionary Alliance. This church was formed in 1887 by a number of distinguished men led by A. B. Simpson. It is essentially a holiness church, but takes a different view from the Pilgrim Holiness Church. In doctrine it stands somewhere between the typical holiness church and the typical Pentecostal church.[2]

> "We do believe in the Personality and work of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer and in a definite crisis experience of the infilling of the Spirit subsequent to regeneration; but we do not accept speaking in tongues as 'the' manifestation, but rather as one of the gifts of the Spirit as set forth in First Corinthians, chapters 12 and 14."[3]

---

[1]Pilgrim Holiness Church Manual (1962) Section 4-23.

[2]Hollenweger, "Handbuch der Pfingstbewegung," II, p. 408.

[3]Ibid., quoting letter from Nathan Bailey, President, Christian and Missionary Alliance, to Hollenweger, March 25, 1963.

> "This experience of Christ our Sanctifier marks a definite and distinct crisis in the history of a soul. We do not grow into it, but we cross a definite line of demarcation as clear as when the hosts of Joshua crossed the Jordan and were over the Promised Land and set up a great heap of stones so that they never could forget the crisis hour. Beloved, have you crossed your Jordan and entered your promised land?"[1]

To exemplify the third category of churches the Pentecostal Holiness Church has been examined. The origin of the church is generally dated from 1911 at the time two church bodies, the Fire Baptized Holiness Church and the Pentecostal Holiness Church, were united. Their origin, however, dates back to the close of the previous century when the Fire Baptized Holiness Church had its inception in 1898 and the Pentecostal Holiness Church in 1901.[2] The organization of these two bodies with the term "Holiness" included in their name indicates part of the results of the decision of the Methodist bishops in 1894.

The Pentecostal Holiness Church has been methodistic in church polity and doctrine with the exception of its emphasis on sanctification and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Along with its other statements of faith the following three statements characterize the beliefs of the church on these issues:

---

[1]A. B. Simpson, The Four-Fold Gospel (New York: Christian Alliance Publishing Company, 1925), without numbering.

[2]Joseph E. Campbell, The Pentecostal Holiness Church 1898 to 1948 (Franklin Springs, Ga.: Publishing House of the Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1951), p. 191.

"Statement 8:

"We believe that Jesus Christ shed his blood for the complete cleansing of the justified believer from all indwelling sin and from its pollution, subsequent to regeneration (I John 1:7-9).

"Statement 9:

"We believe that entire sanctification is an instantaneous, definite, second work of grace, obtainable by faith on the part of the fully justified believer (I John 5:12; Acts 26:18).

"Statement 10:

"We believe that the Pentecostal baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire is obtainable by a definite act of appropriating faith on the part of the fully cleansed believer, and the initial evidence of the reception of this experience is speaking with other tongues as the Spirit gives utterance (Luke11:13; Acts 1:5; 2:1-4, 8-17; 10:44-46; 19:6)."[1]

Among those who identify glossolalia as "the" evidence for the reception of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, but believe that sanctification is a progressive walk are many Pentecostal groups. The Assemblies of God has been selected as the example.

The Assemblies of God was officially organized in Hot Springs, Arkansas, April 2-12, 1914. Those constituting this church group were from the middle western part of the United States rather than from the Los Angeles group. They grew out of the Apostolic Faith Movement over which Charles F. Parham had been the leader. Present for the organizational meeting were some three hundred ministers and delegates. Sixty-eight ministers signed the application for the first

---

[1]Pentecostal Holiness Discipline (Franklin Springs, Ga.: Advocate Publishing Company, 1965), p. 14.

charter of the incorporated body. [1]

The Assemblies of God have been classified as Baptistic in church polity and they differ from Wesley's teaching on holiness, though in purpose and expression one can detect the holiness influence. Articles eight and nine in the Statement of Faith express their view:

> "8. The evidence of the baptism in the Holy Ghost is witnessed by the initial physical sign of speaking with other tongues as the Spirit of God gives them utterance (Acts 2:4). The speaking in tongues in this instance is the same in essence as the gift of tongues (I Cor. 12:4-10, 28), but different in purpose and use.
>
> "9. Entire Sanctification
> The Scriptures teach a life of holiness without which no man shall see the Lord. By the power of the Holy Ghost we are able to obey the command, 'Be ye holy, for I am holy.' Entire sanctification is the will of God for all believers, and should be earnestly pursued by walking in obedience to God's Word (Heb. 12:14; I Pet. 1:15, 16; I Thess. 5:23, 24; I John 2:6)." [2]

With these stated dogmas one can see that the Pentecostal Movement developed out of a belief that God and man may be involved in a spiritual experience and that the spiritual experience is a divine-human encounter between God and His regenerated and cleansed children. It is a belief that Jesus Christ has love for the sons of God beyond their entrance into the kingdom of God and with purpose He baptizes them with the Holy Ghost and fire and removes all doubt of the divine-human reciprocity by an audible, physical phenomenon, glossolalia.

---

[1]Moore, "Handbook of Pentecostal Denominations in the U. S.", pp. 23-25.

[2]Minutes of the Twenty-second General Council of the Assemblies of God (Grand Rapids, Michigan, September 4-9, 1947), p. 50.

The Pentecostal Movement did not develop around men of great influence such as John Huss' Waldensians, Luther's Reformation, or Wesley's Methodism. There were great men connected with the rise of the movement, however, instead of their making the movement, the movement made them. Had it not been for the Pentecostal Movement, who would have ever known of J. Roswell Flower[1] who served for years as General Secretary of the Assemblies of God; of Bishop J. H. King[2] who served as General Superintendent of the Pentecostal Holiness Church; of Aimee Semple McPherson,[3] internationally known evangelist and founder of the Foursquare Church; of Donald Gee, the editor of Pentecost, with influence that girdled the globe; of David du Plessis, the first secretary of the World Pentecostal Fellowship; of Lewi Pethrus who pastored the great Philadelphia Church in Stockholm, Sweden; of W. C. Hoover, who since 1909 led the Pentecostals of Chile to a membership of more than a million; or of Alexander Boddey who inaugurated the first Pentecostal Convention in Europe? These plus hundreds of others became great leaders, yet their influence was produced by the Pentecostal revival rather than their influence producing the revival.

Donald Gee expressed his opinion regarding the rise of Pentecostalism in the following words:

---

[1]Donald Gee, The Pentecostal Movement (London: Elim Publishing Co., Ltd., 1949), p. 87.

[2]J. H. King, Yet Speaketh (Franklin Springs, Ga.: Advocate Press, 1949).

[3]Carl Brumback, Suddenly From Heaven (Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Publishing House, 1961), p. 261.

> The Pentecostal Movement does not owe its origin to any outstanding personality or religious leader, but was a spontaneous revival appearing almost simultaneously in various parts of the world. We instinctively connect the Reformation with Luther, the Quakers with George Fox, Methodism with Wesley, the Plymouth Brethren with Darby and Groves, and the Salvation Army with William Booth, and so on. But the outstanding leaders of the Pentecostal Movement are themselves the products of the Movement. They did not make it; it made them. [1]

PARALLELS OF THE PENTECOSTAL MOVEMENT IN AMERICA WITH METHODIST

The growth of the Pentecostal Movement in America has some parallels with that of the Methodist Church a century earlier. Both groups directly or indirectly grew out of the Wesleyan teaching on an experience subsequent to regeneration. [2] Both made rapid development among the poor, the uneducated, the insecure, and the emotionally starved. [3] Both had excesses of emotionalism, fanaticism, false teachers, and false doctrines. [4] Both groups, though believing the whole Bible and preaching many subjects, especially stressed a single experience-centered message. Both went to the masses rather than having the masses come to them. They used similar methods embracing prayer meetings, camp meetings, organization of new frontier

---

[1]Gee, The Pentecostal Movement, p. 3.

[2]Gordon Francis Atter, The Third Force (Petersborough, Ont., Canada: The College Press, 1962), p. 19.

[3]Charles W. Conn, Like A Mighty Army (Cleveland, Tenn.: Church of God Publishing House, 1955), pp. 7-9.

[4]Campbell, The Pentecostal Holiness Church, pp. 12-146.

churches in keeping with the economic, educational, and cultural interests of the lower classes. Both made use of revival, the preaching of sermons, the organization of Sunday Schools, emotionally packed and Christ-centered songs, altar calls, testimony meetings, and personal witnessing. Both developed an army of preachers whose education was only a step ahead of those to whom they preached, who moved often from church to church or from pastorate to the field of evangelism, and who economically lived on the brink of poverty and depended ardently on God's Providence and the liberality of the people. In both cases, their preachers struck hard at social evils and personal habits including alcohol, tobacco, and even dress and cosmetics for the women. In both ministerial groups there were some among them who felt inferior, condemned education but secretly wanted it, and when the opportunity came they pursued it.

The first half of the nineteenth century Methodism stressed emotional revivalism, and during the second half they turned to higher education for the ministry and educational evangelism for the local church. In the first half of the twentieth century Pentecostalism has likewise stressed emotional revivalism and there is every indication that in the second half of the century ministers will be better educated and the local church will stress educational evangelism.

GROWTH OF PENTECOSTALS

It is difficult to evaluate the numerical growth of Pentecostalism in America. According to Everet Leroy Moore whose statistics would

be valid up to about 1950, reports:

> It will be noticed . . . that the Pentecostal groups included in this study have a total membership of approximately 1,500,000. The writer is of the opinion that if the constituency of all other Pentecostal works in the nation, whether independent or organized into an association, were included in this total, a figure of about 2,000,000 members would be a minimum estimate of the total strength of the American Pentecostal Movement. [1]

Listed in Moore's membership totals for Pentecostal churches in America are thirty-six different church bodies ranging in size from 1,000 up to 370,118 with his actual total being 1,532,914. [2] Atter in 1962 rates them as 3,000,000. [3]

In a report of Time Magazine, Pentecostalism is described as the fastest growing religious movement in the hemisphere. [4] Henry P. van Dusen wrote in an aritcle for Life Magazine and rated the Pentecostals and similar groups as the third force in Christendom. [5]

PENTECOSTALS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

To illustrate the development of the Pentecostal Movement throughout the world, reference is made to the World Pentecostal Conference and the World Congress on Evangelism.

The first meeting to form the World Pentecostal Conference

---

[1]Moore, "Handbook of Pentecostal Denominations in the U. S.," p. 226.

[2]Ibid., p. 227. [3]Atter, The Third Force, p. 6.

[4]"Fastest Growing Church in the Hemisphere," Time Magazine, November 2, 1962, p. 56.

[5]"The Third Force," Life Magazine, June 9, 1958, pp. 122ff.

was held in Zurich, Switzerland, in 1947. At this meeting steps were taken to inaugurate a magazine devoted to giving information of world-wide Pentecostal missionary and revival activity. Two years later in Paris, France, another policy-making conference was held in which objectives were established limiting the business to a minimum and emphasizing spiritual objectives. A presidium was created to arrange for conferences and select speakers. The third conference was held in London, England, in 1952. Every third year thereafter the World Pentecostal Conference has been held in Stockholm, Sweden, in 1955; Toronto, Canada, in 1958; in Jerusalem, Israel, in 1961; in Helsinki, Finland, in 1964; with the one in 1967 to be in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Because of limited facilities a smaller number of delegates attended the Jerusalem Conference. The total number of delegates registered in Jerusalem was 2,589 from thirty different countries. [1]

The World Congress on Evangelism was conducted in Berlin, October 26 - November 4, 1966, where 1,250 delegates were invited from 106 nations. In this ten-day congress, one part of the daily program was dedicated to "Windows on the World" in which the speakers gave statistical reports on the religious activities from the many countries of the world. In the majority of these reports it was clearly stated that "the Pentecostals were the fastest growing" religious body. [2]

---

[1]Atter, The Third Force, pp. 278-281.

[2]"Study Papers," Books I and II, World Congress on Evangelism, Berlin, West Germany, October 26 - November 4, 1966.

From various sources it is estimated that Pentecostal members now number more than ten million with some of them on every continent and in most of the countries of the world.[1] Walter Hollenweger, Chairman of Evangelism for the World Council of Churches, who spent six years producing the seven volumes of "Handbuch der Pfingstbewegung," holds that there are 177 different Pentecostal groups operating as organized denominations in the world. And at this date, February, 1967, there are 270 different magazines produced by various Pentecostal bodies, groups, or individuals that monthly, bi-monthly, or weekly come to the "Pentecostal Room" which is an exclusive part of the Learning Resources Center of the Oral Roberts University.

SUMMARY

Pentecostalism, like the Holiness Movement, evolved into new identifiable characteristics. It came at the turn of the century and is known by the emphasis it places upon the baptism in the Holy Spirit and divine healing. It has grown rapidly in the United States and throughout the world. It, like the Holiness Movement, is splintered into many organized sects and denominations. Differing from the Holiness Movement which was built around the doctrines of John Wesley, there are no outstanding personalities who can claim credit

---

[1]Atter, The Third Force, p. 1; and La Pentecote VIE et Lumiere (Rennes, France: No. 29, Nov.-Dec. 1966), p. 20.

for the origin or development. From the beginning of Pentecostalism there has been a unique emphasis upon the Bible exemplified by the Bible School Movement.

CHAPTER IX

THE BIBLE SCHOOL MOVEMENT AND PENTECOSTALISM

Irwin Winehouse in his popular survey about the Assemblies of God in 1959 sets forth objectives and accomplishments of his church.

> "'It may be news to some,' J. Roswell Flower, Executive Secretary, has stated, 'to learn that one of the reasons for the organizing of the Assemblies of God in 1914 was the promotion of schools.' There were some independent schools serving the movement from the very beginning, but it was not until 1922 that Central Bible Institute was established in Springfield. . . .
>
> "Today there are eight Bible institutions and Bible colleges, besides the recently created Evangel College in Springfield. Total enrollments number more than 2,500, representing every state and many foreign countries, as students prepare for careers as: pastor, evangelist, missionary, children's evangelists, youth director, chaplaincy, etc.
>
> "A recent survey revealed that of the 806 student freshmen at Assemblies of God institutes and colleges, 65 per cent of them planned to enter full-time ministry for Christ; 20 per cent planned to enter part-time work as ministers of Christian education, sacred music, youth, or as other workers in the local church; only 15 per cent planned secular careers or were undecided."[1]

Until 1950 or later there were only Bible schools in the Assemblies of God system of higher education. They had as their objective the training of ministers and other Christian workers. Most

---

[1]Irwin Winehouse, The Assemblies of God, A Popular Survey (New York: Vantage Press, 1959), p. 172.

applicants who attended were generally spiritually committed before they entered the Bible school. This philosophy and curriculum were most conducive to those who planned full-time Christian service.

Bible training was believed necessary due to the rapidly expanding program of evangelism and the world vision of foreign missions. The Assemblies of God Church was organized in 1914, and in 1959 Winehouse in his statistical report listed 8,104 churches with 505,552 members in the U.S.A., 9,300 ordained ministers, 8,082 licensed ministers, 922,663 enrolled in Sunday schools with a goal of 1,000,000 by 1960.[1] This church ranks number one in the world among all churches in the number of foreign Bible schools, fifth in the number of missionaries, and twenty-seventh in American church membership.[2]

Almost every progressive Pentecostal denomination developed its own Bible schools to train its own workers. These schools without exception held the same goals for existence as did the church that gave them support.

The Bible School Movement has been unique in its purpose, curriculum, contribution, and history. The movement was originally begun to produce Sunday school teachers. Among the first was Nyack Missionary College in New York with the Christian and Missionary Alliance. D. L. Moody in Chicago established the Moody Bible College, also to train Sunday school workers.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 197. [2]Ibid., p. 198.

There were Bible schools in existence when the Pentecostal Movement was born. Bethel Bible School, under the supervision of Charles Fox Parham in Topeka, Kansas, is the place where students made their conclusion regarding the evidence for the reception of the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

HOLMES BIBLE COLLEGE, AN EXAMPLE

Exemplifying the relationship of the Bible school with the Pentecostal Movement and the churches they served is Holmes Bible and Missionary Institute (later named Holmes Bible College) in Greenville, South Carolina. From the beginning, it helped to stimulate the growth of the Pentecostal Holiness Church.

N. J. Holmes, the founder of Holmes Bible College, was the second child of Zelotes Lee Holmes. His father was a Presbyterian minister and a professor at Laurensville Female College. N. J. Holmes was born September 9, 1847, Spartanburg County, South Carolina. He attended the Laurens Academy, and served three years in the Civil War as a Confederate soldier. He finished at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, in 1869, and returned to America during the summer of that year. After returning, he farmed and taught school awhile, and then began reading law. He married Lucy Elizabeth Simpson, February 29, 1876. She was the daughter of ex-Governor W. D. Simpson of South Carolina. Holmes practiced law fourteen years, then entered the race for solicitor in 1888, but gave up the

race to enter the ministry. He established Holmes Bible College in 1898, and died December 17, 1919.[1]

The idea of a Bible school first originated in the mind of the mother of N. J. Holmes. Here are excerpts from letters she wrote just before her death:[2]

> "I wanted a house of my own, and I wanted it filled with young people that I could train to serve the Lord. And when I married, as your father was a minister, I thought I could carry out my plan, but found out the Lord was not ready for the plan . . . .
>
> "The Lord spared the oldest son, I knew not for what, but he was given to Him for service. Hope died in me when he chose law for his profession, but in time he changed his mind for the ministry. And one day, while at his house, my mind ran back over my life and his, and something said to me, 'Your son shall carry out your plans.' Now it has been fulfilled. My plan has been carried out. Praise the Lord!"

He preached as an evangelist for a number of years in South Carolina. Most everywhere he went, Christian young men were found who were in great need of training. In 1891, he and his wife visited Northfield, Massachusetts, and attended two of D. L. Moody's Bible conferences.[3] He had a personal interview with Moody. It is possible that some ideas were received at these conferences which partly inspired his future educational activities. The following year,

---

[1]N. J. Holmes, Life Sketches and Sermons (Franklin Springs, Georgia: Publishing House of the Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1920, p. 8.

[2]J. V. Ellenberg, "History of the Holmes Bible and Missionary Institute," Pentecostal Holiness Advocate, May 23, 1940, p. 10.

[3]Holmes, Life Sketches and Sermons, pp. 68-69.

> in 1892, he and his wife rented a little cottage on Paris Mountain (near Greenville, S. C.) in which to spend a part of the summer. They were so well pleased with the place that they bought a few acres of land and erected another cottage. In the summer of 1893, they invited some young men who were interested in Christian work to spend ten days or two weeks with them in Bible study. They used a tent for services and classes, but the following year they built a cottage for the increasing number of students, and also a chapel, which was used for classes until 1898. At that time they had opportunity to buy, for five thousand dollars, the Altamont Hotel property, originally worth twenty thousand dollars. [1]

In November, 1898, the school was opened permanently for the purpose of training Christian workers. [2] It remained on Paris Mountain for two years and was moved to Atlanta, Georgia, for two terms. In 1902, the school began and continued for two terms in the Oliver Gospel Mission building, Columbia, South Carolina; then was moved back to the Altamont Hotel on Paris Mountain. A tabernacle was erected in 1909 on property bought by N. J. Holmes in Greenville, S. C. The first dormitory was built in 1915, at which time the school was moved from the mountain to Greenville, S. C. on the corner of Briggs Avenue and Buncombe Street where it has remained since. [3]

The first three years of the school there was a tuition of nine and ten dollars per month, but during the travels of the founder, many worthy young students who were unable to pay any price asked about the school. He wanted them to attend, but didn't feel that a distinction

---

[1] Ibid., p. 93. [2] Ibid., p. 95.

[3] Ellenberg, "History of the Holmes Bible and Missionary Institute," Pentecostal Holiness Advocate, May 23, 1940, p. 11.

in any way should be made between those who were and those who were not able to pay. After much prayer and consideration, he decided to operate the school by faith in God. January 10, 1910, he wrote:

> All teachers work as unto the Lord without salary or remuneration, except that we all eat at the Father's table with the students. The whole work rests upon faith in God. We make no charge for board or tuition, except to let everyone understand that those who have means are expected to contribute to the support of the work, as the Lord leads them. We never ask anybody for anything and have no church or society, or individuals to whom to look for support, but depend on God alone. We make known our needs to Him and He has kept us going these years. Many times we have been face to face with an empty pantry and an empty purse, and have not known where the next meal was coming from, and a few times we have had only bread or peas, and once or twice nothing but water. But it is marvelous how God has kept and provided for us![1]

The three-year Bible course was outlined as follows:[2]

"Old Testament I.	Genesis, Exodus, Joshua, I Samuel, II Samuel, Ezra, Proverbs, Isaiah, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Haggai.
"Old Testament II.	Leviticus, Numbers, Judges, I Kings, II Kings, Nehemiah, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Daniel, Joel, Habakkuk.
"Old Testament III.	Deuteronomy, Ruth, I Chronicles, II Chronicles, Esther, Job, Psalms, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Zephaniah, Zechariah, Malachi.

---

[1]Holmes, Life Sketches and Sermons, p. 95.

[2]N. J. Holmes, Holmes Bible and Missionary Institute Handbook (Franklin Springs, Ga.: Publishing House for the Pentecostal Holiness Church), pp. 13-15.

"New Testament I. Life of Christ--Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts.

"New Testament II. I Thessalonians, II Thessalonians, Galatians, I Corinthians, II Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon.

"New Testament III. I Timothy, Titus, II Timothy, Hebrews, James, I Peter, II Peter, I John, II John, III John, Jude, Revelation.

"The other courses of study in the Advanced Department are Missions, General Theology, Pastoral Theology, Evangelism, Church History, Homiletics, Psychology and English."

Until about 1950, the Bible schools were limited in their subject offerings almost exclusively to the Bible plus a few related subjects. This was due to the great need for quickly trained personnel for the churches, to the limited academic training on the part of the administrators and teachers, and because of the traditions that the schools developed.

By 1950, there were more than fifty Bible schools under the direct supervision of the Pentecostal churches in America and Canada.[1]

The Pentecostal denominations are becoming gradually more eager for liberal education. Among them it is contended that Christian higher education should be offered to young people who enter vocations and the professions as well as those who enter full-time Christian work. Parents who supported the Bible schools whose children were

---

[1] This report is based on the personal knowledge of the writer who served as secretary of the P. F. N. A. (Pentecostal Fellowship of North America). See also General Minutes of the fifteen different groups that constitute the P. F. N. A.

not "called to preach" raised serious questions regarding the curriculum. Often students entered the Bible school upon the insistance of fellow students or overly zealous religious leaders. Those who were not by temperament or ability capable of entering full-time Christian service, found themselves sometimes like a "round peg in a square hole." The training did not fit them to make a living, and upon graduation they had to re-train themselves.

That there were values in character building, in prayer, in learning faith and trust in God, honest persons will not question. The Bible School Movement became the greatest producing agency for ministers and foreign missionaries and can be credited with contributing greatly in keeping the Pentecostal Movement in a Biblically-centered theology with less "wild fire and fanaticism." Had it not been for the Bible School Movement, Pentecostalism would never have become the third great spiritual force in the world.

With this said, it is also true that the Bible school did not become all things to all men--not even in the field of education. The Pentecostal denominations in their educational programs have been, since the mid-century and some before, turning toward a broader curriculum and a more liberal education.

In 1955 Evangel College, a liberal arts school of the Assemblies of God in Springfield, Missouri, opened its doors, "thus fulfilling the resolution passed by the Milwaukee General Council in 1953 for the establishment of a senior college--the first Pentecostal

liberal arts college in the world."[1]

The Pentecostal Holiness Church reorganized Franklin Springs Institute in 1933 and made it a junior college;[2] and Southwestern College in Oklahoma City, a junior college, was organized in 1946.

Lee College, which is under the supervision of the Church of God, Cleveland, Tennessee, opened as a Bible Training School at 9:30 a.m., January 1, 1918, on the second floor of the Church of God Publishing House in the apartment where the Elders Council convened.[3] It grew and moved about, but operated primarily as a Bible school until 1939.

"Junior College Department and Struggles for Accreditation" was a heading used by Mauldin A. Ray to report the direction the Church of God was taking in its educational system.[4] Lee College has been accredited as a four-year liberal arts college and is now one of the leading Pentecostal colleges in the world.

---

[1]Winehouse, The Assemblies of God, p. 174.

[2]R. O. Corvin, "History of Education by the Pentecostal Holiness Church in South Carolina and Georgia," (unpublished Master's dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1942).

[3]Mauldin A. Ray, "A Study of the History of Lee College," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, College of Education, University of Houston, 1964), p. 35.

[4]Ibid., p. 158.

SUMMARY

For the first fifty years of the twentieth century the Bible School Movement's curriculum was centered in the Bible and used to prepare Sunday school teachers, ministers, and foreign missionaries. The Bible schools have produced an army of workers that influenced the growth and stability of the Pentecostal Movement. As a result changes are taking place both in the Bible schools and in the educational objectives of the various Pentecostal churches.

With the trend turned toward a broader curriculum and a more liberal arts type of education, the pertinent questions arise as to which direction shall the Pentecostal Movement take? What school will lead in this cause? Where would such a school be built? These are reasons why Oral Roberts University is being developed.

CHAPTER X

DEVELOPMENT OF

ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY

On September 7, 1965, the Oral Roberts University began its first term. Present at the opening banquet were distinguished guests, educators, members of the Board of Regents, representatives of the news media, faculty, students, and many others.

Why ORU came into being may be partially understood by gleaning statements from the opening address of President Oral Roberts:

> You young men and women who have enrolled today are our first class. Of the 3,900 high school graduates who either made application or asked for information, we have accepted for the first semester only you 300. You have been carefully selected from among some of America's most excellent young people. You have in coming to ORU pledged yourselves to join with us in what is considered to be an exciting and revolutionary quest in modern times--the quest for the development of the whole man. [1]

In answering the question, "What kind of university is ORU?" the President indicated hope that it would produce a daring new concept in higher education which would be exemplified in a willingness to bring about innovations in all the basic aspects of one's being.

---

[1]Oral Roberts, "Quest for the Whole Man," address given to first class at ORU, September 7, 1965.

Since great universities are distinguished by their libraries, it was made clear that interest and finances would be dedicated to the development of an adequate library, one that would have current periodicals related to the subjects adopted in the curriculum, plus shelving for a half million volumes.

Placed at the fingertips of the students was an information storage/retrieval system designed to accelerate study. Ultimately, whether one is in his dormitory, in a language laboratory, or at a learning station in the Learning Resources Center, he will have push-button access to the information in the storage center.

For the Freshmen of the Liberal Arts Department and the Juniors of the Graduate School of Theology, there was a faculty consisting of fifteen holding doctorates, four having completed their work for the doctorate, and eleven others with the Master's degree, making a total of thirty-three. This was a teacher-student ratio for the first year of one to ten.

Inward spiritual development along with the development of the intellectual and physical was held as necessary. This development includes a new birth through repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ with a constant cleansing of the inner self from sin, the baptism with the Holy Spirit in the charismatic dimension for the impowerment and personal edification, a manifestation of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, a personal witness of the Master to one's fellow man, and a daily application of Christian principles to the demands of life.

For the purpose of preparing ministers and other Christian workers, the Seminary became the first graduate school of the university. Though in its outset it is housed in the Administration Building, an entire new building complex was embraced in the future plans of the Theological Seminary.

President Roberts concluded his address on the opening night with the following statement:

> Could students emerge from this university among the world's most-wanted graduates? Why not? When a graduate has a healthy body and knows how to care for it, a trained and disciplined mind that never settles for less than excellence, an invincible spirit of integrity inspired by a personal relationship with the living God, and driven by an irresistible desire to be a whole man to help make a troubled world whole again, then there will be a place where he can make his contribution. [1]

ORU opened with 300 students in the Freshman class and with 29 in the Graduate School of Theology. They were instructed the first year by 33 teachers. Before school opened, seven buildings were finished or nearly completed consisting of two dormitories, each capable of housing 160 students; one tri-winged seven-story dormitory to accommodate 600; an administration building, 33,000 square feet in size in which is a 600-capacity dining room, classrooms, offices, and a 700 seating capacity auditorium; a health education building equipped with basketball courts, swimming pool, and a gallery with seating capacity for 2,500; the Learning Resources Center with

---

[1] Ibid.

192,000 square feet, six stories in height, and housing the library plus all equipment for the production, storage, retrieval, and dissemination of learning; and the power plant in which is installed a natural gas turbine energy system capable of producing sufficient energy to meet all electrical, heating,and air-conditioning needs of the university even when it is fully developed. These buildings with the 418 acres of land plus all improvements called for an expenditure of more than $12,000,000 at the time ORU opened.[1]

EARLY HISTORY

The Pentecostal revival developed in Oklahoma during the early decades of the twentieth century. The Reverend E. M. Roberts and his wife, Claudie, dedicated themselves to the ministry of the gospel and became leading pioneer evangelists in the state of Oklahoma and beyond.

Among the thousands influenced by their ministry was their own son, Oral. Oral ran away from home when he was a stuttering fifteen-year-old boy, secured a job, continued his high school education, and became a member of the basketball team. One night while playing in a competitive game, his coach observed in him a condition of sickness. He was taken to his home in Ada where the doctor diagnosed his case as tuberculosis. It was during this seige of sickness that Roberts experienced a spiritual experience that changed the course of his life.

---

[1]These figures were taken from reports prepared by Stanfield & O'Dell, Tulsa, Oklahoma, auditors for ORU, dated May 20, 1965.

Oral Roberts became an evangelist and later a pastor. His broader ministry began in Enid, Oklahoma. Soon he moved to Tulsa where throngs of people came to hear him preach. His meetings in Tulsa launched him into the first of eight world outreach programs. Meetings of this kind he called "crusades." These crusades began in 1947. Since then he has conducted them around the world in tents, auditoriums, stadiums, arenas, or anywhere that groups assembled to listen. From this beginning other world outreaches developed.

The field in which he reaped was fertile and the harvest was ripe. The nation had just emerged from the greatest war in its history. Millions of families had been uprooted. Some felt the pangs of sorrow because of battle losses. In general, among the American people there was spiritual hunger and desire for soul security. The greatest contributing factor to the success of his evangelistic ministry, other than his own dynamic personality and ability, was the Pentecostal revival of the first half of the twentieth century.

In the beginning of the Oral Roberts Evangelistic Crusades, there had come into being thousands of small Pentecostal churches throughout the nation and around the world. The pastors of these churches were the ones who cooperated with him. In most places where he conducted crusades there were from 20 to 50 of these pastors and their churches who supported his crusades. Primarily they were

members of the organized church bodies that made up the Pentecostal Fellowship of North America.[1] Later when he developed more extensively and successfully his radio and television ministry, many people came to the crusades who had no connection with these churches.

The ministry of Oral Roberts has grown to proportions far beyond the anticipated, and his interest in education over the years has been expressed in many ways. He and Lee Braxton, the Director of the Radio and Television Outreach phase of the Oral Roberts ministry, contributed fifty thousand dollars toward the construction of the library and administration building on the campus of the Southwestern College in Oklahoma City in the year of 1952. However, Southwestern College was church controlled, and the successful evangelist was looking for a much broader scope in which he could express his educational interest.

On July 31, 1961, Roberts held a conference with the members of his staff. The following constitutes enough of his conversation to give the trend of his thinking:

> "I came to some decisive actions for the future of my ministry. One is that I definitely now am committing myself to the institute and bringing foreign people over to America, not necessarily extremely young people, but people all the way from the early twenties to the early forties--bring the wife if it's possible--and pick out men who are very active and who show great promise--possibly start with between thirty to sixty. Then I have come nearer to my decision to establish an institute in the strictest sense of the word which will ultimately become a college. It will start off as a thoroughly religious missionary evangelistic

---

[1]"Welcome to the Oral Roberts Abundant Life Crusade," brochure printed for each crusade listing sponsoring churches.

> training endeavor, but I believe it will ultimately grow into an accredited school that will have world ramifications.
>
> "When we build a school, by the help of God, we'll build one whose academic standing will be high enough that it will have a great appeal to young people who want to have a real high academic education. This is possibly several years off, but I want you to know what my thinking is. This is not a new thought with me; I've only had it about fifteen years. I was instrumental in starting Southwestern College in Oklahoma City which is still in operation. [1]

The idea of a "boot camp" was on his mind a month later. In a telephone conference with members of his staff, speaking to them from California he said:

> "I am thrilled with this ministry and without a shadow of a doubt, I believe there are greater days ahead.
>
> "We will build a 'boot camp' outside of Tulsa. I plan to bring about 40 students from overseas this spring. These will be more trained than the others--important men and women--cream of the crop--already in this work. Train them two or three months and send them home. Then in the fall of 1962, start a regular term like a school term of fall and spring. Start with 100 students this fall and hope within 10 years to have 1,000 per year coming for training.
>
> "We are going to build a 'boot camp' and note that term--a true 'boot camp' with little cottages housing four or six or eight students--instead of dormitories. Have the partners sponsor each cottage and have their names on the doors. I have talked with several partners and people about the idea and everyone likes it. They like the 'boot camp' idea of using separate cottages instead of dormitories.

---

[1] Typed report of a tape-recorded conference of Oral Roberts and the Tulsa staff of Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association (in the files of R. O. Corvin).

> "Over a period of time we will have to have about 500 cottages. We will build 20 to 25 of them between now and spring. Bill's estimated cost of contructing each one for a 20' x 40' cottage to house four or six students and furnish it would cost approximately $7,500. That's just an estimate. We'll have to have a building for classes and one for a dining hall. Everybody will work and study and then go back home.
>
> "I want everybody to pray earnestly for God to give us the land to build the 'boot camp' on."[1]

The "boot camp" idea did not materialize.

The first land to be purchased for the campus of the university was a tract consisting of 160 acres located at the north-east corner of 81st Street and South Lewis Avenue. This acreage was acquired at a total cost of $295,000 which was an average of $1,844 per acre. The terms of the purchase were $98,200 cash and $196,800 mortgage payable at $24,600 annually at four per cent interest.

Immediately upon the purchase of the property, Cecil Stanfield was employed as the architect to design the buildings of the University of Evangelism. Stanfield was the same architect who designed the Abundant Life Building which has been acclaimed by so many as one of the most beautiful structures in Tulsa. Setting himself to this task, he was ready with preliminary designs and building delineations by December 22, 1961, at which time the Tulsa Tribune published an article about the University of Evangelism and included a picture of the buildings. These buildings consisted of two dormitories

---

[1] Recorded telephone conference with Oral Roberts in Calif. and Manford Engel, Oscar Moore, Lee Braxton, Leon Hartz, Bill Underwood, Willard Mason, and Al Bush in Tulsa, on August 30, 1961.

and the administration building.

It was on March 2, 1962, that the official ground-breaking ceremonies were held for the construction of the buildings for the new University of Evangelism.[1] Before the ground breaking, though, more then 100,000 cubic yards of dirt had been moved by the huge earth-moving machines in preparation of the site. Present for the meeting were all members of both the Board of Trustees and the Executive Committee of the Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association. At that time it was decided that a Board of Directors would be organized for the University of Evangelism.[2] A resolution was also adopted and entered into the permanent record of the association, that the School of Evangelism is never to make a charge for tuition, board, or room. It is to be a faith school in perpetuity. The idea behind this was that the school would trust God to meet the needs and make it possible for worthy men and women, although financially unable to attend, to attend when invited. This resolution has been carefully observed, though it does not apply to the academic department of the university.[3]

Placed in charge of the construction of the buildings and the direction of the total project was Bill Roberts, the nephew of Oral and a graduate in engineering from the University of Oklahoma. The deadline for its completion was January 1, 1963. He was only six days late.

The first Ministerial Seminar, which was one of the

---

[1]Abundant Life, May 1962, p. 24. [2]Ibid., p. 23. [3]Ibid.

proposed objectives of the University of Evangelism, was scheduled for January 16-22, 1963. There were 307 ministers and their wives who accepted the invitation. They represented 11 different denominations and 27 states throughout the nation. Lectures in classrooms dealt with subjects such as: The Communion, Right Believing, The Key to Helping People, The Holy Spirit, Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews, The Art of Soul Winning, and others. There were a number of instructors.

Discussion panels were directed in the afternoon sessions. These embraced a variety of subjects including: Divine Love, How Can the Order of Worship Contribute to a More Spiritual Service, and What Do You Expect from the Oral Roberts University. Listed among evening speakers were: J. E. Hamill, E. J. Fulton, and W. H. Turner.[1]

In spite of conflicts regarding the visit of personnel from overseas, plans were made and executed. Responsibility was given to a designated group who made surveys of 54 countries of the world. Names and addresses of top leaders in religion and education were secured. One member of this team traveled 50,000 miles within 50 days, visited 37 countries, and held personal interviews with more than 300 national leaders. Only the "number one" man or the top-level administrators of a country were invited. This policy lessened

---

[1]William Sterne and William Armstrong, "Ministers' Seminar," Abundant Life, April 1963, p. 3.

the cause for fear held by some missionary boards.

A 707 jet was chartered with Air France that brought a load of 127 people directly from Paris to Tulsa, Oklahoma, with only one stop in New York City. Representatives assembled in Paris from Africa, the Near East, from behind the Iron Curtain, and many parts of Europe. They took the chartered plane to Tulsa. Other groups assembled in Tokyo, Japan, and Sydney, Australia, and came in numbers of 25 or more. Those coming from South America came individually or in small groups.

A dream came true as 212 delegates from 56 nations and from every continent on the globe arrived in Tulsa and assembled at the Oral Roberts University for the first International Seminar. [1]

FACULTY

In the outset it was assumed by the founders that the most difficult task in the establishment of the university would be the securing of a faculty that was academically qualified and at the same time compatible with the spiritual and philosophical objectives of the school.

The general feeling of the Board of Regents, the Administration, and the supporting constituency at large was that the university was coming into being as a result of the Charismatic Revival and the leadership of Oral Roberts and his ministry and that those teaching in the school should be not only assenting believers, but

---

[1]Doyle Heibling, "International Seminar," Abundant Life, February 1964, p. 10.

actual participants in the spiritual experiences.

There was a decision made to assist financially a number of prospective teachers. A fluctuating amount of approximately $50,000 was made available for this purpose. It was to be used as a loan fund. Complete legal details were drawn up for those who participated as to what would be done in case of sickness or death. Provisions were written granting both the applicant and the University freedom of choice as to a final teaching agreement. A number of persons have participated in this program and it is anticipated that others will.

Interviews were held by members of the Administration with more than three hundred persons who expressed an interest in teaching. Files containing data on these were developed that proved most helpful in the securing of the faculty.

THE LEARNING RESOURCES CENTER

Planning that consummated the decision to design and construct the Learning Resources Center embraced a belief that the best learning processes should be discovered, analyzed and implemented, both in motivating the dynamics of teaching and the excitement of learning. The designers were interested in retaining the educational techniques that have proven in the past most successful in academic excellence, but equally as interested in finding and implementing educational innovations that may prove to be superior

and more effective in giving greater learning results to more pupils in less time. The purpose was not primarily to save money, but to use money wisely in developing a quality educational program.

The building for the Learning Resources Center is the most expensive structure on the campus. It is six stories in height, triangular in shape, containing 192,000 square feet, and is made of concrete, steel, and glass. If it were on one floor, it would cover four and one-half acres. The construction of the building was awarded to the Manhattan Construction Company of Muskogee, Oklahoma, at a bid of $2,900,000, with an agreement that it would be finished by July 1, 1965. Carpeting for it was awarded the Commercial Carpet Corporation, New York, for a bid of $7.91 per square yard for a total of $70,000, with an agreement that it would be installed by August 15. The laboratory science equipment was purchased from Browne-Morse, Muskegon, Michigán, at a cost of $50,000, to be installed before the opening of school. The learning resources equipment was purchased from the Radio Corporation of America, at a price of $615,135.20.

A summary of the total investments in the Learning Resources Center, not including land, is as follows:

Building	$2,900,000.00
Excavations	25,000.00
Audio-Video Equipment	615,135.20
Books and Magazines	483,000.00
Carpeting	70,000.00
Science Equipment	50,000.00
Furniture	252,763.20

FM Radio Station	38,000.00
Landscaping and Sidewalks	10,000.00
Memorial to Gideons	20,000.00
Musical Instruments	25,000.00
Art Equipment	2,000.00
Duplicating Machines, Typewriters	4,000.00
IBM Check-out Duplicator, etc.	5,000.00
	$4,499,898.40

Programmed materials, whether produced commercially or originally, have an unusual advantage in the learning process when used with a mass distribution system accessible by groups or randomly by individual students. With this systems approach in the retrieval of information, a teacher in any field of knowledge could assign his pupils a variety of planned programs for supplementary or collateral study. These programs may be in any variety of presentation in time durations from 15 minutes to an hour and continuing combinations of slides, moving pictures or other documentary combinations.

The materials would be available for the individual student at any time of the day or night to be selected randomly to suit his interest and meet his need. A difficult laboratory experiment with explanations and lectures by a superior professor may be produced and stored, then retrieved and reviewed again and again until the student has complete mastery of the difficult information.

Following the process with this accessibility students may advance in a given field as rapidly or as slowly as their interest and ability will permit. Basic information may be programmed and stored, then retrieved at the convenience of the students, thus allowing the

professors to utilize class time more productively.

Under such circumstances large segments of courses could be programmed where self study could reach a high level of efficiency. Collateral printed materials could be made available to students as a guide to audio-video programs in such a way that they could direct their own instruction with opportunity for response, awareness of achievement, with directed and re-directed continuation to the successful conclusion of the program.

It is possible to conceive a plan of computerized course programs where detailed instructions and presentations are so thoroughly arranged that a student could sit in his dormitory room at his learning station making use of the video monitor and audio set and complete an entire course without visiting a class or seeing the teacher.

With this approach to learning one could visualize an educational innovation where a student could enter and finish a course at any time of the year and proceed at the speed most suitable to his interest and learning ability.

These innovations have not become hardened philosophical policies of the Oral Roberts University Administration; however, there is interest sufficiently vitalized that experiments will be attempted to test the value and feasibility of this educational approach.

In the audio-video learning laboratory the equipment to be installed for the individual student learning station includes the 8" video monitor, the audio headphone, the dial system, miscellaneous

cabling, connectors and all other equipment required for remote observation. These will be located in the library, in various learning laboratories,and ultimately in the dormitory rooms.

The remote study learning stations for groups include student stations as outlined previously plus the necessary video monitors. At the group station area, instead of supplying headphones, transistorized amplifiers are supplied with speaker mechanism and enclosures that are compatible with 23" monitors to allow a group of students to observe the video monitors and hear the audio. All classrooms are equipped with the large monitors enabling teachers to have access to the learning storage center.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

The Graduate School of Theology of the Oral Roberts University was officially opened September 9, 1965, with the Junior class in which were 29 students. Each year thereafter, a new class will be activated. The first graduation where the Bachelor of Divinity degree is conferred will be in the Spring of 1968.

The Seminary is a distinct educational entity and at the same time an integral part of the university. It occupies the two dormitories and the Administration Building and classrooms which were first constructed on the university campus in 1962.

Coordinated with the Seminary are Seminars, World Outreach Conferences, International Evangelism Conventions, Youth Congresses, and other meetings that may be deemed advisable by the Administration.

SUMMARY

The opening of ORU with the Freshman class of some 300 students plus a class of 29 in the Graduate School of Theology, housed in a physical plant evaluated with grounds at more than twelve million dollars, taught by an administration and faculty of thirty-three, indicates a beginning that may become significant within religious circles.

Historically the school evolved out of a combination of personnel, religious, economical, educational, and communicational factors. Its origin can be traced to a mental concept formed early in the minds and purposes of certain young men. The Pentecostal Revival projected as the third great force in Christendom has produced the religious and philosophical framework and supplied the contributing constituency that actually brought the university into being. Trends in higher education which were refined by experiment in America during the last half of the nineteenth century and bore fruit in the first half of the twentieth century have been amalgamated with Christian atmosphere.

Curriculum designing coincides with the patterns of the past, but new innovations are advocated in methods and communications. Uniqueness may be claimed by uniting under one roof the Learning Resources Center, the library, and the electronic resources information storage-distribution and retrieval process.

To reach the public in the dissemination of knowledge and in securing cooperation from the assenting constituency the more recent

communicative arts are used embracing television, radio, publications, public address, and personal contact. Through these media a greater numerical constituency have participated in the public relations and financing of the university.

The graduate school beginning only with Theology is designed to include additional fields where emphasis will be placed upon research, publication, and the communicative arts.

CHAPTER XI

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUNDS IN THE FOUNDING OF ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY

PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL

The major purpose why Christian higher institutions were established was to propagate the gospel of Jesus Christ. The statement "for the advancement of all good literature, arts, and sciences . . . to the education of the English and Indian youth" summarizes Harvard's more general philosophical purpose. In the charter of William and Mary it is specifically stated "that the Christian faith may be propagated." Yale's purpose was "that youth may be instructed in the arts and sciences who through the blessings of Almighty God may be fitted for public employment both in church and state." To a greater or lesser degree all other colonial colleges held that the propagation of the gospel of Jesus Christ was a worthy and valid objective.

Shipherd asserted that Oberlin should teach theology and "educate ministers for our dying world." Statement nine in "The Oberlin Covenant" is: "We will take special pains to educate all our children thoroughly, and train them up in body, intellect, and heart for the service of the Lord."

This was the supreme motive during the prolific college

building program of the pre-Civil War period when 180 permanent denominational institutions of higher learning were established.

The fact that the Baptist Union Theological Seminary became a part of the University of Chicago, and that the first president was a theologian would indicate the religious objective even though the school was rather broad in its philosophical objectives. ORU came into being as a result of the ministry of its founder and the religious revival of which he was a part. The major purpose is to propagate the gospel of Jesus Christ.

EDUCATION FOR THE STATE

From the beginning of higher education in the United States the purpose of education was designed to benefit the state and promote the arts and sciences. Harvard was designed to promote "all good literature." William and Mary, in addition to divinity, would establish a place to perpetuate "philosophy, languages, and other good arts and sciences." Yale included the arts and sciences.

Oberlin maintained that "all children of the colony are to be well educated, whether destined to professional or manual labor; for those designed to be mechanics will learn their trades while in a course of study." This policy made arrangements for a broader educational curriculum.

The University of Chicago made provisions for a diverse national and international educational interest and set a trend for

educators in various fields. The school recognized bigness, turned its focus of interest from Athens and Rome to the present and future, advocated teaching, research, and publication, opened an ear to the hum of industry, looked assentingly toward corporate business, urbanism, and social complexities, and set pace for the advancement of science and professional education.

The Oral Roberts University is in many respects a prototype of the European universities. It has in it likenesses of Paris, Berlin, Oxford, and Cambridge. These characteristics have been transferred from school to school and from generation to generation. The liberal arts department of ORU is designed to train citizens for civil service.

REPRODUCTION OF ENGLISH CULTURE AND EDUCATION

Yale's successful Rector Thomas Clap stated that "Yale College in New Haven does not come to the perfection of the ancient established universities in Great Britain; yet, it would endeavor to imitate them in most things as far as its present state will admit of it." In the establishment of the colonial colleges the designers attempted to emulate the British schools to reproduce in the new world English culture and education.

If Oberlin can be classified as a typical example of the pre-Civil War college proliferation, one can conclude that the pattern for these schools, with a multiplicity of minor variations, was cut from the New England colonial college.

INFLUENCE FROM GERMANY

German educational philosophy made its contribution. A small army of German-trained American educators filling positions of leadership attempted to remold higher education in America. Henry P. Tappan contended that America had only colleges; it needed universities. He held that German universities were model institutions with freedom, great libraries, and professors of eminence in all branches of knowledge and that American colleges were deficient, narrow, and too much like the British. The University of Chicago was more nearly like the German, but designed to meet American needs.

CLASSICAL EDUCATION

Classical education was brought directly from Cambridge and Oxford. It stressed Greek, Latin, logic, mathematics, and geography. When Harvard was first established, entering students were required to pass an examination in both Greek and Latin. Two hundred years later, entering students in Oberlin were tested in the same subjects. In 1828 President Jeremiah Day of Yale and Professor James L. Kingsley, national figures, successfully defended classical education and became responsible for the "dead languages" being retained at the heart of the college curriculum for another fifty years.

When the University of Chicago opened, ancient languages were taught including Hebrew and Latin, Greek and others, but they no longer were predominant.

ORU opened with a curriculum where students can major in eighteen fields including French, German, Greek, Russian, and Spanish. Not one subject in Latin was listed in the curriculum.

CHARTERS AND LEGAL PROTECTION

The charter of an institution of higher education establishes the articles of incorporation. It generally embraces the name of the incorporators, the name of the corporation, the address of its registered office, a statement regarding its perpetuity, the purposes for which the corporation is formed, means of accomplishing the purposes, the number of directors of the corporation, how new members are elected, and what constitutes the authority vested in the members.

The charters of William and Mary and of Dartmouth were received directly from the King of England. The charters of Harvard and Yale were granted by the colonies of Massachusetts and Connecticut respectively. On various occasions there were questions of uncertainty regarding their authority and procedure.

The Dartmouth charter became an educational and legal battleground in the new nation. Daniel Webster before Chief Justice John Marshall and the Supreme Court of the United States settled once and for all that a private corporation could remain free from the legislative powers of the state and its changing political parties to implement its purposes and promote its religion. This guaranteed protection impeded the rise of the state controlled institution and

contributed to the proliferation of denominational colleges.

The Oral Roberts University was incorporated in the office of the Secretary of the State of Oklahoma. The legal rights established by the Supreme Court in the Dartmouth Case in 1819 shelter the new university with confidence and assurance.

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Through the years a policy of separation of church and state has often been discussed. In educational institutions the policy has not always been observed.

It was the common practice that the colonial colleges were supported financially by the colonial governments. Harvard was established on October 28, 1636, by the General Court acting as the legislative body of puritan Massachusetts. The colony was obligated thereafter for its development and support. The General Court of the colony of Connecticut issued a charter for Yale on October 9, 1701, and not only assumed certain responsibilities for its support, but also exerted strong influence for its control. The charter of William and Mary was granted by the King of England, but it was Virginia's tobacco tax and other revenues that supported the school. It was New Hampshire's support of Dartmouth that led the federalists to attempt legislative control over the school.

The decision in the Dartmouth Supreme Court Case contributed greatly to the policy of separation of church and state.

Oberlin came into being because of the initiative of Shipherd, Stewart, the Oberlin Colony, and contributors from New England. The University of Chicago was born because of William Rainey Harper, the Baptist, Chicago contributors, and the wealth of John D. Rockefeller. In the early history of these two schools we have no record of support to them from American tax dollars.

The twentieth century compared with the nineteenth century has observed changes in national attitudes, customs, and laws. Finances flow again from government treasuries that assist private and denominational colleges. The question may arise again regarding the supreme control. Oral Roberts University has participated in both government grants and loans. The question arises, where will the private university's loyalty be in a final test of strength? To Christ or the state? To God or Caesar?

TRAINING MINISTERS

Holding a place of importance in the philosophy and objectives of the Christian college has been the training of ministers of the gospel for the churches. Primarily this was the purpose of the colleges that came into being during the colonial period. The Great Awakening as influenced by Jacobus Frelinghuysen, Gilbert Tennent, Jonathan Edwards, and George Whitefield stirred the religious fervor that gave birth to schools such as Princeton, Brown, Dartmouth, and Rutgers. These institutions prepared men to preach.

Of course, Harvard was determined that a learned ministry would not perish in the new world, and Yale zealously guarded the faith of its future ministers. William and Mary was chartered that the church of Virginia may be furnished with a seminary of ministers of the gospel.

During the pre-Civil War period, the state of Ohio was plentifully supplied with denominational colleges. Out of the thirty-seven institutions of higher learning among the 3,000,000 Ohio inhabitants poured a stream of college-bred ministers who went out to reproduce their kind.

Both Oberlin and the University of Chicago had strong departments that specialized in preparing men for the ministry. Charles G. Finney, a nationally-known evangelist and a lawyer, was the head of the religion department, and Harper, president of the University of Chicago, continued his teaching of Hebrew.

The Oral Roberts University opened with a major in religion in the liberal arts department and with the beginning of the Graduate School of Theology with a curriculum leading to the Bachelor of Divinity degree.

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Theological education during the colonial period was almost synonymous with the general college education. After the nation gained its independence, great philosophical struggles arose as to what type

of education was best. Hard hitting interests knocked upon the college doors to gain entrance, knowledge, utilitarianism, and prestige. Agriculture, business, mechanics, and industry made their voices heard. For them, a place was made.

Generally there were not less religious people attending college, there were just more who were interested in training for a vocation. As the college curriculum embraced new fields, religion was retained as one among many. Such a department has been retained in most denominational institutions of higher learning, yet not with sufficient strength to produce the finished ministerial product. To meet the need for a better trained ministry, the graduate school of theology, usually known as the theological seminary, came into being.

By the time the University of Chicago was organized, educators generally conceded that theological training would be done best if it were a separate and distinct educational entity. These schools in Harvard, Yale, Oberlin, and the University of Chicago were entities within their university systems. The accrediting agency that developed for the recognition of these theological seminaries is the American Association of Theological Schools.

Concurrently with the opening of the liberal arts department of ORU, the graduate school of theology began. It is designed according to the generally accepted standards of the AATS.

SECTARIAN RIGIDITY AND LIBERALITY

The Great Awakening of the colonial period tested severely

the rigidity of religious practice in institutions of higher education. Though open conflict erupted between members of the Harvard faculty and George Whitefield, the university maintained a high degree of academic and religious freedom. Yale was more rigid than Harvard in doctrine, discipline, and worship. Students who refused to conform to the rigid religious policies of Yale were expelled.

Colleges established in the latter colonial period such as Princeton, Brown, Pennsylvania, Dartmouth, Rutgers, and Columbia granted the youth of all religious denominations entrance with the protection of fair, generous and equal treatment during their residence in school. Even Yale ultimately adopted the policy of religious freedom of its students.

The schools developed during the pre-Civil War period, which was a time of intensified denominational rivalry, granted entrance to students of all faiths, though some were fairly rigid in the selection of faculty members.

When the University of Chicago was organized, religious adherence to a particular doctrine had become less important while academic training, research, and publications had become more important.

In ORU there are no questions asked entering students regarding their church affiliation and their freedom of religious belief is assumed as a matter of practice. It is expected that members of the faculty will be Christian theists in philosophy, hold the tenants of faith

as generally advocated by the Charismatic Movement, and yet, within the framework there is complete freedom where unity of spiritual purpose is maintained in diversity of opinion.

ENTERING THE KINGDOM OF GOD

"How does one enter the kingdom of God" is a question that has driven a mighty wedge into American Christendom leaving large segments on both sides of the issue.

The earliest colleges of colonial America, continuing European church practices, taught Christian nurture and obedience to spiritual concepts as the proper procedure for one's entrance into the kingdom of God. This procedure began at birth through family faith and developed by parental instructions, baptism, confirmation, church membership, church attendance, worship, Christian education, and life adjustments, both to the will of God and moral standards in society.

The later colonial colleges were influenced by the Great Awakening which was produced by a different concept as to how one entered the Kingdom. This concept embraced the view that the normal method of entrance was through a transforming instantaneous change known as a conversion where one knowingly experienced the forgiveness of sins by faith which was followed by a joyous Christian life. Converts were won primarily through revivals characterized by persuasive preachers who often appealed to emotion more than reason and to empirical religion more than theology. Churches founded upon empirical religion stressed faith in God and love of neighbor, but often held theology

and intellectualism in contempt. Interest in education by these churches was pronounced, as the founding of many colleges indicates, but the objective was not toward theological education as such, but rather a Christian general education where men were prepared for the ministry by a study of the Bible and the humanities with special training in practical work.

The educational institutions of protestant Christianity, including the theological seminaries, have their roots in these two related but different concepts of faith. The nurture approach was practiced by the churches of the Reformation and those in Puritan England. Harvard, Yale, and William and Mary were planted early in the colonies by this influence. Churches maintaining this tradition are the Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Episcopal. The later colonial and post-Revolutionary churches that grew so rapidly by stressing a personal religious experience were the Methodist, Baptist, Disciples, and others related in belief. These churches were great college builders.

In Oberlin, C. G. Finney, head of the department of theology, advocated a religious experience subsequent to regeneration. From the teachings of John Wesley, a doctrine developed known as sanctification or holiness. This was a second crisis experience that an individual believer could receive. This doctrine produced a new family of denominations and an additional number of colleges. These denominations and colleges are embraced in the Holiness Movement.

Near the beginning of the twentieth century a third great force

entered the Christian arena. During the first half of the century it was known as the Pentecostal Movement. Since its influence became rather broad, it frequently has been called the Charismatic Movement. This movement also maintains that an entrance into the kingdom of God is wrought by conversion or personal crisis experience.

Some churches in the Pentecostal Movement believe in Wesley's doctrine of holiness as a second crisis experience while others believe in holiness as a growth process of purification, but all these Pentecostal churches believe in a personal experience known as the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

The success of the Oral Roberts ministry and the development of the university may be attributed in a large degree to the masses of people who believe in the crises spiritual experiences and in the belief that sicknesses may be healed by prayer and faith.

INFLUENCE OF PRAYER

Often those who established Christian colleges were men of prayer. On November 22, 1832, five young Presbyterian ministers found a soft spot on new fallen snow in the woods of Crawfordsville, Indiana, and prayed for the establishment of a college. As a result, Wabash College was begun. Notre Dame was established at South Bend in 1842 as a result of the prayers of eight French priests. John J. Shipherd and Philo Penfield Stewart in October, 1832, spent a day in prayer, mounted their horses, took their course and rode to a point deep in the forest. The two men dismounted, tied their horses to a

tree and knelt under the boughs of another and prayed for divine guidance. The place of their prayer marked the spot where Oberlin College and Colony began. It was under an oak tree in front of a farm home near Ada, Oklahoma, in August, 1935, that four young men prayed. Thirty years later, Oral Roberts and R. O. Corvin, two of the four, exerted influence in the opening of ORU.

THE MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE

The missionary enterprise stemming from restless and concerned Yale and Princeton graduates caused them to spend sleepless nights while planning for the organization and building of new colleges. Their feeling was that the Mississippi Valley must be conquered for Christianity. A contributing impetus to the origin and development of ORU was a zeal to train foreign persons for missionary activities. During the first international seminar on the campus, 212 leaders from 56 countries of the world were guests of ORU for twelve days.

SECURING A FACULTY

Harvard's first faculty came from Oxford and Cambridge, and Yale's from the English universities plus Harvard. Oberlin reaped a harvest of teachers from Lane Seminary when internal debates erupted over the slavery issue. Cornell concentrated on younger men who were developing rather than on big-name men. The University of Chicago went after the big-name men. Rockefeller's money helped President Harper in this. Harper took advantage of an unsolved problem at

Clark University. Before it was over, "Fox" Harper had taken from Clark's "chicken house" many of their best teachers. The ORU Administration followed a long-range view in securing its faculty. Some $50,000 were appropriated to assist prospective teachers through to their doctorates. There was also some campus raiding.

DENOMINATIONAL RIVALRY

Denominational rivalry played no little part in the program of college building. The prestige and honor of denominations were measured by the size, value, and beauty of church structures, the social, economic, and intellectual achievements of their constituency, the number of members on the church register, and how and who attended church on a particular Sunday or over a given period of time. This church rivalry is exemplified by a certain pastor who, reporting to his district superiors about his church, said, "we had a ten percent decrease in our Sunday School this quarter, but, thank God, our rival church down the street had a fourteen percent decrease."

Denominations had to have schools to meet competition from other churches. During the colonial era and the early part of the nineteenth century, the Congregationalists and Presbyterians were the busiest denominations in college building. The Methodists and Baptists were late starters, but they came up with speed. What happened in Ohio's population was reproduced throughout the great Mississippi Valley.

In the late summer of 1887, Dr. Strong, a leading member of

the Baptist Church, wrote Rockefeller about William Rainey Harper who was then teaching at Yale: "My dear Mr. Rockefeller, if we let that man get out of our hands, it will be the greatest loss our denomination has sustained during this century."

Though ORU is under the control of no denomination, there are denominational pressures that have exerted influence in the development of the school. There are church leaders of the Pentecostal denominations who feel that the university will contribute to their denominational objectives; others feel that it will injure. This is why there is both support and opposition from these leaders.

COEDUCATION

Higher education in the colonial colleges for women was unknown. Two hundred years of collegiate history passed in America before women were admitted to the college classrooms.

There are claims among Oberlin constituency that their college was among the first to permit higher education for women. From the beginning of the school in 1834, its doors were open to both men and women.

The University of Chicago and ORU have welcomed both men and women from their inception.

INTEGRATION

When Asa Mahon left Lane Seminary to accept the presidency of Oberlin College, it was with the understanding that Negroes would be

permitted to attend the school with white boys and girls. At this time, the fires of the Civil War in America were beginning to burn which would ultimately result in the liberation of the Negro slaves.

Gradually northern colleges and universities were integrated. Doors of southern colleges and universities were pried open by rulings of supreme court decisions. Neither the University of Chicago nor ORU prohibit students' entrance because of race.

UNIVERSITIES

It was after the Civil War that colleges became universities and tended toward bigness. Previously the schools remained relatively limited in physical plant, finances, curriculum, faculty, and enrollment. America had colleges, but universities were needed to meet the demands of education.

Contributing factors that gave rise to the university grew out of a national demand for a revolutionary educational change from an ecclesiastical control and a narrow classical curriculum to a broader educational base that would make available the benefits of higher education to the mechanical, agricultural, and business interests. Giving impetus to the change were the successes of German universities and the Morrill Act where large amounts of government land were made available for higher education. When Ezra Cornell contributed $500,000 and the state of New York took advantage of the benefits of the land grant law to establish Cornell University, when Yale established postgraduate education with the Ph.D. in the curriculum, when the millionaire

philanthropists became willing to share part of their fortunes to perpetuate their names, and when the various states became willing by legislative enactments to pay the price to meet the demands of higher education, then the university was launched into bigness and success.

William Rainey Harper would have nothing short of a university born full grown. This took some doing--including the interests of the Baptists, the cooperation of Chicago, and the millions of John D. Rockefeller.

MILLIONAIRE PHILANTHROPISTS

Naming institutions of higher learning in honor of persons has been a common practice through American educational history. William and Mary was named in honor of the king and queen of England. The contribution made by Eliho Yale resulted in naming the college in his honor. The name given to Oberlin was in memory of a German religious leader.

When the universities began to rise and larger sums of money were required for their origin, it became necessary to interest men of wealth. Though the University of Chicago does not bear the name of John D. Rockefeller, it is true that he supported the school with his millions. Some of the universities that bear the names of millionaire philanthropists are: Cornell, Johns Hopkins, Vanderbilt, and Stanford.

The name "Oral Roberts University" was officially given to the school that bears his name by the Board of Regents for the purpose of perpetuating the name and ministry of the evangelist. He came from

a poor family and vows that he will die a poor man. Though several millions of dollars have passed through the non-profit religious corporation called the Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association, this money has never belonged to him, nor been spent for his benefit. Personal money that he acquired through the sale of his books plus other properties were given by him and his family to the university. He lives on a modest salary and consistently refuses to receive personal gifts.

RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION

Research and publications are considered as university trademarks. A professor must publish or perish. In order to publish, he must do research.

The University of Chicago has specialized in producing published works which have had a profound influence on American higher education. The faculty and research specialists from the undergraduate college, the four graduate divisions, the seven professional schools, and the seven institutes produce a constant stream of published works.

It is proposed that research and publication will become a strong part of the Oral Roberts University. Presently, it is too early to predict the success or failure of this project.

UNIQUENESS OF ORU

Few things about any college or university in America are unique if one holds that the term means "single, sole, or the only one of its kind."

ORU cannot lay claim to uniqueness in purpose, faculty, religion, academic excellence, students, library, beauty, physical facilities, health education, character building, or even Christ-centeredness. Many other schools practice these.

If one can detect uniqueness it would possibly be: first, in the magnitude of communications as practiced by Evangelist Oral Roberts in the use of television, radio, publications, letter writing, and personal contact in his ministry out of which evolved the school; second, in relation to time since it is one of the few Christian universities that have been organized in America during the last fifty years; third, in its financial support where communications and methods make it possible for masses of ordinary people to participate in its development; fourth, in that it is the first university and theological seminary to be produced by the Charismatic Movement; fifth, in its modernly designed buildings and equipment; sixth, in its video-audio production, storage, distribution and retrieval systems; seventh, in its evangelistic outreach through its adult educational program known as seminars; and eighth, in its emphasis upon prayer as is indicated by the two-hundred foot high prayer tower that dominates the whole campus, built at a cost of $1,200,000.

The Oral Roberts University stems from history. Though the leadership is willing to innovate, it must be concluded that the vast majority of its educational programs and policies have been pioneered by other American colleges and universities, and some by the English and European.

DEMOCRACY

The democratization of American higher education has been a goal of many in higher education since the Revolution. Reaching this goal has been slow and difficult. It is still pursued. The nation, in following the philosophical apex of making the benefits of education available to all without regard to race, creed, or class, has smashed barriers and brought together the low and the high to feast from the same table. Under the wing of democracy rests the multiple brood of freedom.

Under the banner of Christian education the question arises as to whether in actuality a university can be completely congruous with the highest aim of democratization and believe with unquestioned sincerity that the chief aim of Christian education is

> to know and honor God in His divine and moral attributes, to love and serve Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord, and to respect and follow the Holy Spirit as administrator and instructor, with all other educational objectives being subservient to, yet acceptable, if compatible with this objective.

In these philosophies, each makes room for the other. Democratization relegates God and religion to a position of subservience. Christian education relegates democratization to a position of subservience, but makes it a worthy and acceptable educational objective.

BIBLE SCHOOL MOVEMENT

Concurrently with the rise of the Holiness Movement and the Pentecostal Movement, there was the growth and development of the

Bible School Movement. For the promotion of the experience-centered empirical revival the Bible schools made an important contribution. It did not meet all the educational necessities of these movements. Both the Holiness and Pentecostal Movements are broadening their educational base to embrace more secular and more liberal arts courses.

The Oral Roberts University is attempting to amalgamate the religious and the secular. Only history will tell how successful it will be. Already it is placing almost as much emphasis on the "whole man" as it is on "God and His Word." Can both be placed at the apex? Ultimately one will be subservient to the other.

CONCLUSION

This study attempted to present the Oral Roberts University in historic perspective. To do so it was necessary to review higher education in the United States in various periods of history. Individual schools were selected in the different eras around which the problems, issues, weaknesses, and successes of the age clustered, such as Yale in colonial, Dartmouth in post-Revolutionary, Oberlin in pre-Civil War, and the University of Chicago, in the beginning of great universities.

Behind the scenes it is hoped that one can see flowing the different streams of educational philosophy as was manifested in the classical curriculum of early America, the religious fervor that produced college proliferation, the rising tide of utilitarianism, the causes that produced the great universities with the slow but sure

development of educational democratization.

Particular emphases were placed upon the methods and rivalries of denominations in the free society and why they built colleges. The democratic doctrine of Wesley's scriptural holiness was used to exemplify focal points around which evangelism, church splits, and college building revolved. The Methodist Church shifted its emphasis on holiness which resulted in the development of the Holiness Movement and the proliferation of churches and colleges. Out of the Holiness Movement at the turn of the century the Pentecostal Movement developed. This, too, was an empirical experience-centered Christian religion in quest for personal security and evidence. The Bible schools were stabilizing agencies that assisted in scripturally balancing the multiplicity of sects and denominations that have become the "third great force in Christendom."

Revival campaigns, modern communications, the rising tide of Pentecostalism in various countries of the world, post-World War II with its emotionally hungry masses constituted part of the forces used by Evangelist Oral Roberts to produce the outreaches of his ministry and lay the groundwork for the founding of Oral Roberts University.

The Oral Roberts University is reality stemming from educational history and influenced by the dynamics of Christian faith. But this school like every other university has its strong and weak points.

STRONG POINTS OF ORU

It is committed to the principles of righteousness and faith in God.

Its philosophy holds that the supreme objective of education is to know and honor God in His divine and moral attributes, to love and serve Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord, and to respect and obey the Holy Spirit as teacher and comforter. All other educational objectives are held as subservient, yet acceptable, if compatible with this objective.

The philosophical objective as it relates to students in ORU emphasizes the training of the whole man in mind, spirit, and body.

The president, as an evangelist, has broad public relations experience that is conducive to the marshalling of many supporters in building faculty, securing students, and raising funds.

The administration and faculty of the university meet acceptable standards of academic excellence with moral and spiritual qualifications.

The Learning Resources Center functions successfully with its audio-visual abilities in the production, storage, retrieval, and distribution of knowledge.

The land acquired is sufficient for future development and the buildings are beautifully designed, utilitarian, durable, and adequate.

Its library has increased to a number above 65,000 volumes with subscriptions to more than 1,000 current magazines. The library

staff is efficient and adequate.

Its financial structure with investments in lands, buildings, and equipment totaled more than $12,000,000 at the university's opening. A goal to match endowment with capital gains dollar for dollar is being pursued.

The Graduate School of Theology fulfills partially the Christian objectives for which the university was founded.

WEAKNESSES OF ORU

Its philosophy is not clearly understood by all who fill responsible positions of leadership.

The president is an evangelist whose educational training requires that he depend on the knowledge of others in serious educational decisions. He is wise in seeking advice. At times he may be susceptible to wrong educational counsel.

The equipment in the Learning Resources Center must continue to be used wisely and diligently; otherwise, vast expenditures will have been spent for gadgetry.

The level of expenditure financially is above the average in Christian colleges for buildings, equipment, and salaries. After the newness and novelty of the university have changed to the inevitable routine, will there be sufficient resources to maintain the pace and increase it?

When Charles G. Finney was connected with Oberlin as evangelist and head of the department of theology, the school held

national interest among a certain element of Christian believers. His passing created problems and changes. Will similar circumstances produce the same at ORU?

ORU IN THE YEAR 2000

It is visionary and possibly unrealistic to project what a new institution will be thirty years in advance because of the unpredictable variables; however, with these hazards recognized the following predictions seem plausible:

By the year 2000 most likely the goal of a one-hundred million dollar program will be accomplished with half of it invested in grounds and physical plant and the other half in endowment.

Graduates from ORU will be serving in many fields including public school education, Christian colleges, state colleges and universities,and in a network of sister colleges and universities in many countries of the world.

Graduates from the theological seminary will be filling important positions as pastors, evangelists, teachers, and missionaries in different denominations at home and abroad.

Additional graduate schools in education, engineering, and medicine will be established and will be sending forth educators, engineers, and doctors into the societies of the world.

The library will have increased to 500,000 volumes.

At least once before 2000 ORU's basketball team will be a national winner, and by then the school may be known for its football

teams and other sports.

Additional innovations will be made in the field of educational media which will keep the school in the upper bracket in this field among the great schools of the nation.

Culture and fine arts will occupy a great segment of the university's interest and by then, in addition to the fine arts building, there may be an excellent art museum. Those in the performing arts will have made national and international reputations.

Research and publications should be a hallmark of the university.

It is hoped that the Bible will still be honored as the greatest book on earth in the field of religion and that the central personality of this book will be honored as Saviour and Lord.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

Lincoln, Abraham. "Gettysburg Address."

United States of America. Amendment 13 to the Constitution of the United States of America. Proposed January 31, 1865, and proclaimed December 18, 1865.

United States of America. Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America.

United States of America. Higher Education for Democracy: A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, Vol. I "Establishing Goals." New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.

BOOKS

Atter, Gordon Francis. The Third Force. Petersborough, Ontario: The College Press, 1962.

Bartlett, Lester W. State Control of Private Incorporated Institutions of Higher Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1926.

Becker, Carl. Cornell University: Founders and Founding. New York: Ithaca, 1943.

Brubaker, John S. and Rudy, Willis. Higher Education in Transition. An American History. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Brumback, Carl. Suddenly From Heaven. Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Publishing House, 1961.

Campbell, Joseph E. The Pentecostal Holiness Church 1898 to 1948. Franklin Springs, Ga.: Publishing House of the Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1951.

Clark, Elmer T. The Small Sects in America. New York, Nashville: Abington Cokesbury Press, 1949.

Cobb, Sanford H. The Rise of Religious Liberty in America. New York: Macmillan Company, 1902.

Columbia Viking Desk Encyclopedia. New York: Columbia University.

Conn, Charles W. Like a Mighty Army. Cleveland: Church of God Publishing House, 1955.

Curtis, Olin A. The Christian Faith. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1905.

Dexter, Franklin B. Biographed Sketches of the Graduates of Yale College with Annals of the College History. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1885.

Douglas, Paul F. The Story of German Methodism. New York, Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern, 1939.

Eells, Walter Crosby. Bacculaureate Degrees Conferred by American Colleges in the 17th and 18th Centuries. Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1958.

Fairchild, James H. Oberlin: The Colony and the College 1833-1883. Oberlin: E. J. Goodrich, 1883.

Flexner, Abraham. Universities: American, English, German. New York: Oxford University Press, 1930.

Forman, Sidney. West Point: A History of the United States Military Academy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1950.

Frodsham, Stanley H. With Signs Following. Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Publishing House, 1946.

Gabbell, Luther L. Church-State Relationships in Education in North Carolina Since 1776. Durham: 1938.

Gee, Donald. The Pentecostal Movement. London: Elim Publishing Company, Ltd., 1949.

Hofstadter, Richard and Hardy, C. DeWitt. The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Hofstadter, Richard and Smith, Wilson. American Higher Education: A Documentary History. Vols. I and II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Holmes, N. J. Holmes Bible and Missionary Institute Handbook. Franklin Springs, Ga.: Publishing House of the Pentecostal Holiness Church.

_____. Life Sketches and Sermons. Franklin Springs, Ga.: Publishing House of the Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1920.

Havighurst, Walter. The Miami Years 1809-1959. New York: 1958.

Hutchins, Robert Maynard. The Higher Learning in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

King, J. H. Yet Speaketh. Franklin Springs, Ga.: Advocate Press, 1949.

Leonard, D. L. History of Oberlin. Chicago: The Pilgrim Press, 1898.

Littell, Franklin Hamlin. From State Church to Pluralism: A Protestant Interpretation of Religion in American History. Chicago: Adline Publishing Company, 1962.

Locke, John. Of Civil Government, Book II. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1924.

Mayer, Milton. A Young Man in a Hurry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McDonald, W. and Searles, John E. The Life of Rev. John S. Inskip.

New England's Firstfruits. London: 1643.

Pentecostal Holiness Church. Pentecostal Holiness Discipline. Franklin Springs, Ga.: Advocate Publishing Company, 1965.

Rose, Delbert R. A Theology of Christian Experience. Wilmore, Ky.: The Seminary Press, 1958.

Rudolph, Fredrick. The American College and University. New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1962.

Simpson, A. B. The Four-Fold Gospel. New York: Christian Alliance Publishing Company, 1925.

Smith, B. P. History of Dartmouth College. Boston: 1878.

Stiles, Ezra. Ecclesiastical Constitution of Yale College.

Sweet, William Warren. Methodism in American History. New York: Abington Press, 1953.

Tewksbury, Donald G. The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1965.

Ulich, Robert. History of Educational Thought. New York: American Book Company, 1945.

Veysey, Lawrence R. The Emergence of American University 1865-1910. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Walker, Williston. A History of the Christian Church. New York: Charles Scribner's and Sons, 1942.

Wayland, Francis. Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System in the United States. Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, 1842.

Warren, Charles. The Supreme Court in the United States History. Vol. I. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1922.

Winehouse, Irwin. The Assemblies of God, A Popular Survey. New York: Vantage Press, 1959.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

Abundant Life. (May 1962).

Atter, Gordon Francis. "The Third Force," Life Magazine (June 9, 1958).

Brown, E. E. "The University in Its Relation to the People," NEA Proc. (1892).

Collegiate Challenge Magazine, IV, No. 1 (January 1965).

Draper, A. S. "The American Type of University," Science XXVI (1907).

Durbin, John. Quarterly Register (August 1831).

Ellenberg, J. V. "History of the Holmes Bible and Missionary Institute," Pentecostal Holiness Advocate (May 23, 1940).

Heibling, Doyle. "International Seminar," Abundant Life (February 1964).

Methodist Magazine (July 1839).

Sterne, William and Armstrong, William. "Ministers' Seminar," Abundant Life (April 1963).

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Assemblies of God. "Minutes of the Twenty-second General Council," Grand Rapids. September 4-9, 1947.

Corvin, R. O. "History of Education by the Pentecostal Holiness Church in South Carolina and Georgia." Unpublished Master's dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1942.

Gassis, Merrill E. "Christian Perfectionism in America." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1929.

Harvard University. "General Education in a Free Society." By a committee appointed by President Conant consisting of twelve men, headed by Paul H. Buck.

Hollenweger, Walter J. "Handbuch der Pfingsbewegung," II Hauptteil ona Nordamerika. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Zurich, 1966.

Moore, Evert Leroy. "Handbook of Pentecostal Denominations in the United States." Unpublished dissertation, Studies in Religion, Pasadena College, April 31, 1964.

Ray, Mauldin A. "A Study of the History of Lee College, Cleveland, Tennessee." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, College of Education, University of Houston, 1964.

"World Congress on Evangelism Study Papers." Books I and II. These are printed copies of all lectures and sermons given at the World Congress on Evangelism in Berlin, October 26 - November 4, 1966.

OTHER SOURCES

Bailey, Nathan. Letter from Nathan Bailey, President, Christian Missionary Alliance, to Walter Hollenweger. March 25, 1963.

Columbia College. "Annual Report of President." New York, 1870.

Cornell, Ezra. "Address." In Cornell University Register, 1869-1870.

Methodist Church, Methodist Discipline, 1787.

Oberlin College. First circular issued by Oberlin officials. March 8, 1838.

Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association. "Welcome to the Abundant Life Crusade." A brochure printed for each crusade.

Pilgrim Holiness Church. Pilgrim Holiness Church Manual. Sections 4-23, Statement 13, 1962.

Roberts, Oral. "Quest for the Whole Man." Address given to first class at ORU, September 7, 1965.

_____. Recorded telephone conference with Oral Roberts in California and Manford Engel, Oscar Moore, Lee Braxton, Leon Hartz, Bill Underwood, Willard Mason, and Al Bush in Tulsa. Tulsa, Oklahoma. August 30, 1961. (Typewritten)

_____. Tape recorded conference of Oral Roberts and the Tulsa staff of the Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association. Tulsa, Oklahoma. (Typewritten)