



A New Institutional Saga for Anderson University

A New Institutional Saga for Anderson University

*ELSA JOHNSON BASS; JERRALD FOX;
KIMBERLY MAJESKI; DEBORAH (ZARKA)
MILLER FOX; JASON R. VARNER; AND
JEFFREY E. WRIGHT*

ANDERSON UNIVERSITY PRESS
ANDERSON, INDIANA



A New Institutional Saga for Anderson University by AU Press is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), except where otherwise noted.

Contents

Preface	vii
Nathan Willowby	
Introduction	1
<i>A New Institutional Saga for Anderson University</i>	
David Thomas Murphy	
 Part I. <u>Main Body</u>	
1. In The Beginning	7
Kimberly Majeski	
2. A Singing People	21
<i>The Musical Heritage of Anderson University</i>	
Jeffrey E. Wright	
3. Going Pro	39
<i>The Growth of Professional Programs at Anderson University</i>	
Jerrald Fox	
4. Our Commitment to Liberal Arts Education	69
<i>A Story Within the Bigger Story of AU</i>	
Deborah (Zarka) Miller Fox	
5. Anderson College 1968-1972	90
Elsa Johnson Bass	
6. A Tale of Two Ideas	109
<i>On the Importance of Holiness and Unity</i>	
Jason R. Varner	
 References	137
About the Authors	142

Preface

NATHAN WILLOWBY

On June 24, 2020, then-Provost Marie Morris emailed then-Dean MaryAnn Hawkins about a new grant opportunity—Reframing the Institutional Saga—from the Council of Independent Colleges. She invited several of us to consider how the School of Theology and Christian Ministry (SOTCM) might speak into upcoming visioning and action plans by engaging this project. Dean Hawkins encouraged me in the pursuit of a grant proposal that would fit the criteria and add to the living history of AU. Since that time, both Dr. Morris and Dr. Hawkins have retired, and I find myself in a new role at the SOTCM. The grant was accepted, and this collection of essays is one piece of the project. There is also a documentary presently under production, being led by Cinema and Media Arts faculty member Jack Lugar.

The story of Anderson University is the story of an institution, but that story includes the fact that this institution has occupied the same physical place since its inception. It is also a particular school of higher education created by and remaining in an endorsed agency standing within a group of Christian believers known as the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana). More importantly, AU is an institution comprised of people—students, faculty, and staff—past, present, and future.

In the essays that follow, invested people of this community reframe AU's institutional saga. This work comes on the back of significant written treatment in the past by Merle Strege, Barry Callen, and Robert Reardon, but it seeks to tell the story somewhat differently. There is no attempt at a single unifying hand. We present here snapshots on respective topics that are written from six different perspectives.

These essays bring together a significant part of the fabric that makes AU the unique university that it is. As you read these essays, you may notice that, at times, authors do not quite present previous figures in complete agreement. You will see that Anderson has had ideals it has not always obtained. You will also observe a tension that has always been a part of our existence—church, academy, training, and liberal arts. In both design and editorial processing, we have intended for

these different perspectives to stand on their own. Neither editor David Murphy nor I have tried to smooth over tensions. And beyond a simple topic for investigation, the authors chose their approach. The tones will be different, but the truth about this special place is presented in a rich way.

I'm thankful for the nudge to pursue this project back in 2020. In preparation for these essays, I arranged listening sessions and surveys. I spoke with a number of interested people and revised the slate of authors at least three times. The resulting project came together with the help of many hands. I'm thankful to these six authors and the project editor for their work to bring anew this work that helps those of us who care deeply about this place (and even those students who get assigned these essays some day) to look at the history and formative narratives of Anderson in light of the question that I drew from a phrase in Merle Strege's centennial history, *The Desk as Altar*: How can we understand AU's peculiar ethos? I trust readers will learn something new or at least see the saga of AU in a new light as you engage these essays.

Finally, many thanks are in order for Cara Miller from AU Press and Scott Borders, who served as copy editor of the final manuscripts.

Rev. Nathan Willowby, PhD
Anderson University BA, 2005
Dean, School of Theology and Christian Ministry
Homecoming, 2022

Introduction

A New Institutional Saga for Anderson University

DAVID THOMAS MURPHY

The word “saga” comes to us from the medieval literature of Scandinavia, and it is typically used to describe a long, involved tale of heroism, struggle and adventure. At first glance, the present collection of essays about the history of Anderson University may contain little that most of us would characterize as “adventure.” On closer reflection, however, the use of the term “saga” for the institutional narrative that emerges from these contributions, taken as a whole, is not inappropriate. The story they tell is complex. It comprehends a considerable stretch of time, with roots now reaching back well over a century. It has involved both risk and struggle that sometimes evoked passionate conflict—of a non-violent nature—originating in differing visions of what Anderson University ought to be. It includes occasional flashes of genuine moral heroism, as when, for example, Ravens of all racial backgrounds came together in the struggle to create a more inclusive institution that would authentically embody the founding movement’s finest principles. And it may fairly be said to constitute a kind of adventure, an intellectual and spiritual quest to overcome obstacles and create a specific kind of Christian institution of higher education.

The saga of AU, however, differs in this very important respect from the original Scandinavian sagas: it is not yet concluded. Hence, the purpose of this collection of historical essays and reflections. Rather than a definitive history of a finished story, this saga is perhaps more a “taking stock,” a pause to assess where we are, consider how it is that we arrived here, and reflect upon how our ideas about our shared past can prepare us as a community for our future. It is important to acknowledge that this is not the first effort to evaluate Anderson University from the perspective of historical narrative. Far from it: past decades have seen several histories of AU (all of which feature in the

following essays), in addition to numerous memoirs composed by key actors in the institution's history. As a body, these works comprise a rich source of historical insight about AU. It is less than a decade, after all, since the publication of the most recent and authoritative of these efforts, Merle Stregé's judicious and eloquent centennial history of our institution, *The Desk as Altar*. Given the existence of these earlier, historically sophisticated and eminently reliable narratives, students (and other AU constituencies, naturally) may reasonably wonder: why a new saga, and why now?

The answer, like the story of Anderson University itself, is complex. In part, these essays are about responding to current changes in American higher education by reconsidering Anderson University's mission as an institution of higher learning. As the grant application that funded this project noted, "This is a pivotal time for AU . . . The geographic and demographic context is rapidly changing about us" (Willowby 2021, 1). The accuracy, and urgent implications, of this observation can hardly be overstated. Like American institutions of higher learning in general, Anderson University is caught up in a moment of far-reaching cultural and economic transformation. More than at any time since the Second World War, perhaps, the current decade looks likely to present American higher education with transformative and existential challenges, which will be met successfully only by institutions with a clear sense of their past and of their mission. A new institutional saga—described as a "collective understanding of unique accomplishment in a formally established group"—can be a powerful tool in guiding our community's response to the transformative pressures of the present (quote comes from the work of organizational theorist Burton R. Clark, cited in Willowby 2021, 3).

Other considerations also helped to motivate the creation of this new and intentionally different re-telling of the AU saga. Every generation, it has been said, writes its own history. The cliché must not be taken to mean that new histories render previous versions superfluous. Far from it. History, perhaps more than any other discipline in the humanities, proceeds by consciously building upon the accomplishments of past practitioners. But the old saying reflects at least the truth, directly relevant to this collection of essays, that different times look to their histories to meet different needs. Our early twenty-first century finds

itself in a cultural moment that craves history practiced from multiple perspectives, and a vibrant multiplicity of historical voices is something this collection has deliberately, and with some success, set out to offer. This is entirely in keeping with Anderson University's historic, but perhaps insufficiently appreciated, openness to diversity, an openness that, as readers of the essays will note, placed women and people of color in positions of leadership and prominence at Anderson University decades before most American universities. Readers will encounter perspectives on the AU saga from women and men, black and white, alumni and faculty (and some who are both), from a variety of denominational and disciplinary backgrounds. The Anderson University saga they construct emerges not from a single interpretative perspective but out of a variety of backgrounds and passions that in combination authentically express a broad swath of the range of voices that have contributed to the making of this institution.

The most compelling justification for embarking upon yet another history of AU, however, is in some senses the most obvious: Anderson University exists to serve and teach students, and this new collection of historical essays is intended to directly support the teaching mission of the institution in a way that other histories were not. This is the history of AU, written by AU people, for students of AU. More specifically, it has been written to help freshmen, new to their surroundings, understand their new setting. "These projects," as the funding grant application noted, will shape this community by "cultivating an ongoing student-body sense of AU's unique accomplishments and peculiar ethos that blends practical preparation, church-relation, and a commitment to education through an applied and pragmatic curriculum in the liberal arts" (Willowby 2021, 1). The essays that follow, accordingly, do not present a comprehensive or exhaustive account of all the details of the university's past. For that, readers would do best to consult Stregé's history, Barry Callen's earlier AU history, *Guide of Soul and Mind*, or writings by Robert Nicholson, John Morrison and other important actors from the university's formative years. Instead, this is a different kind of history, one that opens new windows on the journey that brought us to where we are through a series of short explorations, reflections and recollections, each complementing one another and, hopefully, lending students helpful tools for conceptualizing their place

in the community they join when they matriculate at Anderson University.

And what, exactly, might students discover here? A trove of institutional memory that takes them from AU's roots to its present. Kimberly Majeski explores the Anderson University "origin story," tracing the heated battle that pitted the advocates of Anderson as a Bible school against the ambitious 'modernizers' who envisioned a full university, presenting the Christian idealism and intellectual vision of both sides with scrupulous fairness. The university's deep roots in professional and vocational training, as well as the gradual incorporation of a liberal arts ethos expressing our community's luminous and optimistic Christian humanism, are recounted with engaging narrative skill by Jerrald Fox and Debra Miller Fox. Sensitivity to the intimate connections that link aesthetic experience with faith has always characterized the Church of God movement, and Jeffrey Wright's recounting of our history as "a singing people" integrates AU's distinguished musical heritage into its broader institutional setting as a central part of our community of Christian scholars and students. Despite the best intentions, as Elsa Johnson Bass recounts from compelling personal experience, the university struggled to find a way to "accept," and not merely "admit," students from communities of color, and had to gradually learn to acknowledge their rich contributions as both students and faculty. And Jason Varner provides students with a meticulous and at times profound analysis of the underlying and chronic struggle of this, as of so many Christian communities, to foster an environment where intellectual and spiritual ambitions are able to embrace both "holiness" and "unity."

Viewed from the broadest comprehensive perspective, these essays reveal the operation of a distinctive institutional dynamic which has been present from the beginning, which still drives the university today, and which is likely to characterize AU's culture as long as the school's doors remain open: The struggle to be both authentically Christ-centered while being simultaneously in and relevant to—not "of"—the world around us. This is not, and has never been, an easy balance to strike. A series of seeming dichotomies have dominated our debates about our proper ordering of the community: faith versus learning, liberal arts versus professional preparation, and so on. But this is not a cause for lamentation. Rather, the reverse is true: these

essays make clear that AU's condition of permanent self-scrutiny is a good and natural situation for an institution such as ours. Indeed, the tension between the spiritual ideals of the institution's founding Movement and the University's mission to serve in a society whose dominant values are often out of synch with those ideals (to put it mildly) has served as a creative force, a motor of fruitful self-evaluation and reform throughout Anderson University's history. As Strege (2016) shrewdly observes in *The Desk as Altar*, "It is no easy task to be a church-related academic institution . . . At times the marriage has been irritating, strained, and confining, but it has also been vital, affectionate, and liberating. In this century-old relationship lies the key to understanding Anderson's peculiar ethos" (xi).

These writings, then, in the words of the project's initiator, will bring the AU story of this century-old relationship to a new audience of students, in order to help our community "articulate a contemporary institutional mission and vision informed by the institutional saga" (Willowby 2021, 3). This is a task that in some senses is never completed, obviously, and ours will not be the last effort to find new ways to re-think just what it is about AU that makes it AU. The entire educational enterprise, as Rousseau recognized, is subversive in this constructive sense of permanent, ongoing re-evaluation of received wisdom (some discussion of Rousseau's critique of pedagogy may be found in Geraldine Hodgson, *Studies in French Education*, 1908). At this moment, as AU takes its mission forward into a second century of teaching for service in the church and society, there is a distinct urgency to this undertaking. Conceptual clarity about who we are and a shared, community-wide vision of what we hope, by the grace of God, to achieve in the joint endeavor that is education will be essential if we are to continue in our work. These essays, this new version of our shared "saga," in the hands of committed teachers and willing students, will help us to understand and draw strength from the AU saga in order that the story may go on.

Acknowledgments

In addition to the authors of these essays (whose professional biographies may be found at the conclusion of the volume), we wish to acknowledge with gratitude the support and contributions of the following: The Lilly Foundation, for the generous financial support which made this work possible; Marie Morris, Provost of Anderson

University when the project was proposed and begun, and Joel Shrock, Provost at the time of its completion; Nathan Willowby, Dean of Anderson University's School of Theology and Christian Ministry, initiator of the project and author of the grant proposal with which the project began; Jaymie Dieterle, administrative supervisor of the School of Theology and Christian Ministry, who coordinated the organization of tasks and writings without which the project would not have been possible; and Megan Morrison, student editorial assistant, who was responsible for the daunting task of applying the Chicago Manual of Style as a means of imposing coherence and consistency upon the scholarly apparatus of all the essays.

1. In The Beginning

KIMBERLY MAJESKI

“Colleges are necessary to fit men for the work of the devil and the business of the World. . . . They are but the devil's playhouses” (Strege 2016, 7). These are not words flung onto the screen by an angry social media troll but are, in fact, the words of the founder and pioneer of the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana), Daniel Sidney Warner, printed in *The Gospel Trumpet* in God's year 1884. Strange words indeed to read as a faculty member, seated at your own desk perched in the halls of the School of Theology and Christian Ministry some one hundred and thirty years later. The above is cited in Dr. Merle Strege's labor of love, *The Desk as Altar*, and these words struck me as I began my research for this article. I was so caught by Warner's vehemence against colleges and schools of higher learning that I went to the original source, pulled that copy of *The Gospel Trumpet*, the original circulation connecting ministers in the fledgling Movement in the late 1800s, and read the words for myself. Warner goes on to say, in a column he entitled “The Devil's Preacher Factory,”

It must indeed be amusing and highly pleasing to the arch fiend of hell to have professed [C]hristians lavish the Lord's money in erecting large houses and employing a class of worldly wise spiritual fools, to gather up the most promising children of God and there drill out of them the last spark of God-life, God-power, and God-wisdom, and make them drunk on “her fornication” and polish them up for his fashionable, pompous ministration of damnation. (Warner 1884)

To be fair, it's clear in the article that the target of Warner's ire is seminaries, which were predominantly, in his time, dedicated to educating priests for the service of the One, Holy, Apostolic, Catholic, Church. However, one cannot miss the fervor with which Warner wrote and preached against institutionalism and notions of formal education for preachers. He goes on to state unequivocally in the column referenced above that it is not necessary to be educated to preach the Gospel. To balance the above comments, though, one must also

consider sentiments he expressed elsewhere, which seemed to criticize the notion that institutions perpetuated denominationalism itself. It is compelling to note the passionate predilections of our founder regarding the importance of higher education to ministry preparation in light of the thousands of distinguished alumni of Anderson University and their dedication to the church and service to the world. Yet it is here we must begin to understand the tumultuous and refining crucible of faith and learning that is our beloved university and find new ways forward in a time fraught with pressures of its own.

I arrived on campus as a graduate student in 2000, eager to study theology with Dr. Gilbert Stafford. I grew up in the Church of God in Tennessee, and I knew only that I wanted to complete my MDiv at the school of my tradition. Anderson University was the storied place I'd heard of my whole life where so many of my mentors had studied, had life-changing experiences with God, and had often met and married their significant other. After completing my degree, I became the campus pastor and would serve in that post from 2003-2008 before transitioning to serve on the full-time faculty at the School of Theology and Christian Ministry. What I didn't know then, but wish I had known, about the hard and beautiful complexities of living out the Gospel doing ministry in a place such as Anderson University is what I now endeavor to impart to you in this essay. I believe the following research has borne out what I am often fond of saying: Anderson University is not a perfect place, but a special place. In this special place that has now existed more than one hundred years, church and school are intricately intertwined for both good and ill, a present-day university where a church's "open table" theology invites the troublesome blessing of renewed tension as perennial as every freshman class.

It was but one generation after Warner and on the heels of the "necktie controversy"¹ that Anderson University got its start as Anderson Bible Training School in the year 1917, as the hope and dream of J.T. Wilson and other progressive church leaders who considered the

1. The "necktie controversy" is a debate among early Church of God pioneers; more conservative adherents believed men wearing neckties was flashy and worldly. Those who would be considered more progressive thought neckties a non-issue.

tender young place of learning, “the child of the church” (Strege 2016, 1). This understanding of “child” seems, for better or worse, to inform the relationship between the church and school in perpetuity.

In this project, as we think about the history and impact of Christian ministry on the campus of Anderson University across the last one hundred years, we must understand the complexities and tensions out of which those ministries were wrought. The Church of God, Anderson, Indiana, has struggled with questions of identity since its founding in 1880, and, much like the churches of the New Testament, the Movement has found itself embroiled in theological debate and conflicts regarding biblical interpretation for the whole of its existence. This is certainly not a criticism. This is, in fact, the nature of faith communities as generations come and go, questions over doctrine, correct practice, and orthodoxy loom, and cultural shifts and time give way to new hermeneutics, which is how we find our way. In the case of the Church of God, Anderson, Indiana, and for the purposes of this article, what we must consider is how this has affected the school caught up in the process, the “child of the church” that we now know as Anderson University.

As noted above with Warner’s comments regarding formal education, we must first acknowledge that our young school was born into a faith tradition in which the notion of preparation for a future purpose beyond the winning of souls is of secondary import. For many of the earliest pioneers of the Church of God, and among many in the generations that followed, there existed an “end of days” perspective and identification, one which understood the Church of God as the manifestation of God’s true church, whose primary work was to spread the message of salvation before Christ’s imminent return. Evident in their writings was a tendency to interpret New Testament scriptures literally and understand themselves to be living in what they called the “evening light.” Consider early Church of God evangelist Nora Hunter’s words penned in *The Gospel Trumpet* circa 1905:

These are the “last days” for soon the “night cometh” when “no man can work.”. . . May God’s voice like a trumpet awaken us to greater activity before it is forever too late, before the awful night of gloom shall set in and we find ourselves on the outside among those who ministered not to Jesus when he was cold, naked, in prison, and hungry.

To understand the context then, in the earliest days of the Movement, there is a resistance to any sense of institution within the church. In fact, that is what they had all just “come out” from.² At the turn of the century, and in the early years, there was also a contingent of pastors and leaders aligned with J.T. Wilson and others who had benefited from a formal education and believed a training school was needed for our leaders. The Anderson Bible Training School was founded in 1917 while J.T. Wilson served as president of *The Gospel Trumpet*. Simultaneously, F.G. Smith, a former missionary to Beirut and rising star among the more conservative pastors, helped to craft and create the General Assembly, the most representative voice of the Church of God (Strege 2016, 15). Thus, a strained relationship of parent and child emerged at the outset, one in which the representative body and pastoral leadership of the church undertook the role of gatekeeper for what was to be taught and learned at the college.

In the beginning, the intent of the school was to train ministers. The scope and reach was voted upon by the General Assembly in 1918 and operated much as a spiritual education arm of *The Gospel Trumpet*. As the school enjoyed enrollment from *Gospel Trumpet* workers, and as others in the Movement began to support its cause, by 1921 the Church of God Yearbook endorsed general college preparation. While this was enormous progress, the General Assembly and the newly formed Committee on Schools and Extension kept a close eye on all the young institutions (Strege 2016, 22). The hard-won progress continued, nonetheless, and by 1925, the school had become independent of the Gospel Trumpet Publishing Company and was then known as the Anderson Bible School and Seminary (Strege 2016, 44). It was during this period that the young pastor John A. Morrison became the first president, subsequently hiring the first dean, Russell Olt. Here we begin to see school officials, administrators, and faculty step to the edges of the Movement and begin to lead the conversation. Morrison wrote a scathing article for *The Gospel Trumpet* attacking the Klan in 1923, just as the white supremacist group was on the rise in the

2. Early Church of God pioneers referred to themselves as come-outers because they had come out of the sectarian institutions of denominationalism to embrace God’s one, true church.

Midwest, and authored another prominent piece to be included in the 1925 *Church of God Yearbook* on Warner himself (Strege 2016, 45).

Though it appears Morrison and Olt worked to recruit a diverse faculty, welcome minority students, and begin to add liberal arts courses steadily from 1923 on, spiritual life on campus was largely shaped by the promulgation of Church of God doctrine and values. In fact, the Anderson Bible School and Seminary won independence from the *Gospel Trumpet* company and came directly under the General Assembly and the Articles of Association, which provided for the appointment of a committee with the authority to make decisions regarding “doctrinal censorship” over curriculum, courses, and specific content professors taught in their classrooms (Strege 2016, 45). The General Assembly then gave oversight to faculty and students, who gathered for chapel three times a week to hear sermons from Church of God ministers. By 1928 the trustees supported Morrison’s recommendation to add “college courses,” which meant a more intentional liberal arts education beyond ministerial preparation, and he along with Olt began to expand their faculty and horizons.

The Controversies

As Strege aptly depicts in *The Desk as Altar*, his centennial history of Anderson University, the stock market crash that rocked the United States in 1929 left the Anderson Bible School and Seminary feeling the shock of progress and restraint. The parent in the relationship was troubled by the changes and the new ways taking hold at the school as the child was growing, changing and expressing her independence. Because of the inherent interdependence and predominant factions of traditionalists and progressives within the church and academy pushing and pulling at disparate poles, a series of controversies emerged. The first real clash and casualty of this dynamic was the bright young Professor of Theology, Russell Byrum.

Russell Byrum and his wife, Bessie, were two of the six original faculty members of the Anderson Bible Training School in 1917. Earlier Bessie had founded a Church of God work in Syria, and Russell intended to return with her after their marriage, but their plans were upended by World War I (Strege 2016, 52). Russell and Bessie pastored a church in Boston, where Russell spent his years studying in the library at Boston Theological Seminary and involved in pastoral training programs until he was called to Anderson to become the managing editor of *The*

Gospel Trumpet. Byrum taught theology, a course for which he wrote his own textbook, but in 1929 his way of thinking seemed to represent a challenge for more traditionalist Church of God leaders, such as F.G. Smith and others. Following a paper Byrum delivered at an Indiana State Minister's meeting, where he challenged the "apocalyptic rhetoric of F.G. Smith and the Reformationist Party" and the notion that the Church of God was the only true church, Byrum was charged with heresy by two school trustees (Strege 2016, 69).

When reading Smith's notes from the trial, one is struck by the flowery twirl of his penmanship and the detail with which he transcribed the events of the saga. It is impossible to read the record, or Smith's own notes, and miss how intensely he was invested in the process. To read the back and forth the poignant questions and, yes, the witness testimony—in many cases from students—is to read the embittered battle between the conservative, traditionalist, fundamentalist, and older parties of the Church of God and the younger, more progressive voices. Though the entire fiasco was finally ruled a "misunderstanding" (Byrum trial notes 1929), the heresy trial had made a mark upon the Movement and upon what had now come to be known as Anderson College and Theological Seminary. In the wake of the trial a chasm grew ever larger between those more traditional adherents to the Church of God and those who were ready to begin questioning some of those notions that seemed not to hold in the wake of the fall of the American economy and the early years of the Great Depression. Further, a shift had taken place such that now those leaders, administrators, and professors at the Anderson College were emerging as thought leaders in the realm of theology and doctrinal matters as it related to the Church of God, and this would be a determining step for the identity of both church and school.

Acquitted of heresy charges, Russell Byrum resigned his post at the college and returned to his family construction business. He built more than 300 homes in the Anderson area, and the Byrum auditorium, which he helped his father build, is named for him and his family members, early Church of God pioneers. Russell Byrum died in 1980 at the age of 91 (*Andersonian* 1980).

Sadly, the Byrum heresy trial is only the beginning of resolutions taken up, complaints filed, and battles fought as some church leaders became ever more concerned about the direction of the young school.

Dean Olt, who was a practicing psychologist, hypnotized a friend for a dental surgery, and it made the news wires, leading pastors from the Kentucky Assembly and in the state of Washington to call for his resignation in 1932 (Strege 2016, 75). In 1933, several prominent ministers in Ohio proposed a resolution to remove the undergraduate curriculum altogether so that the liberal arts courses would cease and the college would return to a Bible training school (Strege 2016, 79). The resolution failed, but one can only imagine how battle weary the administration and faculty must have been after those turbulent years.

Controversies would continue as Anderson College grew, and bad blood between Morrison and Smith would plague another generation. Otto F. Linn, the first Church of God pastor to earn a PhD in biblical studies, served on the faculty of Anderson College, and then later became the dean of the Pacific Bible College. Linn wrote *Studies in the New Testament*, and the final volume, published in 1941, criticized many of Smith's interpretations regarding the Revelation (Strege 2016, 151). Earl Slacum, a Muncie, Indiana, pastor who was fond of F.G. Smith, read Linn's work and referred to it as "poison." Slacum began publishing and circulating his own paper called *Watchman on the Wall*, which focused on calling out the numerous apostasies he saw taking shape at Anderson College, not least of which was the fact that a new chapel construction had a split chancel, which was taken as a clear sign of sectarian influence (Strege 2016, 153).

Slacum would press on to criticize faculty and would cite students who claimed their faith was challenged in particular professors' classes, until one faculty member left the faculty and two more were forced to stand before the Doctrinal committee in 1947 to answer charges such as "atheistic" teaching related to instructing students in the theory of evolution³ (Strege 2016, 155).

These are just a few examples of controversies as time and space will not permit the naming of all of them. In the 1950s, administrators and faculty members who came under fire for their political views were suspected of socialism (Strege 2016, 146). By the 1970s, matters of sex and sexual ethics began to dominate the conversations in mainstream

3. As cited in Strege (2016), issues of the *Andersonian* were published on March 20, 1980; March 27, 1980; April 17, 1980; and April 24, 1980.

America, and so the topics found their way into the classrooms of Anderson College. Not only were professors engaging the topics of the culture with their students, the students were engaging each other, as *Andersonian* articles frequently ran on such topics as homosexuality and pregnancy outside of marriage, and students debated matters among themselves⁴ (Strege 2016). In 1980, the “Open Letter” controversy occurred when a pastor from South Carolina sent a letter to then President Robert Reardon concerning the complaints received regarding the “moral drift” at the college, particularly what was perceived as a disregard for the Bible and a moral neutrality on sexual relationships. For Pastor Leroy Oesch, the critical issue at hand was biblical inerrancy over biblical infallibility; to that end, Oesch had taken care to photocopy pages from New Testament textbooks highlighting the critical study of Scripture and images from sociology textbooks on human sexuality. As in the past, the conflict made its way to the General Assembly and the wider church (Strege 2016, 289).

It was perhaps the “Open Letter” conflict that finally persuaded college leaders to find vocabulary for their own identity and for their role as it related to the church. As President Robert Reardon was aware, there were deep divisions in the Church of God, and Anderson College was still in need of financial support and affiliation with its founding church. In order to address these mounting issues and the appointed committee’s particular concerns, Reardon and the administration published a statement called “Anderson College: In Partnership with the Church,” written by Barry Callen, then dean of the School of Theology (Strege 2016, 294). Here, Reardon articulated the purpose of the church-related school of higher learning, in which “curricular design and community life combine the honesty and rigor of academic inquiry and the perspectives and mission emerging from *biblical revelation*” (Reardon 1981).

Ministry and Identity

4. See *Andersonian* 2, no. 1, September 9, 1947, <https://cdm15705.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15705coll56/id/30/rec/3> and *Andersonian* 4, no. 8, November 2, 1949, <https://cdm15705.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15705coll56/id/482/rec/1>.

Despite all the battles between parent and child across the tattered past, one truth remained in this dysfunctional relationship: one party never totally abandoned the other. Beleaguered administrators and faculty pressed on, students continued to enroll, churches still sent their young adults to study at Anderson, and the dream of a Christian liberal arts university for the building up of the Church and the good of the world continued to endure. What is more, amidst all the years of conflict, ministry continued to grow and flourish on the campus at Anderson, and young women and men grew in their academic discovery and Christian faith and carried the hope of the Gospel to their homes, communities, and around the globe. Yet, there are particular distinctives, unique attributes that our first president drew upon to illustrate our devotion to and shared heritage with our founding church that will sound familiar to contemporary students today: required chapel, required Bible courses, and special religious services each semester to enrich student spiritual life (Strege 2016, 169). In the earliest years, the curriculum itself was ministry preparation, and students would gather three times each week for chapel worship services. The women's clubs (Camarada and Arete Pep), men's clubs (Boosters and Sachem), and other social clubs began to appear in the 1930s, and musical ensembles traveled and shared their gifts with the wider church. Early issues of *The Andersonian* featured written sermons composed by students and intended to stimulate thoughtful reflection. Though it is clear from early campus handbooks that students remained under the watchful eyes and care of deans Russell Olt and Amy Lopez, they enjoyed an enriching and full spiritual experience while on campus, finding service opportunities with organizations such as the ecumenical Student Volunteer Movement (Strege 2016, 50). It seems a clear shift in the campus community consciousness took place with the onset of World War II and the campus arrival of Professor Candace Stone, who was appointed chair of the Department of Social Sciences.

Dr. Stone's distinguished record of accomplishment at Anderson College includes launching a Model UN program for high school students and introducing an International Relations club, affiliated with the Carnegie Endowment for World Peace, which became a favorite among the student body, bringing "real-world" issues to table discussions on campus (Strege 2016, 148). Additionally, Stone organized

the Anderson College Friendship Organization to underwrite international travel for twenty Anderson students into post-war Germany. Stone subsequently organized a second trip, sponsored by the Church of God and the World Council of Churches, to devastated regions of Europe, believing that as followers of Christ, we must accept a portion of the responsibility for the horrors of the Holocaust (Strege 2016, 148). In 1956, students from Professor Stone's International Relations Club traveled to Alabama during the Montgomery bus boycott and invited nonviolent resistance leaders they met to Anderson to speak. Rev. Howard Vines and Rosa Parks traveled to Anderson for special services hosted by the School of Theology students and the International Relations Committee as well as Central Christian Church.

While the support of professors and the cultivation of a safe and open environment to express ideas and doubts are necessary for the growth and development of adulthood, the leadership displayed by Anderson students in areas of justice and social change across the years should not be lost on readers. For instance, students collected funds to provide blankets for refugees in the Algerian war for independence. In 1961 as the Peace Corps was launched, Anderson college students were some of the first volunteers accepted into the program (Strege 2016, 224).

Perhaps one of the greatest results to date of the combined efforts between national church leaders and Anderson faculty and student leadership is what we now know as Tri-S. Reardon's vision for the endeavor was to incorporate the program, then known as "Student Sumner Service," into the overall educational experience and to serve the communities the students visited (Strege 2016, 226). This time-honored cross-cultural immersion and servant leadership program has become one of the "distinctives" of the Anderson experience. Within a decade of the establishment of the Tri-S program, over 1,000 students had participated (Strege 2016, 224).

In 1965, students Stoney Cook and Richard Freer traveled to Selma, Alabama, to stand with civil rights protestors. Upon their return, they met with President Reardon, and the stories of their experiences were so compelling that he announced a Freedom March in support of human rights for every American citizen following chapel on March 18 (Strege 2016, 231-32). Some 800 members of the campus community along with other neighbors walked from the corner of Eighth and College to the foot of the courthouse. This is not to say there were

not those who were vehemently opposed to Reardon's actions and the students and faculty who marched (Strege 2016, 231-32). Strege estimates that at least 200 students joined an alternative prayer service objecting to the march (Strege 2016, 233). Following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and in response to the mounting civil rights issues of the day, Reardon and trustees worked to appropriate funds to recruit African American students and faculty as well as develop courses on Black history and culture (Strege 2016, 236). To the great benefit of the college, in 1969 Rev. James Earl Massey, pastor of Metropolitan Church of God in Detroit, was appointed as the first Campus Pastor (Strege 2016, 236).

In 1969, the war-weary campus was caught in the fray of the varied passionate politics of students. While President Reardon and Rev. Massey held steady, the students again stepped forward to show the way. On October 15, during a national student moratorium to protest the war in Vietnam, students and Admissions Director James Edwards planted a "tree of life" in the valley. In a beautiful display of their commitment to the work of peace, students laid the shovels aside, and both those who opposed and who supported the war came together, hands in the dirt, scooping out the earth to bare fresh soil in which to plant peace (Strege 2016, 246-47).

While Dr. Massey understood his role as campus minister as "promote[ing] a specific religious emphasis in campus life," the hallmarks named by Morrison were still the avenues for spiritual development at Anderson (*Andersonian* 1971). Also of note is that from the very beginning, the campus pastor worked with students and faculty on a spiritual life committee to help determine programming, select campus themes, and plan emphasis weeks. Dr. Massey was succeeded by Pastor Don Collins, and it was under Don Collins's leadership that Campus Ministries took on a new life on campus and a new role in the surrounding community. During his tenure, Collins developed a wide range of volunteer teams led by students with opportunities to serve in prisons and nursing homes and to tutor at-risk children after school (Strege 2016, 305). Collins introduced Vision/Revision Week, through which students could express and explore their spirituality and expanded the opportunities for student-led ministry initiatives. In 1978, just as Dr. Marie Strong, beloved professor of Bible and sponsor of Christianity in Action, retired, Collins arrived on

campus, thereby ensuring that Campus Ministries was able to fill in the gap and broaden the scope of student-led ministries.

While Tri-S, Campus Ministries, and Chapel/Convocation exposed students to the world around them, the needs of their community, and the issues facing the day, small-group Bible studies in the residence halls and student-led worship services flourished into the next era of campus life. New partnerships were established such as the AU-East Africa initiative led by Scott Martin and Stuart Erny in the early 2000s, which worked to connect campus ministries students in Anderson with needs in East Africa through education, events, and Tri-S trips. Students launched new campus ministries teams like Neighbors to serve the practical needs of the people who live in the neighborhood around campus; over the last decade, they've cleaned gutters, built ramps for neighbors with accessibility needs, and gutted and renovated bathroom stalls for those in our community in need.

Even as students enjoyed more freedom in expression and leadership in planning for spiritual life experiences on campus, angst regarding required chapel and its content has always been and continues to be a matter of contention. Reading across scores of *Andersonian* articles, this former campus pastor was comforted to note that my tenure was not the first to face less-than-favorable feedback from time to time regarding chapel programming. It was also reassuring to note that all those who held the post hosted forums, talkbacks, and venues for dialogue. It should also be said that campus pastors and administrators continue to receive a fair amount of input from church leaders and parents who feel strongly about this speaker or that topic to which students are exposed. There are also church leaders who have expressed feelings of exasperation that Anderson has now taken the place of the church in "over-programming" to the point that students lack time to participate in local congregational life. So even while there are new campus ministries teams and lots of new programming, chapel has been reduced from three times per week to two and the meeting time has moved from 8 a.m. to 9 a.m. to 10 a.m. to now 11a.m. Much has changed, and much remains.

Perhaps what this article can do is state anew what the research bears out. Over the course of 100-plus years of this turbulent and faithful relationship, parent and child, church and university have fiercely loved and fiercely fought. One must recognize, however, that

the child has matured into an adult, full functioning and informed by her parental roots. The relationship is and has been messy and beautiful, troubled and loving. The foundations of this Movement, the belief of an open table and open fellowship, both inform and complicate the work. Because of our unquestionable loyalty to our founding church, Anderson University welcomes students no matter what their faith, or lack thereof, into a community that is undeniably Christian and Church of God. We must understand, then, the difficulty and opportunity inherent in doing ministry and life in a community in which there is nothing where it can be said, "This we all believe" (see *The Heart of the Church of God Teaching Tradition*, Barry Callen and Cliff Sanders).

In keeping with Anderson's commitment to the church, students at the school are required to attend chapel, take a course in Bible, and spiritual emphasis weeks are offered each semester for students to explore their faith more deeply. In keeping with the commitment of the church to the school, the church supports the school financially, prayerfully, and faithfully by sending a fresh crop of students every fall. As we read the record, what seems painfully obvious is that while this relationship is troubled, it has always been intact. There will never be a time when it is appropriate for faculty to lay down the responsibility to honor God with their minds and to retreat from venturing into the world of thoughts and ideas, and they will always be challenged to engage students on the issues of our times where students must navigate the world. There will never be a time when the church will not seek to know that these questions are being confronted from a biblical perspective. To the credit of our church and school leaders across the good times and bad of the last one hundred years, it seems that, like any normal family, they may have their internal spats, but they stay in the room, work through the hard stuff, and find a way through.

Anderson University is not a perfect place, but it is a special place. It is a place where talks of peace echo across the valley as the leaves turn golden. It's a place where generations of alumni gather to tell stories of college life in Old Main. It's a sacred space where we gather for prayer when planes rocket through the World Trade Center. It's a place that is home of the Ravens and Mocha Joe's. It's a place where we wrestle with topics of Christian ethics and volunteer for anti-trafficking work in our

community and around the globe. It's a place where we sing out loud and true the never-ending love of God.

2. A Singing People

The Musical Heritage of Anderson University

JEFFREY E. WRIGHT

The preface to the 1953 *Hymnal of the Church of God* states, “We have been a singing people. Our songs have served both to draw us into greater communion with God and to provide a witness to others of what Christ has done” (Nicholson 1953, iii). When the next *Hymnal of the Church of God* was published in 1971, the editor introduced it by writing, “The people of the Church of God have a tradition and a deep love for vital and meaningful congregational singing” (Nicholson 1971, iii). Following in this line of thought, the editors of the 1989 hymnal reminded its users, “Historically the Church of God as a movement expressed faith through vibrant singing and meaningful worship. The early hymnals produced by the church were more than song books, they were testimonies of faith, expressing our theology through music” (Newell and Vader 1989, preface). This love for singing is made obvious by the fact that the 1989 hymnal was the seventh major collection of hymns and spiritual songs to be published in the short lifespan of the Church of God movement. Between its founding in 1881 and the publishing of the 1989 hymnal, the Church of God produced, on average, a new collection of hymns and songs every 15 years, an astoundingly rapid rate when compared to other Christian faith traditions.

Why was singing so important to the Church of God, and why did singing sink its roots deeply in the soil of the Anderson University campus? Perhaps it was because this community of faith, which chose not to adopt a specific creed or tightly reasoned set of doctrines, turned to song as the most expedient way of expressing its beliefs. Rather than articulating its faith through theological tenets, this community defined its faith in song. In addition to providing a powerful and moving way of expressing their faith, singing provided something equally important to the Church of God movement—a deep and profound way of knowing God through personal experience. This way

of knowing one's faith could not be defined in words, so it was not subject to argumentation or rebuttal. This experiential knowledge of one's faith was a defining characteristic of the Church of God movement, and music was the principal connection to this personal life of faith.

Equally important was the sociological impact of singing. Music provided a powerful way of creating a close-knit community of faith within Church of God congregations, just as it does in today's churches. Uniting our voices in song bolsters our beliefs and creates a shared perspective on the world. When we sing together, we create a common worldview and a collective sense of reality that shapes the way we live and respond to life's triumphs and challenges. If hope is to be found in the midst of hardship, and if clarity is to be found in the midst of uncertainty, they are likely to arise within a community of faith where beliefs and burdens are shared and where one finds footing for life's most challenging days. Blending our voices in song makes possible an intense level of connection that binds people together, making it possible to share the deepest parts of our human and spiritual journeys.

This essay examines the ways in which singing and other types of music fostered this experiential way of knowing God and created community in the church and on our campus. These ways of knowing and sharing their faith were present when the Church of God began and when the Anderson Bible Training School was founded in 1917. They remain deeply rooted in the fertile soil of AU's campus, where music has been nurtured and has evolved from its early and accessible forms to the more sophisticated and nuanced expressions of faith that are the hallmark of a mature university. This type of musical growth can happen only when music is fully embraced and encouraged to bloom in ways that lead to advanced levels of artistry, and it can happen only when music is shaped equally by the traditions of the liberal arts college and the traditions of the church.

The Sounds of Faith

In "Sounding the Symbols of Faith: Exploring the Nonverbal Languages of Christian Worship," Don Saliers reminds us of the songs and rituals we shared as children when we gathered for times of play. Whether dancing, telling stories, or playing games, children naturally sing together and teach each other the tunes and chants that accompany their spirited interactions. These shared musical moments

create instant acceptance and community, and they become a deeply embedded part of our childhood memories and our personal identity. Songs provide one of the earliest ways in which we form bonds of friendship that shape us for a lifetime.

Saliers goes on to remind us that this natural way of singing our childhood rituals carries over into the ways we know and experience our life of faith as adults:

So the shared music-making in the gathered assembly is about the book of our memories; about the font of our baptism, or death and resurrection; about the table where we “taste and see” the goodness of the Lord. In this gathered community, shared music-making helps the human body remember long after the mind has forgotten. Those children knew what we adults so often forget: that there exists a natural, communal way in which we come to vitality in life. Thus, human beings have always ritualized life and sung it in our work, in our festivals, in our solemn occasions of grief and joy. Whether around campfires or in recital halls, on the playground, or in a synagogue and church, the act of singing has brought us together in a kind of acoustical gathering of life. Singing has released for us, through a natural language of doxology, what the human soul longs for, what signals the transcendent. For the dance of the children is more than their dancing, and their song is more than their singing, and their mutuality more than their friendship. It’s a sign of what we’re meant for: a God-given liturgy on earth. (Saliers 2005, 18-19)

This “acoustical gathering of life” is central to the experiential dimension of faith, reminding us that we are more than we can express in the rational ways of knowing and thinking that are the hallmarks of modernism and the legacy of the Enlightenment. Saliers reminds us that:

We are more than we can think. We are more than we can feel. So singing and making music together that expresses our life before God is, in this way, identity confirming and future opening—duty and delight. Something about being human requires this. Something about the way we come to know and understand our destiny and our world through the senses is

provided for us; things God holds out for us in the gathered assembly. (Saliers 2005, 19-20)

The singing of a gathered assembly offers a way of knowing our world that is different from, but no less valid than, what we know through reason and rationalism. Our singing allows us to know our world and our faith directly and experientially. As with all of the arts, singing gives expression to the deepest levels of our humanity that are otherwise unknowable. When we unite our voices in song, we share in direct and unmediated ways our life of faith and our most vulnerable levels of humanity. In our singing, we become one.

Church of God Heritage Hymns

In the absence of a clear statement of their Christian beliefs, early members of the Church of God turned to hymns as a way of articulating their beliefs and strengthening their sense of community. Not only did they sing hymns that were shared with other Christian congregations, but the Church of God enjoyed a healthy number of hymns that were written by its own church leaders and were sung exclusively by its own congregations. Most of these hymns were written by five early leaders of the church, including one of the primary pioneers of the Church of God movement, D. S. Warner (1842-1895). It is interesting to note that these five hymn writers were also ministers and evangelists, giving further credence to the idea that the Church of God expressed its religious beliefs primarily through song. It is also interesting to note that four of these hymnists worked for the Gospel Trumpet Company, which provided them an expedient way of publishing their music. One of these early hymn writers, Barney E. Warren (1867-1951), served as music editor for the Gospel Trumpet Company for more than 50 years and composed the music for more than 2,000 hymns and children's songs.

The other early hymnists in the Church of God movement included Charles W. Naylor (1874-1950), lyricist and evangelist who worked briefly for the Gospel Trumpet Company; Andrew L. Byers (1869-1952), evangelist, pastor, and composer of hymns who also worked briefly for the Gospel Trumpet Company; and D. Otis Teasley (1876-1942), lyricist and composer of hymns who also worked for the Gospel Trumpet Company. These hymn writers did their work at a pivotal time in the life of the Church of God, a time when this newly formed Christian movement needed something to bind it together and provide a sense

of shared identity. These hymns became the voice of the church, providing a way for people to articulate their beliefs while also expressing their feelings about their faith.

These hymns are now referred to as the Church of God heritage hymns, and they were written in the form of typical Gospel hymns of that era. Harmonically, they are simple, consisting of a few predictable chords. Melodically, they are easy to sing and remember, often including a musical refrain that is repeated after each verse of the hymn. The lyrics consist of personal expressions of faith, making frequent use of the pronouns “I” and “me” rather than making reference to the global community of Christian believers. All of these qualities combine to make the Church of God heritage hymns personal, memorable, accessible, and reassuring. While they are not musically adventuresome, they are sonic “comfort food,” providing an expressive, though often sentimental, connection to one’s life of faith.

Music Was There In The Beginning

The vibrant life of song that characterized the Church of God movement in its early and formative years carried over naturally to the Anderson Bible Training School when it was founded in 1917 “for the purpose of providing instruction for those who feel called to the ministry . . . and for the training of music directors” (Strege 2016, 18). Given this mission statement, it was not a surprise to find that a music professor was one of the first faculty members hired by ABTS. In fact, this first music instructor, Henry C. Clausen (1880-1960), was the only full-time member of the ABTS faculty when it opened its doors in 1917. Maintaining and furthering the music that had already established deep roots in Church of God congregations was imperative. Participatory worship required the leadership of skilled musicians who were strong performers but who also grasped the academic side of music including music theory and choral conducting. The founders of ABTS were keenly aware of this need for well-honed musicianship, and they acted accordingly by creating a full-time faculty position in music. Henry C. Clausen was one of two original faculty members who brought college training to their work at ABTS. He held a two-year diploma from Moody Bible Institute in Chicago, and he had experience serving as a music director in Church of God congregations. Clausen came to ABTS as the embodiment of all things musical, serving as both a professor and a professional role model for students. He taught

a two-year cycle of courses, including voice and piano lessons, choral conducting, and music theory—all of the basic knowledge and skills needed to serve the church as a competent music minister. Clausen laid a solid musical foundation that served ABTS well and anchored the place of music in its curriculum. His work ensured that music would be woven into our campus for the next century and that it would be an indelible part of our collegiate identity. We owe much to this visionary pioneer of music (Strege 2016, 19).

Not only did Clausen establish a solid musical foundation for the Anderson Bible Training School, but he also raised its musical standards to the more elevated levels of Christian churches outside of the Church of God and to the musical standards of other college music programs. While Clausen's vision for higher artistic standards was viewed by some as being hedonistic and self-serving, he found acceptance on our campus, and his musical practices quickly became embedded in our musical culture. Clausen's success in achieving his artistic goals can be attributed to the support and protection offered by strategic leaders of the campus, including Russell and Bessie Byrum, who were kindred spirits with Clausen and his more expansive vision of the educational mission of ABTS (Strege 2016, 29-30).

As ABTS grew, the tradition of maintaining a strong music faculty continued. In 1919, Ruth Plantz, a graduate of the Indianapolis Conservatory of Music, joined the ABTS faculty to teach piano and other types of instrumental music. Professor Plantz was followed in 1925 by Cecil H. Hartselle and in 1930 by piano professor Paul Breitweiser. By the early 1930s, ABTS had evolved into Anderson College, and the School of Music was firmly embedded in its academic structure and its liberal arts curriculum. In these early days of Anderson College, students had the option of earning a four-year Bachelor of Music degree, a three-year certification as a voice or piano teacher, or a two-year certificate in music. As was the case from its opening days, music remained a preeminent program on this campus. From here, the vision would continue to grow (Strege 2016, 124-25).

Choral Music—A Tradition of Excellence

In 1928, Clausen formed the Glad Tidings Chorus, the first formal choral ensemble on our campus. He had no way of knowing that he was beginning a tradition of choral music that would thrive over the coming decades to become one of the distinguishing hallmarks of

Anderson College and, in time, of Anderson University. While the Glad Tidings Chorus was a voluntary choir that was intended primarily for the edification of the campus community, it would eventually give way to a grander vision of choral music that would reach far beyond our campus and would bring us international acclaim

In 1945, Robert A. Nicholson joined the faculty of Anderson College and succeeded Henry Clausen as the leader of the music program. Nicholson was the youngest member of a faculty cohort that was hired by President John Morrison to bring a new energy to the AC campus. Nicholson fit the bill perfectly, having established a strong academic record as an AC student and developed his musicianship by singing in the Glad Tidings Chorus and the choir of Park Place Church of God. While Nicholson did not major in music at Anderson College, he possessed a natural proclivity toward music and showed great musical promise, traits that would allow him to complete graduate music studies at a reputable music school. Nicholson was exactly the type of talent that President Morrison wanted and needed. President Morrison had a vision for a touring choral ensemble that would act as an ambassador for the AC campus. At a time when the Church of God was concerned about the academic mission of the college and was convinced that liberal forces were moving the college away from its ecclesiastical roots, he reasoned that a choir could do much to calm the stormy waters and demonstrate to concerned churches that AC students were strong in their faith and were spreading Christian messages through their music. To that end, Robert Nicholson established the Anderson College Choir and set out to fulfill the vision of President Morrison.

At the time that Nicholson was hired to guide the music program of the college, it was agreed that he would pursue graduate studies in music. His solid academic work as an undergraduate at AC allowed him to matriculate at New York University, where he would complete his doctoral degree some eight years later (Strege 2016, 155-157). During his years at NYU, Nicholson had the opportunity to study with two of the leading choral conductors of his day—Fred Waring and Robert Shaw (Strege 2016, 205-206). Fred Waring was the conductor of The Pennsylvanians, a popular choral ensemble that performed frequently on radio shows and completed a number of highly regarded recording projects. Known for the precision and clarity of their diction, Fred

Waring's choir elevated choral music to a new level of artistry. Nicholson had the opportunity to attend workshops given by Fred Waring where he learned much about the rehearsal and conducting techniques that made The Pennsylvanians so successful.

It was in these workshops that Nicholson became aware of Robert Shaw, a young apprentice in the Waring organization and a rising star in the world of choral music. This association with Shaw led to an opportunity for Nicholson to sing in Shaw's Collegiate Chorale, a New York-based choir of the highest caliber that was taking choral music to an even greater level of musicianship, gaining the respect of music critics not only in New York City, but across the nation. Shaw's Chorale performed serious choral music on the radio and in the early days of television, partnering with, among others, renowned conductor Arturo Toscanini and the NBC Symphony Orchestra. The Collegiate Chorale embarked on extensive tours that took choral music into communities that had never before heard classical choral repertoire or a choral performance of this caliber. Shaw's choir won accolades as they blazed a new trail that popularized choral music in America.

The influences of Waring and Shaw on Nicholson's conducting and on his vision for choral music cannot be overstated. Waring's focus on lighter and more popular music was balanced by Shaw's interest in more complex concert music. Both were important to Nicholson, who took what he learned from Waring and used it to his benefit when he was appointed music director for *The Christian Brotherhood Hour*, a national radio program of hymns and church music sponsored by the Church of God. His experience with Shaw's concert music served him well in elevating the Anderson College Choir to the level of artistry that was expected of a serious collegiate music program. Clearly, Nicholson was the right choice for that moment in the history of Anderson's music program. In addition to establishing the AC Choir and elevating its musical standards, he took the choir on numerous tours to perform in Church of God congregations and a variety of respected concert venues across the nation. Choral music at Anderson College was on an upward trajectory.

The Crescendo

In 1958, Robert Nicholson assumed a new leadership role on the campus, taking up the mantle of dean of the faculty. As he widened his scope of responsibility to oversee the entire academic program of

the campus, it was time to find a new leader for the music program, someone who would maintain the standards that had already been established and would build on the momentum that was already in motion. F. Dale Bengtson turned out to be the natural choice for this leadership role. Bengtson, an AC alumnus, joined the AC faculty in 1960 to build the instrumental program, and in 1963 he became conductor of the AC Choir, a post he held for 10 years. Under his leadership, the AC Choir made its first tours of Europe. In the early 1960s, the choir took a six-week tour that included performances behind the Iron Curtain, and 10 years later, they took a four-week tour that culminated with singing in a large choral festival in Vienna. One of his most enduring accomplishments came in 1965 when Dr. Bengtson led the first performance of *Candles and Carols* in Park Place Church of God. This performance of Advent and Christmas music quickly became an annual favorite, eventually moving to Reardon Auditorium to accommodate the large audiences. For more than 25 years, these performances were broadcast on PBS stations across the nation and on two international cable networks. *Candles and Carols* still exists on our campus, and for many people it marks the official beginning of the Christmas season.

In 1970, Dr. Bengtson was named chair of the Department of Music, a leadership role he maintained until his retirement in 1995. These years saw many significant developments in the program. In 1974, the Music Department went through its first accreditation review by the National Association of Schools of Music, leading to the program's initial accreditation later that year. National accreditation has continued without interruption to the present day. In 1976, Anderson College was granted a chapter of Pi Kappa Lambda, the national music honor society, and in 1977 the Music Department launched its music business major, one of the first programs of this type in the nation. This program continues to bring large numbers of students to the campus.

The year 1980 saw a landmark event in the history of music on this campus. The Music Department moved into its current home, the Krannert Fine Arts Building, after being housed in temporary settings, such as converted houses, and after sharing facilities with Park Place Church of God. The opening of the new music building brought a sense of permanence and security to the music program, allowing it to operate in spaces that were designed specifically for music classes and

rehearsals. The formal dedication of the music building in the spring of 1980 was highlighted by performances from several distinguished guest artists.

To mark the 100th anniversary of the Church of God the following year, Don Marsh was commissioned to create musical arrangements of ten Church of God heritage hymns. The orchestral tracks for these stunning arrangements were recorded in Pasadena, California, then the choral tracks were recorded by the AC Choir at Bill Gaither's Pinebrook Studios in Alexandria, Indiana. These arrangements elevated the heritage hymns to a new level of musical sophistication, taking them from predictable gospel songs to engaging musical gems. Two of these arrangements are still performed on a regular basis by the AU Chorale, maintaining a vibrant connection to the musical heritage of the Church of God (Bengtson 2007, 22-26).

In the 1970s and '80s, men's choirs were popular, performing ensembles on college campuses across the nation. Anderson College was no exception. At the direction of President Robert Reardon, who wanted to recruit men as they returned from the VietNam conflict, the AC Male Chorus was formed by Dr. Gene Miller, a choral conductor of immense talent and depth. The ensemble quickly grew to include more than 60 men and excelled in its artistry, winning an invitation to perform at the Regional Convention of the American Choral Directors Association, a prestigious and coveted honor among college choirs. In the early 1980s, the Male Chorus became the first AC ensemble to perform throughout Finland, a country to which our choirs would return many times in the future. In addition, the Male Chorus traveled to Washington, D. C., to perform for a National Prayer Breakfast hosted by President Ronald Reagan. All of these performances won strong accolades for the ensemble and garnered international attention for Anderson College. Alongside the Male Chorus, the AC Choir continued to thrive. Dr. Miller brought his artistic vision to this ensemble from 1973 to 1979 before passing the baton to Paul Smith, who led the choir for the next five years. Richard Sowers joined the music faculty in 1984 and served as the ensemble's conductor until 2021, completing the longest tenure of any conductor since the ensemble began. In 1987, when Anderson College revised its academic structure and became Anderson University, the name of the Anderson College Choir was changed to the Anderson University Chorale. This new name did not

alter its commitment to the highest levels of artistry. Under Dr. Sowers's direction, the AU Chorale continued to perform in highly visible venues, further expanding AU's reputation for musical excellence. Selected highlights from Dr. Sowers's 37-year tenure include:

- In 1987, the Chorale traveled to New York City in March to sing for the Sunday morning services at the historic Riverside Church, an important hub of religious and musical activity that was closely affiliated with Union Theological Seminary. The Chorale received an invitation to return for a second performance a few years later.
- On the day following the Chorale's first performance at Riverside Church, they performed the Brahms *Requiem* in Avery Fisher Hall at The Lincoln Center.
- In 1991, the Chorale was one of four choirs invited to perform at the National Convention of the American Choral Directors Association in Phoenix, Arizona, a coveted honor among college choirs. The Chorale performed just before the keynote address by Robert Shaw, the conductor who shaped the musical life of Dr. Nicholson many years before.
- In 2002, the Chorale performed for the Regional Conference of the American Choral Directors Association in Indianapolis, Indiana.
- The Chorale was selected to represent the state of Indiana for the celebration of Indiana Day at the Washington National Cathedral, singing for a Sunday morning service.
- In March 1996, the Chorale marked the 50th anniversary of the ensemble by traveling to Southern California where they performed for the national broadcast of the Sunday morning services at the Crystal Cathedral in Anaheim.
- Over the course of many years, the Chorale partnered with the Anderson Symphony Orchestra to perform some of the most important works in the choral/orchestral repertoire, including Verdi's *Requiem*, Beethoven's *Symphony No. 9*, Walton's *Belshazzar's Feast*, Mozart's *Requiem*, Haydn's *Lord Nelson Mass*, Brahms' *Flos Campi*, and Rutter's *Requiem*.
- In an ongoing partnership with the Carmel Symphony Orchestra, the Chorale performed many important works in the Palladium at The Center for the Performing Arts, including Mahler's *Symphony No. 2*, Orff's *Carmina Burana*, and Beethoven's *Symphony No. 9*.

- Following in the footsteps of Dr. Miller and the Male Chorus, Dr. Sowers took the Chorale on its first Nordic Tour in 1986, traveling to Germany, Denmark, and Finland. The Chorale completed 12 tours of Scandinavia over the span of 32 years. On each of their Nordic tours, the Chorale performed in many of the same venues, always welcomed back warmly and enthusiastically. Because of these repeated performances and the dedicated following of Scandinavian supporters, the AU Chorale became part of the great choral tradition of the Scandinavian countries, which have given us some of the finest choral ensembles in the world. (Sowers 2022)

Choral music was not the only way in which the music program excelled on our campus. In 1960, Dr. Bengtson had been hired to build the instrumental music program, and that emphasis has continued through the years without interruption. In 1969, Dr. James Rouintree took over leadership of the instrumental program and guided it until 1998 when Dr. Susan Taylor stepped into the role, bringing a strong vision and fresh energy that expanded the program significantly. Upon Dr. Taylor's retirement in 2018, Dr. Adam Waller assumed this role, elevating the artistry of our instrumental ensembles to new heights. Instrumental music continues to be a vital part of our campus life.

Musical theatre and opera performances are deeply woven into the fabric of our musical heritage. Musical theater productions made an early appearance on our campus as a natural extension of the theatre program, but it was taken to new levels of excellence by Dr. Fritz Robertson and Prof. Laurel Goetzinger, two dynamic faculty members whose vision invigorated our musical theatre productions and elevated the beauty of opera performances on our campus. The foundation that was laid by these two faculty members led to the creation of a musical theatre major under Dr. David Coolidge that brought together our thriving programs in music, theatre, and dance. The musical theatre major continues to grow in quality and quantity. The number of lyric theatre performances given on our campus and the high production values of these performances are unique for a campus of our size. Strategic partnerships with the artistic community in Indianapolis makes it possible for AU to hire leading designers for sets and lighting as well as strong choreographers. These partnerships augment the

artistic vision of our faculty and bring unparalleled levels of artistry to our musical theatre and opera performances.

Recent decades have also seen a growth in the strength and reputation of the music education program on our campus. This undergraduate major is viewed by peer institutions as one of the strongest in the Midwest, and for more than a decade every graduate of the music education program has found employment as a music teacher within a month of completing the program. Through a grant from the Falls Departmental Initiative Fund in 2003, the School of Music began offering graduate-level summer courses that led to certification in the Orff-Schulwerk teaching methodology. The three courses in this certification program quickly expanded to include a variety of supporting courses, leading to the formation of The Summer Studies Program in Music Education. This program evolved rapidly into a master's degree in music education, a degree program that brings graduate students to our campus from all over the world. Every year, more than 100 students travel here to take these summer courses, and more than 30 of those students are also pursuing their master's in music education at Anderson University. These programs have garnered international attention for Anderson University, making them gems in our academic crown.

Vision and Leadership

The campus of Anderson University provided fertile ground for music to take root. The Church of God was steeped in musical traditions before this school welcomed its first students. Those musical practices were supported by The Gospel Trumpet Company (later known as Warner Press) and the hymnals it published on a regular basis. While these factors were important in giving music a strong start on our campus, another factor strengthened our musical culture—the vision of campus leaders who believed in the value of music and invested in it even when it was costly to do so.

The late 1960s brought a pivotal moment in the life of the music program at Anderson College. The Music Department was struggling for enrollment, causing President Reardon and Dean Nicholson to ask a difficult question: Given the high cost of 1-on-1 instruction in music and the high cost of the instruments, equipment, and facilities required by the music program, could the program be sustained? Eliminating the music major and the costs associated with the program, instead

offering only some musical activities, would be less of a burden on the institutional budget (Bengtson 2007, 25). At pivotal moments such as these, institutional leadership has the responsibility of making decisions that will set the course and trajectory of the campus for decades to come. At an earlier moment in 1945, President Morrison had made the decision to strengthen the music program by hiring Robert Nicholson to create a choral ensemble that would repair and enhance our relationship with the church. That set in motion a musical agenda that played out over the next two decades. When another decision point was reached in the 1960s, a different set of campus leaders were at the helm—Dr. Nicholson and President Reardon.

Through his close affiliation with the music program, Dr. Nicholson had firsthand knowledge of the importance of music, but now he was in a different role that required him to look at the situation from a new perspective. He was now charged with maintaining the overall health of the school's academic mission, and that charge might have required him to close the costly music program for the benefit of the greater campus. President Robert Reardon, the other voice in this conversation, also knew of the importance of music on a personal level. Not only did he grow up in the musical traditions of the Church of God, but he went on to develop his musicianship to a high level by studying organ at Oberlin College, one the nation's finest music schools. Like Dr. Nicholson, President Reardon laid aside those personal loyalties to make a decision for the good of the entire campus. After weighing all the factors and giving the matter careful consideration, these two leaders decided to maintain the music major, knowing intuitively and experientially what the early Church of God hymnists knew—music has an unparalleled power to express the deepest levels of our humanity and spirituality. Through their actions, these two leaders demonstrated their belief that music is a central component of a liberal arts education, which, at its best, encompasses both mind and spirit.

Following the example of President Reardon, President James Edwards also supported music as a central component of a fully-orbed college experience. As a student at Anderson College, Edwards sang in the AC Choir, took voice lessons, and gave a senior voice recital, even though he was not a music major. From his personal journey, he knew of music's ability to transform the individual and to bring a campus community together in profound ways. President Edwards's

strongest contribution to music resulted from his decision to construct York Performance Hall and Galleries, which opened in the fall of 2012. York Hall provides us with a world-class venue for musical performances. Its acoustical properties are stunning, and they can be adjusted for different types of musical performances. The hall has received accolades from every guest artist who has performed there. Under their watch, presidents Morrison, Reardon, Nicholson, and Edwards invested in the music program, believed in its value, and became its staunchest guardians in moments when their rational minds would tell them to act otherwise.

Music as a Bridge to God

If Anderson University is to fulfill its mission as a liberal arts university and a church-related campus, we must educate the whole person—mind, body, and spirit. One of the vestiges of Enlightenment thinking that has gripped Western culture for centuries is the idea that mind, body, and spirit are separate entities, and that the mind offers the only way of knowing ourselves and our world. Recent thinking and research tells us otherwise. We can also know ourselves and our world in non-rational ways. We can know things through experience, feeling, and intuition, all of which are housed in and known through the body. These experiential, non-rational ways of knowing, while different from rational knowledge, are equally valid. The dominance of rationalism has now given way to the inclusion of the non-rational and deeply personal types of knowledge that are the true hallmark of our humanity.

Music taps into this incarnate way of knowing, providing ways for us to explore and express that which cannot be captured in words. Music is experienced in the body, and it is a way of knowing our deepest regions, our soul, that inner region of life where we sense the presence of God that abides within each of us. It is here that our human spirit mingles with the Spirit of God, leading to personal and spiritual transformation. It is one of the primary ways that we grow into the image of God. Viewed in this way, music is more than a diversion, more than a source of entertainment, and more than an adjunct to our lives. Music is a conduit for spiritual transformation. As Don Saliers reminds us:

Let our music, then, . . . not be a luxury but something like breathing, like heartbeat, like manna in the desert. Let it not be so much a public status symbol, not so much an aesthetic treat,

but an instrument whereby our loves, our hopes, our anguish, our delights, yes even our untruths may be, as it were, refined. That whatever purity of heart may remain in the human scene can be sounded and tasted there, and hence, bring life. (Saliers 2005, 21)

In his classic work *The Idea of the Holy*, theologian Rudolph Otto affirms the importance of non-conceptual and non-rational ways of knowing, reminding us of the similarities between religious experience and aesthetic experience, both of which elude words and rationalization. He writes,

It is essential to every theistic conception of God, and most of all to the Christian, that it designates and precisely characterizes deity by the attributes spirit, reason, purpose, good will, supreme power, unity, selfhood Now all these attributes constitute clear and definite concepts: they can be grasped by the intellect; they can be analyzed by thought, they even admit of definition. An object that can thus be thought conceptually may be termed rational

We count this the very mark and criterion of a religion's high rank and superior value—that it should have no lack of conceptions about God. . . . But, when this is granted, we have to be on our guard against an error which would lead to a wrong and one-sided interpretation of religion. This is the view that the essence of deity can be given completely and exhaustively in such “rational” attributes as have been referred to above and in others like them. (Otto 1950, 1-2)

Otto goes on to assert that the holy “completely eludes apprehension in terms of concepts. The same thing is true . . . of the category of the beautiful” (1950, 5). Exploring this comparison of the holy and the beautiful, Otto compels us to use metaphorical language when trying to describe the holy, a quality that he compares to a musical composition because of the way it “eludes conceptual analysis” (1950, 59). Rather than defining the holy, Otto asserts that, like an aesthetic experience, the holy can only be known as a “feeling-response” (1950, 6).

Not only do religious experience and aesthetic experience have similar qualities, but they are often experienced together. Aesthetic experience, with its ability to awaken our spirit, serves as a bridge to religious experience. In *Art and the Religious Experience*, F. David

Martin explores this relationship and postulates that these two experiences are ways of returning to God:

Art is a gift of Being. That is why art, despite its autonomy, has always served as the principal sacred bridge . . . to the religious experience, and continues to do so even in these apparently post-religious times. And that is why the participative experience of art is more than just a way back to Being The participative experience of art . . . always includes the presence and articulation of Being.

Both the participative experience and the religious experience spring from the same empirical ground; both involve love for Being; both are intimate and ultimate; both are attuned to the call of Being; both are reverential in attitude to things; both step beyond the confines of self; both give man [sic] a sense of being reunited with “that with which he is most familiar”; both give enduring value and serenity to existence; and thus both are profoundly regenerative. The participative experience, then, always has a religious quality, for the participative experience penetrates the religious dimension. (Martin 1972, 66-69)

Martin’s words were echoed by Pope Francis during his visit to America in September of 2015, when he celebrated an outdoor Mass in Philadelphia and then enjoyed a performance that included a variety of artists ranging from the Philadelphia Orchestra to Aretha Franklin to The Fray. In his closing remarks, Pope Francis thanked all the artists for their gifts of beauty, and then quietly reminded us that “beauty is a pathway to God.” Like Martin, Pope Francis recognized the inextricable bond that holds beauty and spirituality in close communion.

So what does this mean for Anderson University? It means that our commitment to music and our commitment to spiritual growth go hand in hand. Music not only aligns with our desire to be a strong liberal arts university, but it also fulfills our mission of promoting spiritual transformation within our students. What the founders of the Church of God and the early hymnists of this church movement knew intuitively, we now know more fully. Through the work of philosophers, theologians, psychologists, and neurobiologists, we now have a better understanding of the ways in which music and all the arts carry the potential to shape us and transform our lives. The ways in which music has been nurtured on this campus is a strong testament to this

knowledge. AU's commitment to music has set us apart from many other institutions of higher learning. May this commitment remain strong, allowing us to educate the whole person and fulfill our mission in the future as intentionally and as fully as we have in the past.

3. Going Pro

The Growth of Professional Programs at Anderson University

JERRALD FOX

Over your childhood, and certainly as you made your decision to pursue a diploma at Anderson University, you likely heard the question, “What do you plan to do when you grow up?” That’s an important question to consider when committing several years and significant tuition money toward preparing for your future. Soon you’ll be applying for jobs and meeting with recruiters and interviewers. They will ask you even more important questions about not only your dreams but also your preparation and skills for the future you desire.

What do you think might be the most dangerous question an interviewer could ask when you apply for that first job, which you hope will launch your career? Career experts say it is this: *Tell me about yourself.*

What perils lurk in this simple question? Well, because the query is so broad, your telling of “your story” could ramble into topics that are irrelevant to your qualifications for the job. In fact, the things you share might instead lead the interviewer to question your focus and potential fit within the organization. All of the dynamics of human communication come into play in this simple question because we are multifaceted beings. Our stories are complex things.

Your telling of your story to another person carries the potential to create misunderstandings and tensions between the two of you. What you say can expose not only your experiences and preparation for a job, but also your beliefs, values, and priorities. Terms and topics that may seem quite innocent to you can be heard very differently by a listener. We all process what we hear within the context of our own life experiences and within our personal perspectives regarding the organizations to which we belong.

Paul Strozier, a member of Anderson University’s board of trustees and a gifted teacher of God’s word, shared a recent teaching series with

the Madison Park Church in Anderson titled *The Story*. Over several weeks he explained how each of us is living our own life stories under the umbrella of the mega-story of our universe and its Creator. Pastor Paul opened the Scriptures and explored both current and historical events to examine these five acts of the larger cosmic drama within which we all live each day:

1. God exists
2. God creates
3. God loves and cares for His creation
4. Humankind sins and rejects God's love
5. God sacrifices and redeems humankind

Clearly, this mega-story and, frankly, any worldview you may choose to hold, begins with faith. Yes, faith. Each of us sees the world and our place in it by choosing to believe in something—or, for people of most religious traditions, *someone*—that precedes us, is greater than us, and helps give meaning to our own limited experiences and understanding.

In Bible times, as in our day, people had to make choices about their worldview. They had to find a focus for their faith that guided their daily living and their use of their abilities and resources. The New Testament's letter to the Hebrews tells people of that day (and us today):

Now faith is confidence in what we hope for and assurance about what we do not see. This is what the ancients were commended for. By faith we understand that the universe was formed at God's command, so that what is seen was not made out of what was visible...And without faith it is impossible to please God, because anyone who comes to him must believe that he exists and that he rewards those who earnestly seek him. (Hebrews 11:1-2 and 6, [NIV])

Your Anderson University Story

Today, as a university student, you are in the early chapters of writing your own story, your own subplot within the drama of this mega-story of humankind. You are in the midst of developing your own worldview and of placing your faith in something, or someOne, to give your life purpose and to guide you into making your individual story a great one.

You are also taking measure of your personal interests and your unique set of talents. And, with the help and guidance of parents, teachers, and other mentors and advisors, you may now be exploring the world's needs to determine the vocation and preparation by which your talents and education might best intersect with them.

In that search you've now chosen to weave the story of Anderson University, with more than a century of preparing servant leaders for God's church and society, into the narrative of your individual story. From now on, as a Raven, you are forever linked to an amazing group of alumni, teachers, ministers, researchers, artists, innovators, entrepreneurs, and visionary leaders. You have become part of a community that for many generations has been creating new stories of faith, hope, and loving service around the world.

Please read on. The pages that follow will introduce you to the AU story and, more specifically, to the creation and growth of its professional programs. These are areas of study carefully designed to prepare students like you for direct entry into specific fields such as business, education, engineering, church leadership, cybersecurity, social work, health care, and more.

Now, to grasp the real essence of any story it is important to understand the *context* in which it takes place. To build that context, great storytellers provide their audience with information about the "W questions" of their story's setting: when, where, who, what, and why. For example,

- When, within the span of history, are these events occurring?
- Where is this action taking place, both geographically and culturally?
- Who are the primary actors in this drama and whom are their actions affecting?
- With what issues and dynamics are all of these people contending?
- Why did they make the choices and take the actions that formed their stories?

From a War-Torn Nation's Ashes, a Movement Begins

To grasp the story of how today's Anderson University came to be the place you experience during your time on campus, you first need

to understand the environment in which your university developed, its answers to those “W” questions. So, let’s begin with the where, when, and who questions.

The backdrop of the AU story is the Great Lakes region of North America in the final years of the 19th century. Because AU was birthed from the work of a group of people who called themselves the Church of God, we also need to know a bit about this group who saw themselves as a “reformation movement” among people of faith in that time and place.

In the decades following our nation’s bloody Civil War, the weary people of our country began a challenging period of “Reconstruction.” Efforts were made to redress the inequities of slavery and its political, social, and economic legacy. People across this Great Lakes region—and the nation as a whole—struggled to solve the problems arising from the readmission to the Union of the eleven states that had seceded during the war.

I’m sure that you’ve studied that time of national crisis in your high school history classes, so please reflect back on what you’ve learned about that era. Consider some of the questions and challenges facing Americans in the years following that bloody conflict. What was happening in their daily lives in the aftermath of the war? With thousands dead, including an assassinated president, how could they move through grief to a new beginning? With shifting economics and politics and the relocation of thousands of people, whom could they trust to lead them to peace and prosperity? How could they create jobs and opportunities and then prepare themselves and their children to do that work?

During our nation’s Civil War each side’s worldview and deeply held religious beliefs—ironically drawn from opposing understandings of the same sacred Scriptures—anchored their values and motivated their passions. Harry S. Stout, Yale professor of history, religious studies and American studies, writes, “It’s abundantly clear, as recent scholarship has demonstrated, that religion stood at the center of the Civil War for both sides. Both North and South looked to God for meaning, and each side believed—with equal fervor and certitude—that God was on its side” (Stout 2021).

But for both soldiers and their families the war’s devastating death and destruction had challenged their confidence in many of those core

beliefs and traditions. Allen Guelzo, professor at Gettysburg College, has noted, “The Civil War would render moral absolutism less, rather than more, believable, and with long and unhappy consequences for American religion. . . . For every Northern divine claiming God’s favor for the Union, and every Southern one claiming God’s favor for the Confederacy, there were far more who could not make up their minds what to say about slavery. And taken together, they created a popular perception that religion had nothing reliable or coherent to say about the greatest American issue of the 19th century” (Guelson 2020).

When the world and your personal worldview shake beneath your feet, you must look for more solid ground. You seek something true and stable upon which to stand as you try to move forward. For many in post-Civil War America, that search led to a renewed understanding of the providence of Almighty God. It inspired a quest for His protection and provision. For many, that search took place within the teachings of a local church. The majority of U.S. citizens in that time and place identified as Christians. This connected them to pastors and church leaders who preached submission and loyalty not only to their Lord, but also to the specific doctrines, practices and authority structures of that church’s denominational hierarchy (Irons 2020).

Sadly, beyond the divisions of North and South, Union and Confederate, even followers of Christ found many stumbling stones that they used to build walls rather than bridges. Though the Baptists and Methodists and Presbyterians and Lutherans and other mainline Christian denominations each called upon the graces of a common Savior and Lord, they showed little grace to one another. Instead they often chose to “divide God’s church” by emphasizing their own specific creeds and doctrinal distinctions (Irons 2020). This separated rather than unified Christ’s followers. So, while the various churches indeed did much to rebuild community and serve the needs of hurting neighbors during Reconstruction, a general mistrust and lack of unity among Christ’s followers limited their effectiveness and diminished the living example which might draw others to share faith in their Lord.

A.L. Byers, an early professor of music at the school that would become today’s Anderson University, wrote of the divisive spirit of those post-war days: “It must be said . . . that whatever has resulted from Christian endeavor or influence . . . would have been in greater degree

had the church back of these efforts been one spiritual whole instead of many sectarian divisions" (1921, 21).

Byers and other early leaders of the Church of God believed that the true body of Christ's followers would be known not by their doctrines and creeds but by a unifying love for each other and those around them, just as Jesus had taught his first followers: "Let me give you a new command: Love one another. In the same way I loved you, you love one another. This is how everyone will recognize that you are my disciples—when they see the love you have for each other" (John 13:35 [J.B. Phillips]).

A Reformation Movement Begins

So, in this time and in this place, in the midst of these Reconstruction experiences, there began a movement of church reformers that believed all true followers of Jesus could in fact experience unity. They could share loving fellowship with other believers and followers of Christ, even their former enemies in the war. By God's grace they could live holy lives as together they worked to rebuild and reunite their country.

One of these reformers had been a soldier in this Civil War. His name was Daniel Sidney Warner, a private in Company C, 195th Regiment, Ohio Infantry (Callen 1995). At the end of the conflict he returned to his family farm in northwest Ohio. In his school days before the war, he had displayed a gift for public speaking and skills in gaining the attention and interest of others. In fact, during pre-war political campaigns, his father, a staunch Democrat, was proud when his bright and well-read young son would mount a soap box and address an attentive crowd on the issues of the day. In wartime these strong communication skills earned young Dan the favor of his regiment's captain, who made him his clerk and secretary. Now back home in his early twenties, looking for work in the post-war economy, he refined these study and speaking skills as he took up the occupation of teaching in the local school.

As noted earlier, A.L. Byers was an early professor at your university. He was also personally acquainted with D.S. Warner during the last years of Warner's life. After interviewing many of his surviving family and friends and reviewing diaries shared by Warner's son, Byers wrote of this post-Civil War time in Warner's life:

It is natural that the question of religion should present itself to a young man or woman when approaching maturity. It is

then that life is full of prospects, when one plans and builds for the future. It is then that opinions are formed, and there is an inclination to reach some kind of decision, for the time being at least, regarding every issue. One reaches this parting of the ways and the question comes, "Which road shall I take?" The answer, so far as religion is concerned, depends to some extent on what one has observed in those who make a profession, though it is true that the influence of the Holy Spirit alone—that monitor who makes his appeal to the inner consciousness—sometimes decides the question. (1921, 38)

By now you might be asking, "What has this story of a Civil War veteran-turned-school teacher and his search for 'which road' to take in his religious and professional life got to do with Anderson University and its programs to educate for a wide variety of professional careers?" Before getting to that, we must answer a few more of the "W" questions in the AU story. Perhaps you'll agree that Dan Warner's choice of paths—whether by astute self-analysis of his skills and opportunities or, as Byers speculates, through the influence of God's Spirit moving in his life—has more to do with today's AU and your time on campus than you may think.

"Adulthood" Has Never Been Easy

Remember, all good stories are best understood within their specific context, the happenings of that time and place. In early 1865, as Abraham Lincoln spent the last months of his life trying to reunite the nation, Dan Warner—living on his own as a soldier—was back living in his parents' house. He was still trying to make sense of this dynamic Reconstruction world and his place in it as he taught school each day.

Late that first year back home, he ended a day of school teaching by joining friends at another schoolhouse where some religious meetings were being held. Byers tells us that at this time in young Dan's life, attending a religious meeting was likely not his first choice for an activity with his friends. He had been living the life of "an infidel" in this small community populated by Catholics and Lutherans where "[t]here was too much whiskey and tobacco and too little of genuine Christianity for a convincing testimony in favor of the latter" (Byers 1921, 38). Dan found little appeal in the religious habits of his neighbors and instead chose to pursue a life of amusement and distraction, singing and dancing sometimes until the wee hours of the morning. In fact,

Byers tells us that even with his only sister on her death bed with a severe illness, one night Dan went to a dance hall. When he returned home very late, he found his mother at the door of his room. As only a mother can do, “she expostulated with her boy regarding his sinful career” (Byers 1921, 39).

Apparently, in the schoolhouse religious meeting with his friends that particular evening, God had other plans for Daniel Sidney Warner that would change his chosen path. That choice would ultimately set the stage for many other young people who, like him, were trying to find their own gifts and their calling in life. And some of those young people would create a place, ultimately a university (your university), where people could discover and develop their God-given talents and prepare themselves for lives of purpose and service around the world.

Real Life. Transformed.

It’s a powerful thing when your worldview is transformed and you begin to think of yourself and your life purpose in new ways. That night at a religious meeting in an Ohio schoolhouse, Warner seems to have experienced what the apostle Paul wrote about so many years ago in his letter to followers of Jesus living in Rome: “Do not conform any longer to the pattern of this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind. Then you will be able to test and approve what God’s will is—his good, pleasing and perfect will” (Romans 12:2 [NIV]). Byers tells us, “The meeting was one of power, and sinners were made to reflect on the question of their soul’s salvation. On their way home . . . [Warner’s] companions were expressing their opinions as to religion, what it was, etc. One of them, addressing Dan, said, ‘What do you think it is?’ He replied, ‘I am going to find out’” (1921, 39). A transformation of his thinking and the direction of his life had begun.

Dan continued to teach school as he sought answers to his questions about religion and life. What was God up to in His world? And what was God’s path for Dan’s life in that world? So, as a new school year began that fall of 1865, he chose to further develop the talents of study and teaching that God had given him by pursuing higher education. He enrolled in an English preparatory course at Oberlin College and studied there diligently even as he continued to gain experience in his profession of teaching. Byers notes, “It is known . . . that his excellency of character shone while he was at school and was the subject of remark” (2021, 41). Warner’s life in those early years of his new faith embodied

the words of Jesus' disciple Peter: "If anyone speaks, they should do so as one who speaks the very words of God. If anyone serves, they should do so with the strength God provides, so that in all things God may be praised through Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 4:11 [NIV]).

While in his college studies, Warner continued to read the Bible, talk to ministers and more mature Christians, and grow in his faith and understanding of God's gifting and calling in his life. He was troubled by the heartache and needs he saw around him as his nation emerged from war. He wanted others to experience the new hope and joy he had found by trusting and following Jesus Christ. So, he began to look for a church that taught what he was reading in the Bible, a church of believers serving others through the power and leadership of God's Holy Spirit in their individual lives.

But what he found in the churches around him was disheartening. Remember the context of the post-Civil War churches? He began to question the divisions he saw among the many Christian groups. In his reading of the Scriptures he could not find any call to submit to a humanly devised creed or sectarian structure. And as he searched, he felt that God was calling him to leave his profession of school teaching and use his talents as a minister but not one who asked people to become a member of any sect or denomination. His study of the New Testament church—what he believed to be the true church—revealed a movement not governed by man-made religious rules but, instead, a body led and empowered by God's Holy Spirit working through humble, obedient people.

That early New Testament church of Christ-followers that Warner saw in the Bible was made up of ordinary people, working people like carpenters, fishermen, doctors, lawyers, seamstresses, and tentmakers. They were "professional" people who had accepted Christ's forgiveness by believing His sacrificial death had paid the price for their sins and reconciled them to their Creator. They didn't all leave their professions; rather, they lived as transformed people even as they did their daily work. It bore witness to the apostle Paul's words, "Whatever you do, work at it with all your heart, as working for the Lord, not for human masters, since you know that you will receive an inheritance from the Lord as a reward. It is the Lord Christ you are serving" (Colossians 3: 23-24 [NIV]).

Warner studied and prayed and came to believe that no human

being could create a creed or set of rules sufficient to organize this diverse movement of believers as God's true church. Only the Holy Spirit working through surrendered lives could help each of them to discover, develop, and share the gifts God had put within them. Only the Holy Spirit could guide and empower them to use their talents for God's glory and for the service of others.

In his profession as a teacher, and later in preparing for his calling as a minister, Warner saw the great value of using his talents to both glorify his Lord and serve the people around him, even as together they rebuilt their nation and their lives. But he also clearly saw his need for higher education and professional training to sharpen those talents. He wanted to broaden his understanding of the world, its history, its systems, and the tools and technologies available to do his work and fulfill God's purposes for his life.

Tools, Technologies, and Training

Again, understanding the context of this story is important. It was the late nineteenth century with no electricity, no telephones or television, no internet, no cars (and most roads were dirt paths). In the later years of the 19th century, the communications tools available to teachers and ministers like Daniel Warner were public speaking (with no amplification) and publications, such as newspapers, magazines, and books. The transportation technologies available to reach an audience with your message were trains, riverboats, horses, and your own two feet. Warner needed to study the school subjects he taught and the Gospel messages he later preached, but he also had to learn how to use the travel and communications tools and technologies available in his time.

If the spoken word was his greatest tool to teach and to share his Gospel message with others, his studies of English literature and grammar would help him to write and speak with clarity and credibility. If publishing his writing was then needed to broaden the reach of his ministry, he would learn to edit and lay out newspapers and books, and even to operate a printing press. If entrepreneurship and leadership skills were needed to attract ministry partners and organizational skills were necessary to train and place them in helpful roles, with the guidance of God's Spirit in him, he would study and practice to develop those abilities as well.

Byers writes of Warner and his ministry partners developing and sharing their various talents much like the early followers of Jesus:

We note the characteristics of the church in the days of the apostles, which, by reason of its recent founding and organization by the Holy Spirit, is naturally regarded as exemplary and ideal. It had no creed but the Scriptures and no government but that administered by the Holy Spirit, *who “set the members in the body as it pleased him”—apostles, prophets, teachers, evangelists, pastors, etc.* Thus subject to the Spirit, the early church was flexible, capable of expansion and of walking in all the truth and of adjusting itself to all conditions. . . There were no dividing lines, for it was the will of the Lord particularly that there be “one fold and one shepherd.” (Byers 1921, 11, emphasis added)

Obedying the Lord’s “Great Commandment”

Byers highlights that God created each of us to take our places in this world *according to the unique gifts and abilities He placed within us*. In considering Warner’s experiences and his own path into teaching, he explains the need for higher education and training that inspired AU’s early leaders: “There is necessarily the human element in the work of God, for Christian work is God and man working together; but in the true relation man is God’s instrumentality and is altogether in subjection to the divine Head, who rules over all” (Byers 1921, 16).

God and man work together to accomplish His purposes in the world. Jesus’ own words tell us that God created each of us to use the talents He has given us for two great purposes: first, to glorify Himself and second, to serve and bless others. When asked by religious leaders of His day to identify the “greatest commandment” by which people should live, Jesus’ answer elevated both of these purposes for which we are created: Jesus replied, “‘Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.’ This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like it: ‘Love your neighbor as yourself.’ All the Law and the Prophets hang on these two commandments” (Matthew 22:37-40 [NIV]).

AU Began as a Business . . . and a Professional Training Program

Anderson University was first known as Anderson Bible Training School. Because of that name, you might assume that we began with the narrow focus of teaching preachers about the Bible, and in a way,

that is true. But my reading of our history seems to tell a bigger story, one that makes today's extensive professional programs predate even ministerial studies on our campus.

Before there was any school, it seems to me that the founders of AU were in our current vernacular "professionals," though, as volunteers in ministry, they would likely cringe at my use of that term. Yes, their primary purpose was sharing the good news of Christ, but as a tool in that enterprise, they were also "business people" in the publishing industry running a small kitchen-table company begun by—you guessed it—Daniel Sidney Warner. I told you that we'd eventually get to this connection with his story, didn't I?

So now let's ask more "W" questions. What led these evangelists and sometime businessmen to launch what at first was only a narrowly defined program to train skilled workers for a publishing company to spread the "good news" they printed? And then—the real focus of this essay—what later led them to expand that vision to become a comprehensive liberal arts university with a variety of strong professional programs? Context is everything to a good story, and the context for our AU story now begins with the relocation of this small publishing business to Anderson, Indiana, in the early 1900s.

Yes, these business managers saw themselves as ministers and evangelists calling others to faith in Christ, but they also used their considerable professional skills to produce valued products and services to sell in the marketplace. They created jobs, engineered work processes, innovated products, and developed markets to grow sales and generate cash flows. Over time they even expanded the scope of their enterprise by opening "Old People's Homes," staffed with healthcare providers (Callen 1988, 26). This multifaceted operation required visionary leadership, project management skills, engineers and construction managers, accountants, skilled tradespeople, marketing and salespeople, logistics specialists, public relations, and promotional workers.

The publishing business was called the Gospel Trumpet Company. After its shaky beginnings in a rented office on Illinois Street in Indianapolis (between today's Monument Circle and the State Capitol building), Warner's successors moved the publishing operations to several locations including Grand Junction, Michigan, where Warner died in 1895. His leadership role as editor for the enterprise fell to Enoch

E. Byrum, part of the family honored in the naming of Byrum Hall, the theatrical arts center on AU's campus. Over the next decade, they again moved several times before landing in Anderson, Indiana. Beginning in 1906, they built an impressive multi-storied cement block structure for the publishing business and its workers on the site where AU's Decker Hall now stands. In fact, in the Decker Hall lobby across from the president's office is an architect's model of that first building, which came to be known as "Old Main."

We Were a "Professional" School From the Very Beginning

Years before the 1917 formal launch of the Anderson Bible Training School (ABTS) as the "Education Department" of the Gospel Trumpet Company, the publishing firm's leaders sought to grow their national salesforce—and enlarge the market and distribution of their products—by asking current readers to help them extend the reach of their ministry. They could support the work by selling subscriptions to the weekly Trumpet paper and promoting books and other new publications in their communities. But even the most dedicated readers and partners in their ministry needed some instruction in the best promotion and sales methods. Soon they also created a training program aimed at helping these aspiring salespeople to better develop their knowledge and skills. As early as 1909 in their flagship weekly newspaper publication, *The Gospel Trumpet*, they advertised a correspondence course in salesmanship:



Correspondence Course in Salesmanship.

A practical course of lessons for our agents and those selling gospel literature.

Five separate lessons. Subjects treated: the principles of selling, qualities the agent should possess, understanding the customer, gaining attention, explaining the book, etc.

DESCRIPTION.

The lessons are in printed form, size 8 1/2x11 inches, with a neatly designed heading for each page. Questions are asked on the lessons. They are to be answered and returned to us for correction. When the answers to one lesson are returned the next one will be sent.

OUTLINE OF LESSONS.

Lesson I. Introductory. A plan for those taking up the work.

Lesson II. The agent. His attitude toward his work. Health. Value of time. Questions.

Lesson III. The agent and his customer. The study of human nature. Test. Answering objections. Value of influence. Questions.

Lesson IV. The agent and his book. Making the proposition. Acquiring customers. How to study the book. Questions.

Lesson V. Making the sale. Showing the book. The opening and closing. Getting information. Gospel observations.

RATES.

Pay with a \$11.00 cash order for books of our own publication. Free for ten new yearly subscriptions to the Gospel Trumpet. Price of the course, \$10.00.

Gospel Trumpet Co., Anderson, Ind.

Just take a look at that advertisement for new students. Three dollars per course sounds pretty good today, doesn't it? But more importantly

for our topic of professional programs at AU, it shows the continuous thread of a central guiding principle.

In the Scriptures so treasured both by AU's founders and our campus leaders today, they read these words from the apostle Paul written to new followers of Christ in the ancient Greek city of Corinth: "There are different kinds of gifts, but the same Spirit distributes them. There are different kinds of service, but the same Lord. There are different kinds of working, but in all of them and in everyone it is the same God at work" (1 Corinthians 12:4-6 [NIV]). From its very beginning—and even *before* it began as a Bible training school—Anderson University's founders recognized that God has given His people a variety of talents. Not everyone is gifted and called to be a pastor, missionary, or minister. In his book *Preparing for Service, A History of Higher Education in the Church of God*, former Anderson University Dean Barry Callen describes this growing attitude when he cites a 1912 article from *The Gospel Trumpet* by H. A. Brooks titled "Advantages and Value of Education." Callen says, "An increasing number of competent leaders was needed. Evangelistic teams needed singers with trained voices. The [Gospel Trumpet] company needed good writers, editors, and copy readers It was time for something important to be born" (Callen 1988, 26). Those founders believed that it was an act of worship and good stewardship for everyone to study, practice, and grow their particular talents to their highest potential for service to God and other people.

Surely by now you've read the AU mission statement and core values as part of your LART class assignments. Found in the university catalog and on our website, they will help you understand the commitments of your professors and the campus staff as they help you make educational choices and prepare for service:

The mission of Anderson University is to educate for a life of faith and service in the church and society...Through academic and Christian discovery, we intend to graduate people with a global perspective who are competent, caring, creative and generous individuals of character and potential Our identity as a Christian university can be described in three words: Real life transformed.

We aspire to be a transformative Christian community informed by these core values:

- Servant leadership
- Excellence
- Integrity
- Responsibility
- Generosity (Anderson University Undergraduate Catalog 2021-2022, 4)

These were also common themes found in the publications of the Gospel Trumpet Company, and from the start, they have shaped the education programs offered by the Anderson Bible Training School (ABTS), the educational department of that publishing business, later by Anderson College, and still today Anderson University.

A Professional Purpose, Then and Today

In AU's very first academic catalog, published for ABTS in 1918, just prior to the start of its second year, Joseph T. Wilson, the Gospel Trumpet Company's new president, is listed as the chairman of the School Committee and the school's first principal. Wilson had joined the Trumpet family shortly after it located in Anderson, and his education and professional skills had elevated him to become general manager before his appointment as president in 1917. Once in that role, he wasted no time in forming the School Committee and expanding the Gospel Trumpet's educational offerings beyond just training for its own employees. They offered classes to all people with a desire to develop their talents for service to God and His world. He writes about the school's first days and the founders' purposes and goals:

On Oct. 2, 1917, the opening day, a large company of interested young people were present to begin their studies; and everything considered, the first year of this work brought very gratifying results. . . . Although the war [World War I] is sure to limit the attendance to some extent, the prospect is that there will be a much larger body of students during the present year.

A number of causes have contributed to the founding of the Anderson Bible Training School. The chief of these has been the great desire for such an institution on the part of many young people who feel called to the ministry and yet realize the need of being better qualified for their work. . . . There is also a great need of more good writers, editorial workers, and copy-preparers; and these must be educated among us or go elsewhere to get the

necessary education. (*Catalog of the Anderson Bible Training School, 1917-1918, 1918*)

Why the concern that young people associated with this reformation movement known as the Church of God might seek higher education elsewhere? Let's revisit the historical and cultural contexts for our AU story.

The Strained Relational History of Academy and Church in America

Higher education in the United States began while we were still a colony of England. Furthermore, it began as “Christian” higher education, with the first schools founded by the early settlers’ church leaders. They wanted to make sure they had prepared the next generation of leaders to enable their children to survive in their new American home. Harvard College began in 1636 with this statement of purpose:

After God had carried us safe to New England, and we had builded our houses, provided necessities for our livelihood, rear’d convenient places for God’s worship, and settled the Civil Government: One of the next things we longed for, and looked after was to advance Learning, and perpetuate it to Posterity, dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches, when our present Ministers shall lie in the Dust (*New England's First Fruits*, n.d. 1).

In the early years of our AU story, following the Civil War and on into the early days of the twentieth century, the nation had begun to move from its agricultural roots and was making many significant industrial and scientific discoveries. Cities grew large as people left the farms to take more urban jobs in factories and shops and government. These new opportunities called for new knowledge and skills—and new kinds of educational opportunities.

Pressure had grown for higher education to liberate itself from the religious constraints of its founding churches. Barry Callen describes those days of historic change in higher education:

It was argued that the mind of man must be unfettered, loosed to reason boldly and act even revolutionarily on behalf of human happiness. The industrial progress of the nation was developing a need for persons with specialized training not available in the usual liberal arts curriculum that characterized most church-related colleges. (1988, 5)

With specific regard to those AU founders in the Gospel Trumpet Company and their colleagues in the Church of God, Callen writes, “These changes caused many Christian people to distrust higher education and even to fear that cultivation of the mind might be dangerous to the life of faith and a direct threat to the health of the church” (1988, 4).

AU’s second president, Robert Reardon, arrived in Anderson in 1920 as a newborn when his father came to pastor Park Place Church of God, now on the western edge of campus across from Decker Hall. He grew up running around the campus and knew its founders well. He reflects upon the school’s early days and how within a few years of its start, its narrow Bible training focus expanded to include educational opportunities for more than ministerial students:

At perhaps the most critical moment in our movement’s history, when we could easily have turned rigid and cultish, [J.T. Wilson] ingrafted a small educational organism into the vitals of the Church of God reformation movement. . . .This college became the window open upon the world, a spawning ground for fresh ideas and young leaders, a safeguard against the narrow parochial mind, and a home where theologians, biblical scholars, and *practitioners of other disciplines* could contribute to the upbuilding of the church and its young people. (qtd. in Callen 1992, 56, emphasis added)

Although the Gospel Trumpet Company had for years offered professional training through correspondence courses like salesmanship, and its education department gave training for printers and editors, social workers, and healthcare providers in its homes for the aged, we should be clear in understanding that our university’s first real “college” programs were indeed narrowly focused upon Bible training and some related practical courses. But within just a few years, ABTS grew and attracted two new leaders with a much broader vision. They were moved to provide higher education to those God had gifted and called to professions far beyond pastoral ministry. They saw those “practitioners of other disciplines” whom Reardon spoke of as also important to God’s work in the world. These two men wanted these young people to be able to explore and expand their gifts and talents on the Anderson campus as well.

The Dream Team: John A. Morrison and George Russell Olt

In just its third year of operation ABTS had grown in numbers, both among students and its teaching faculty. The ending of World War I and the start of the “Roaring Twenties” was raising the nation’s sights to dream of bigger things. This was especially true among conservative people of Christian faith like those in that reformation movement known as the Church of God. As more young people across the church showed interest in the new school, the need for more professors able to teach a broader curriculum of courses became clear. But this movement of simple people with a general suspicion of higher education didn’t provide many ready candidates possessing academic training and credentials suitable for college teaching.

J.T. Wilson had himself attended college at two institutions in his native Pennsylvania prior to moving to Anderson to work for the Gospel Trumpet Company. The only full-time teacher on the first faculty, H.C. Clausen held a two-year diploma from Moody Bible Institute. Russell Byrum, an editor for the publishing company and a member of the firm’s School Committee that launched ABTS, along with his wife Bessie, also an early teacher at the school, were both widely read, but did not possess even high school diplomas. Most of the small faculty of five taught only part time while they continued their full-time assignments in the publishing company. They needed help from experienced, trained teachers as both enrollment and demand for new majors increased.

Through his editorial work for *The Gospel Trumpet*, Russell Byrum became aware of John A. Morrison, a 23-year-old pastor in Delta, Colorado, who had submitted several articles for publication in the paper. Byrum learned that Morrison had taught school in his native Missouri for several years before entering the ministry. With this small bit of inspiration, he convinced J.T. Wilson to recruit Morrison to join the faculty for the school’s third year in the fall of 1919. Wilson’s letter shows how desperate he was for help from anyone with teaching experience:

As you probably know I have been not only president of the Gospel Trumpet Co., but also chairman of the School committee and one of the teachers in the Bible Training School here. And now it seems [that one of our few teachers will] go on a missionary tour during the next year. If he does I must take over his duties as general manager which will make it necessary for me to turn over some of my duties to someone else. I am

writing you therefore with the hope that you may be persuaded to relieve me of my duties as a teacher in the Bible School. The person who takes over this work should have some experience as a teacher and also as a minister and I am informed that you have both...Now of course I do not want to give you the impression that we are offering you the position before we know that you are qualified for it. But we are anxious that you write us at once. Let us know if you will accept a place of this kind. (Morrison 1962, 125)

At his young age, and with very little experience as either a teacher or a minister, Morrison was understandably surprised to receive such an invitation. He humbly accounts for his thoughts at receiving this invitation when he writes,

The low estate of education in our movement at the time . . . is attested to by the fact that one such as I would be invited to have a place in the one and only educational institution operated by the church. As I look back over the years, I cannot think of a single qualification I had to justify the idea. My formal education was almost nil. True, I had taught in public schools of Missouri for six years and for one year in West Virginia. But slight preparation was required for that. As a lad I went to the country school only a few months out of each year. I did finally graduate from the eighth grade. I never entered high school. I attended normal school a few terms in preparation for teaching. I took correspondence courses, but nothing of significance. Only in America, I suppose, could such a thing happen such as happened in my relationship to Anderson College. (Morrison 1962, 125)

Morrison arrived in Anderson with his young family in July of 1919. By the October start of school, he had studied and prepared himself as well as he could to teach whatever courses were needed. Within just a few years, he taught classes not only in Bible and preaching but also psychology and sociology and other more “professional” and academic subjects. He had also been named assistant principal to Wilson and assumed more administrative and promotional duties. As the enrollment of students slowly grew and as their individual skills and interests created demand for courses to prepare them for fields in

addition to pastoral ministry, Morrison and his colleagues began to dream of a broader curriculum.

Morrison was soon called upon to lead in the fulfillment of that dream. J.T. Wilson's days of heading the young school were about to come to an end. In the summer of 1923, after just six years of leading the Gospel Trumpet Company and ABTS, both institutions were struggling financially. The boards overseeing each institution encouraged Wilson to step away from his leadership roles. Morrison was named principal as the new school term began. Thankful for the opportunity but painfully aware that his limited formal training—no high school diploma and certainly no college degree—was not enough for the school and its graduates to be taken seriously within higher education, he began looking for a true academic leader within the church movement that had birthed ABTS. He soon found just such a colleague, already well-respected within the ranks of both academia and the Church of God movement.

In nearby Ohio, George Russell Olt was busy leading Wilmington College as both a teacher of psychology and philosophy and an academic dean. He did all this while also pastoring a Church of God congregation in Cincinnati on the weekends. AU professor emeritus Merle Strege writes of Morrison's great need for such a partner to complement his own limited skills and experience:

John Morrison brought several gifts to the leadership of Anderson Bible Training School. He was courageous and possessed a deep commitment, almost a reverence, for formal education. . . . Morrison accepted his limitations and possessed the common sense not to pretend they didn't exist. He knew the young school needed people who exceeded him in knowledge and academic experience. He accepted the task of persuading them to join the project he headed. In John Morrison's long presidency, no decision was of greater significance than his selection of Russell Olt as the school's first dean. (2016, 139)

Olt was a rarity among people in the church and its ministry at that time. He held three college degrees in professional and academic fields. His graduate degree in philosophical psychology was from the University of Cincinnati, one of those secular schools mistrusted by many of this reformation movement's people. So, though he had found nurture for his growing faith within the holiness and unity message of

the Church of God and had answered God's calling to pastor a church in that movement, his personal gifts and interests had also led him to seek higher education and professional training in schools with broader academic programs. Yes, he and Morrison had great differences in backgrounds, but they shared a common dream of excellent Christ-centered higher education for all young people, regardless of their diverse talents and professional interests.

After many visits to Ohio and lots of correspondence, Morrison slowly convinced Olt to leave a great job with a well-established college to come and join his small team in Anderson. A transformation into a more comprehensive liberal arts school with diverse professional programs began to take shape. Strege writes, "While he recruited a dean, John Morrison simultaneously planned the separation of ABTS from the Gospel Trumpet Company" (2016, 42). Now, with its own state charter as an independent entity, yet still very much linked to its founding church movement, within a few years the school changed its name and the breadth of its educational opportunities and became known as *Anderson College* and Theological Seminary.

As you walk across campus today, you'll see that our first student residence hall is named for John Morrison. And as you walk to the east from that residence hall and through the campus valley, you'll soon come to our university student center named for Russell Olt. A statue of Morrison in front of Decker Hall welcomes all to campus. And a portrait of Olt near the student dining rooms reminds visitors of his legacy to build a comprehensive academic program with a strong faculty and great resources. We owe a great deal to the vision and tenacity of this dream team as well as the faculty and staff they called to join them.

Visionaries and Champions

As we observed earlier, professional training beyond coursework in pastoral ministry was in the school's DNA even before its official launch in 1917. But the birth and growth of any new university program requires at least two things: a recognized need for trained professionals in a given field and then a campus champion to provide the vision and energy to start and grow the educational program to help meet it. AU has a wonderful history of leaders who were skilled at reading the needs of our world and of innovative faculty with the skills and inspiration to develop programs to meet those needs.

If you've spent much time exploring our campus you've learned that

our largest campus building is named the Kardatzke Wellness Center. The first of many in the Kardatzke family to study here was Carl Kardatzke. He arrived shortly before Dean Russell Olt began to change the curriculum and offer “regular college courses” in a greater variety of professional fields. Kardatzke was a gifted scholar, avid reader, and wonderful communicator of what he learned—in other words, a natural-born teacher. Shortly following his 1927 graduation from ABTS, he was ordained into the ministry and briefly pastored several small churches during the start of the Great Depression. But his talents, heart, and true calling were in higher education. He soon answered that call and, while still pastoring, pursued graduate studies at the University of Kentucky, earning a PhD in education in 1933.

Upon returning to his alma mater, Kardatzke began to build AU’s first truly professional program, the preparation of teachers. Within just four years, the education program was certified by Indiana’s state board of education. Strege notes,

The appointment of Carl Kardatzke was a crucial stage in the evolution of [AU’s] teacher education program. . . . Neither Morrison nor Olt had in mind the idea of learning pursued solely for intrinsic reward. Rather, they believed a well-rounded education in the liberal arts opened the door to a variety of majors. Study in any could lead to a career, and careers wrapped in the mantle of service fitted readily with the ideal of *utilitas* on the new college seal.¹ (2016, 111)

But Kardatzke’s legacy in birthing professional programs at AU is not limited to teacher education. He also had deep interests in young people, family life, and those needing counseling and therapy. He authored two books and many study aids on human sexuality and healthy family relationships. So, in addition to his load of education courses, he also taught many of the first classes that grew into today’s professional programs in counseling, social work, family science, and psychology.

1. How is your Latin? The college seal, found on a large stone marker in front of Decker Hall and the wall outside the president’s office, includes the words *veritas*, *fidelitas* and *utilitas*. Google Translate will tell you these mean truth, fidelity and usefulness.

The Social Sciences and the Impact of Yet Another War

Another campus visionary and champion arrived as World War II was winding down. Dean Olt was relentless in his pursuit of recognized scholars to grow the reputation of Anderson College as he sought full accreditation of the school by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Strege writes of this time and this particular “champion” in this way:

In the wake of the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor, the North Central Association placed a moratorium on accreditation applications. . . . To achieve accreditation [following the war] the faculty had to grow, and its quality had to improve. North Central's moratorium gave Dean Olt time to recruit professors critical to a successful application. In four years he enlarged the faculty and significantly increased the number of professors who held terminal degrees. . . . None brought stronger scholarship and greater teaching competence than Candace Stone. (2016, 134)

With multiple graduate degrees from prestigious universities and a wealth of experience in the U.S. and abroad as a researcher and teacher of history, political science, law, and international relations, perhaps Dr. Stone's greatest impact came from her personal contacts. She knew former first lady Eleanor Roosevelt and brought her to campus. She also knew the 1940 Republican candidate for president, Wendell Willkie, as well as numerous other influential people in government, industry, and education. She connected students and her faculty colleagues in ways that enlarged everyone's vision and inspired courageous new activities and programs. Anderson University's current programs in history, political science, national security, and international studies are all built upon the foundations she laid.

From Secretarial Studies to the Falls School of Business

Throughout the early years of ABTS and Anderson College, the school consistently offered a limited curriculum in business or “commerce.” Most of these courses were in general economics to better understand the world in which we live or clerical skills, such as typing and shorthand. But with the end of World War II and the financial assistance available to veterans through the G.I. Bill, the demand grew for a deeper, broader program to prepare students for professional lives in the booming post-war business environment. Increased enrollment

and the federal dollars that came with these war veterans allowed Morrison and Olt to recruit new faculty and develop a variety of new professional programs, including business studies.

That first faculty team from the school's earliest days was quickly approaching retirement age. Dean Olt looked to AC's brightest recent graduates and encouraged many of them to pursue graduate degrees in these fast-growing fields and then return and help build the next generation of faculty. Together they could expand the curriculum and add a growing list of professional programs to meet the needs of the post-war world.

One returning veteran on the G.I. Bill was R. Glenn Falls. During his teen years in his home church in Denver, Colorado, a number of AC alumni had passed through as preachers and evangelists. One such visitor was Carl Kardatzke's younger brother Ewald, known to friends as "Mit." While preaching in Denver, he encouraged Falls to pursue his further education in his church's college in far-away Indiana. So, following his military service to his country during the war, he enrolled in 1946.

With his family running a small grocery store in Denver, Falls chose to major in business with thoughts of returning to take over the store as his parents retired. He did well in the few courses taught by the slim business faculty, but near the end of his senior year, he dropped by Dean Olt's office and complained about the weak state of the business major. Olt challenged him to help improve it. So, with no guarantee of a teaching position when he finished, Falls enrolled in graduate studies at Indiana University. Over the next six years, he earned both a master's and doctorate and passed the certified public accounting exams. He then returned to AC, where he joined Harold Linamen and Mary Lou Barr to teach business. Barr left a few years later, but Falls and Linamen—both committed Christian servants who saw teaching as their ministry—anchored the program, steadily building it to become one of the largest professional programs on campus.

As these two builders approached their own retirements in the 1980s they recruited several of their former students, such as current professors Doyle Lucas and Jerry Fox (the author of this essay), to do what they had done: begin graduate studies in business and return to help build a stronger program. Soon Dean Patrick Allen, the new academic leader of what was now called *Anderson University (AU)*,

challenged this new generation of business faculty to develop graduate programs in business at both the master's and doctoral levels. Under the leadership of Ken Armstrong, the Business Department was renamed the Falls School of Business, and soon the program grew to serve one-fourth of AU's student body, including some 250 MBA and 75 DBA graduate program students each year. The increased tuition income from these graduate programs enabled the business faculty to grow to more twenty-five full-time and adjunct professors, offering greater specialization and a diversity of voices for students in every business major within the school's programs.

Is There a Doctor, or Nurse, in the House?

Early in the 1920s, Morrison and Olt saw the need to add the sciences to their curriculum if they ever hoped to gain both accreditation and respect within the broader academic community. Early graduates were not even given diplomas, and other colleges and universities did not accept their ABTS courses and credits when applying for entrance. By the early 1930s, with few science courses and barely adequate laboratories, the school catalog nonetheless listed a pre-med course of study.

Several early graduates completed studies in Bible along with this very slim pre-med sciences track and then went to medical school before serving as medical missionaries around the world. In fact, we now have a campus reminder of the legacy of one of those first medical missionary alums. As a creative way to settle his tuition bills for his pre-med studies, David Gaulke was offered the opportunity by President Morrison to complete a much needed campus improvement project. Today, as you walk north from the lower level of Decker Hall across the valley towards the Wilson Library building, you will cross a stone bridge. That is the Gaulke Bridge, a wonderful part of the "professional" training that helped to grow our medical sciences programs.

Once again, the growing enrollment and broader interests of returning veterans on the G.I. Bill created the need and opportunity for further growth in the sciences and the professions that they supported. In 1947 Marie Mayo graduated first in her class at Anderson College. Like Glenn Falls in business, she had taken all of the science courses AC offered and found them insufficient preparation for the needs and opportunities of post-war America. She enrolled in Tulane University's graduate program and by the fall of 1950 was back on the Anderson

campus to teach biology and anatomy, even as she pursued doctoral studies at Indiana University.

Merle Strege describes the critical role she played in birthing today's professional programs in not only health care but scientific research and teaching. He states, "An anatomist, Mayo taught alongside her former [AC] teacher, Zylpha Hurlbut, professor of biology. . . . Mayo then assumed responsibility for advancing biology studies at AC almost single-handedly. She taught introductory biology as well as the advanced courses that prepared students for medical school" (2016, 191). Today the city of Anderson and the surrounding area is served by two local hospitals, Community and Ascension St. Vincent. A great number of both doctors and nurses—as well as technicians and business administrators—in these healthcare systems received their first training at Anderson University. In the post-war years, Ascension St. Vincent, then known as St. John's Hospital, offered a nurses training program. But as greater faculty resources appeared across town at the institution then still known as Anderson College, they partnered with our campus to birth our nursing program, today headed by Lynn Schmidt and staffed by an amazing faculty. For the past two years, it has been recognized as the top nursing program in Indiana, and its graduates pass board exams at the highest rates among nursing programs in the state.

If You Build It, They Will Come

The *Anderson University Undergraduate Catalog, 2021-22* highlights a newly organized department with some of the most recent professional programs on campus. The description of this department reads, "The Department of Physical Sciences and Engineering offers majors in biochemistry, chemistry, physics, physical science, electrical engineering, computer engineering, engineering physics, mechanical engineering, and mechatronics engineering. . . . Students gain broad scientific and engineering knowledge in the classroom while having opportunities to do significant research. Graduates often go on to medical and graduate programs, while others find careers as scientists and engineers" (2021, 164).

As with the birth of the professional programs we've already reviewed, these exciting contemporary opportunities came from faculty and campus leaders of vision and energy. Dr. Chad Wallace and Dr. Scott Kennedy each studied engineering as foundations in

their graduate studies before joining the AU faculty. They and other colleagues examined the needs of our nation and world and, within AU's mission of Christian service, designed these new programs and recruited a team of excellent faculty colleagues to join them. Like so many of our professional program faculty, this group stays on the cutting edge of their fields as consultants to engineering firms and multinational corporations, such as Google and its life sciences subsidiary, Verily. And who says that technical engineering studies can't be fun? Under the leadership of this talented faculty, students have designed and built a solar-powered car, robots, and a remotely driven go-kart that has won awards in competitions against other excellent programs in universities across the country.

The “Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval”

It's easy for AU to say that its professional programs are among the best in higher education, but what do outsiders who really know these career fields have to say about them? Back in 1946, President Morrison and Dean Olt saw the fulfillment of one of their biggest dreams, full accreditation of Anderson College by the North Central Association. Today AU's overall curriculum and degree programs are accredited by the Higher Learning Commission. But what about the professional programs? Take a look at this list of secondary, higher-level professional groups that have granted accreditation to AU's top career programs:

- Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET)
- Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP)
- Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE)
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)
- Council on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE)
- Council on Social Work Education (CSWE)
- National Association of Schools of Music (NASM)

Writing Your Own AU Story—As Part of God's Mega-Story

A lot of human history has been covered in these few pages—from God's creation and redemption of the world in Christ to His work in and through the lives of Jesus' early followers, all the way to D.S. Warner, J.T. Wilson, John Morrison, and Russell Olt, and even to some of your professors on the AU campus today.

Maybe the best way I can challenge you to personally seek God's guidance as you now discover and develop your own talents is through the story of AU's current president, John Pistole. His father, Hollis Pistole, a Church of God pastor, moved his family to Anderson when John was just a year old after accepting an invitation to teach in AU's School of Theology. But as President Pistole began to write his own AU story, it was clear that, unlike his father, pastoral ministry did not fit his sense of his skills and personal interests. As a student, he prepared for law school and what he thought might be a prestigious and well-paying career.

However, it took only a short time working in an Anderson law firm for him to realize that he was not going to find fulfillment spending his life in that line of work. A friend had once suggested that the FBI needed lawyers, especially those with athleticism like Pistole, who had lettered in two varsity sports during his college days. Over the next two decades, his talents, his professional study and preparation, and his personal integrity as a follower of Christ made him stand out among his peers. He rose to the number two spot in the FBI as deputy director to Robert Mueller before President Barack Obama asked him to lead the Transportation Security Administration. Now he is your university president, bringing all of this experience and learning to lead your school and help you as you begin your own story of servant leadership, excellence, integrity, responsibility, and generosity.

President Pistole is just one of thousands of Anderson University graduates who today are writing their parts of God's mega-story in our world. Soon you will join our ranks as you take your AU education and experiences to live out both parts of the Savior's call to each of us. Do you remember Jesus' answer when asked what should give purpose to our lives? According to Matthew 22: 37-40, Jesus replied, "'Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.' This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like it: 'Love your neighbor as yourself.' All the Law and the Prophets hang on these two commandments" (NIV). Consider President Pistole's own words from the opening pages of this year's university catalog:

This is where your college experience begins. Before you move onto the Anderson University campus, you plan a course for your first academic year. You sit down with one of our faculty advisors, and you start your story.

My own Anderson University story started in the 1970s. I came with a single focus—myself. What happened during the next four years transformed my life. My vision broadened as I aligned the focus of my life with God’s expectations for me: To act justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with God (Micah 6:8 [NIV]).

Each academic program offered in this catalog was designed by a remarkable group of faculty, who bring exceptional skills and knowledge to the classroom. Each course is a building block that fulfills our mission to educate students for lives of faith and service in the church and society. By choosing a liberal arts institution, you see value in developing not only as a professional but also as a person. Our faculty and staff are committed to mentoring you and sharing in those experiences with you as well, beginning friendships that will last long past graduation. (*Anderson University Undergraduate Catalog, 2021-2022* 2021, 3)

So, why so many strong professional programs at AU? It’s not because we believe our roots as a Bible training school have lost their importance. We still believe the truth that “the word of God is alive and active. Sharper than any double-edged sword, it penetrates even to dividing soul and spirit, joints and marrow; it judges the thoughts and attitudes of the heart. Nothing in all creation is hidden from God’s sight. Everything is uncovered and laid bare before the eyes of him to whom we must give account” (Hebrews 4:12-13 [NIV]). That’s why we’ve kept study of the Bible as a component of every degree on campus. Since most of us will spend only a few hours a week in a church but most of the remainder of our waking hours in the workplace, shouldn’t we all “[a]lways be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have” (1 Peter 3:15 [NIV])?

It’s time to write your own story in all of its uniqueness. With the guidance and power of God’s Holy Spirit in you, go and make it a great one.

4. Our Commitment to Liberal Arts Education

A Story Within the Bigger Story of AU

DEBORAH (ZARKA) MILLER FOX

A Parable

Let's begin with a story:

Two young travelers set out in search of a restaurant whose reputation had made it famous among all those who know fine cuisine. When they found The Bistro, they were impressed with its highly trained staff, its beautiful dining spaces, and its extensive menu. Of course, The Bistro was an expensive place to eat—\$2000 for an all-day, eight-course feast! What distinguished The Bistro from other restaurants was its mission—not only to feed its honored guests but to teach them to prepare all its entrees and special courses. Excited and hungry for the feast ahead, the two young travelers paid the hefty fee and found open seats at one of the beautifully-laid tables. When the first course arrived, they sampled the food tentatively, taking small bites and watching closely the reactions of their peers. Before the servers carried out the second course, the chefs, who were trained in various culinary arts, counseled the guests to be adventurous in their selections. “But I’m only interested in a few of these foods,” said the young woman with some alarm. “Most of the soups and small plates are things I know I won’t like!”

The chef tried to soothe her anxieties. “You might be surprised how much you like them. After all, isn’t trying new things the reason you came to The Bistro?”

At another table, the young man was having a similar conversation. “Just bring me a double bacon cheeseburger and a chocolate milkshake,” he demanded.

Again, the chef tried to encourage interest in other foods. “The

featured item in the next course is being prepared by a visiting master chef. Aren't you even a little curious?"

The young man crossed his arms. "I didn't pay \$2000 to eat food I probably won't even like. This is my dinner experience, so I should get what I want."

Seeing the young man's resistance, the chef let him make his choice. "Yes, this is your meal, and ultimately you get to decide whether it is meager or magnificent."

For the rest of the feast, the young dinner guests persistently avoided foods that might challenge their palates, complaining when anything unfamiliar was placed in front of them. Seeing his dinner guests' discontent, the maître d' asked why they were so glum. "I came here knowing exactly what foods I plan to eat for the rest of my life," said the young woman, "and I had to eat all of this other stuff, too."

The maître d' nodded. "What makes you so sure that you'll be satisfied with the same small meal every day?"

The young woman opened her mouth, but nothing came out. And she felt a seed of panic in the pit of her stomach.

The young man stood, brushing crumbs from his lap. "I came primarily for The Bistro insignia pin that will show everyone that I've eaten here. That token will win me the respect of everyone who has never eaten here."

Again the maître d' nodded. "Yes," he said, "it is an honor to be known among The Bistro's clientele." He followed the young man to the door. "The Bistro insignia pin will set you apart from all the people in this world who don't have one," said the maître d', "but what will distinguish you among all of those who do?"

And with that, the young man found himself on the sidewalk, knowing very little more about the culinary wonders of the world than he did when he had arrived.

An education, no matter how formal or tattered, is worth very little if it does not change the person it afflicts. I choose that particular condition, *affliction*, because education is both a costly and a painful endeavor—a bit like the sharp leg pains that disturb our sleep all through adolescence. And so much of our education comes in the form of stories—historical narratives, cautionary tales, nursery rhymes, and quadratic equations that riddle even as they teach. It doesn't require

a far stretch of the imagination to conceive of a liberal arts education as an orientation to life through the experience of engagement with a diverse, broadly peopled, and complexly plotted human narrative. Scott Russell Sanders offers a compelling discussion of ten specific powers of story—any story that plucks the strings of our shared humanity.

The fifth power, he contends, is the education of our desires: “The root meaning of educate is to *lead out*, as if everything a student learns were already inside, waiting to be released” (Sanders 2000, 92). If a person can muscle past the dread that precedes intellectual discovery—that all-too-common belief that the things of geometry and Renaissance paintings and Shakespearean sonnets are duller than and as heavy as the stones every gardener has had to haul out of a freshly turned field—then a liberal arts education can lead out the curiosity holed up inside us that is just waiting to be turned loose. “What stories at their best can do is lead our desires in new directions—away from greed, toward generosity; away from suspicion, toward empathy; away from an obsession with material goods, so dear to a consumer culture, and toward a concern for spiritual goods” (Sanders 2000, 92). I would argue that the same is true for the courses in a liberal arts curriculum. Learning is an experience of discovery, but it is also hard work and sometimes disappointing. The heart of the calling to teach within the framework of a Christian liberal arts perspective is to help students recognize and seize upon joy, even if in the middle of a tedious semester that joy is the flecked glimmer of gold panned from so much river muck.

The Evolution of AU’s Liberal Arts Identity and Curriculum

For decades, many four-year colleges took a “buffet” approach to liberal arts education, believing that students were best served if they were made to sample content from as many disciplines as possible. However, a buffet does not necessarily produce an excellent meal, particularly if a person’s choices at this buffet are indiscriminate. A better metaphor for the kind of educational experience that a liberal arts education should provide is a gourmet feast, planned, prepared, and enjoyed through collaboration between skilled culinary experts and the novices they are mentoring. The hunger that brings many students to college is common enough, but the object of many students’ appetite is predictable: a credential with which they can secure the job of their dreams. Although not a bad ambition, this vision

of professional achievement and financial prosperity, it is one that sometimes eclipses all other motivations, causing students to contract their ambitions around a very narrow set of expectations.

Pulitzer Prize-winner George Anders, a contributing writer for both *Forbes* and *The Wall Street Journal*, exalts the marketplace power of a liberal arts education when graduates recognize their eclectic academic experience as an asset rather than an irrelevant accessory on their college transcripts. He believes that one of the most important benefits of a liberal arts education is the openness to new experiences that it trains in a student's intellectual posture (2017, 21).

Anders also challenges the notion that classes in the humanities and social sciences—courses that make up a big part of the traditional liberal arts curriculum—are irrelevant to the professional fields in which many students are hoping to build a career. “New types of jobs keep coming into existence in ways that catch us by surprise. Technology opens up fresh possibilities. So do changing social dynamics; so do evolving public priorities” (2017, 80). While this kind of education DOES have intrinsic value not quantified or justified by monetary measures, it also has extrinsic value that can be clearly measured by its usefulness in both current and future economic settings.

From its beginning, Anderson University has recognized that a clear vocational focus is very helpful for students trying to navigate a path toward productive citizenship, but that this focus should NOT restrict a person's preparation for the future life they imagine. Rather, a person's calling should excite and expand her appetites and interests. A liberal arts education, when it is pursued with curiosity and enthusiasm, is an excellent way to begin the ongoing process of making a life rather than merely making a living.

As a faith-based institution, AU has its roots in the Church of God Movement. The group of Christians who were part of this early church movement understood their calling to be loving God with one's whole self and loving others with the same tenderness, zeal, and compassion with which Jesus loves us. This is one of two great commandments that energize the Movement, the other being Jesus' command to His disciples to go into all the world—their own homes and neighborhoods as well as the far-flung corners of the globe—and make more disciples by introducing people to the person and gospel message of Jesus Christ. Those in the Church of God Movement believe that relationship

with and obedience to the Holy Spirit is transformative—a relational and ongoing experience that enables a person to rise above the crippling effects of sin and share freely the good news of Christ's resurrection ("Our Beliefs," *We Believe* 2003). These beliefs motivated the second generation pioneers of the Church of God Movement to establish a Bible Training School with four distinct disciplinary schools in order to properly equip the next generation of leaders to carry out that calling. In its original conception, this Bible Training School did not confer degrees or offer academic majors. Yet, this fundamental recognition—that knowledge can be gained, that important vocational skills can be nurtured, and that wisdom can be shared—seeded what would become an accredited university with fully developed graduate and undergraduate programs and a diverse population of students, faculty, and staff. Even when the Bible School course curriculum was designed specifically to prepare members of The Gospel Trumpet Company for ministerial and missionary work, students were required to complete courses including English Grammar, Rhetoric and Composition, English Literature, Medieval and Modern History. By 1923, courses in psychology and sociology were also required. Although they were fully committed to the school's mission to prepare young adults for religious vocations, Anderson's first president, John Morrison, and first dean, Russell Olt, were also committed to education for service *outside* the church. Morrison and Olt shepherded the school from Bible Training School to its second identity as an accredited, degree-granting college. Theological training was still at the heart of the school's educational mission, but Morrison and Olt recognized that Christians were doing missional work in all areas of society. Consequently, they expanded the curriculum to include courses in business, education, music, the sciences, and literature.

This foundational academic preparation began taking shape in 1923 when Morrison and Olt added non-theological courses to the curriculum. "In 1927, Morrison proposed to the trustees the construction of a full liberal arts curriculum. Dean Olt and President Morrison envisioned a curriculum that would lead to a full bachelor's degree" (Strege 2016, 52). By 1929, the College of Liberal Arts had been established, and the school's name was changed to Anderson College and Theological Seminary. In addition to their theological training, students were required to complete courses in subjects such as

geology, general psychology, history of western Europe, mathematics, survey of American literature, botany, French, Elizabethan drama, Victorian literature, modern European history, philosophy, sociology, Chaucer and early English literature, and American government (*Catalog* 1929).

This change was not celebrated by everyone in the Church of God Movement. Many ministers and lay leaders “wondered whether it had expanded beyond the church’s need. In the minds of some, liberal arts and professional education exceeded the purview of the church. The expanded curriculum and the character of Anderson College became contested issues” (Strege 2016, 55). Although it created a great deal of controversy and threatened the very existence of Anderson College as a Church of God school, the development of a liberal arts curriculum and the addition of courses in professional areas such as science, education and business led to a considerable increase in enrollment (Strege 2016, 87). In spite of intense pressure to return to its original mission and identity as a Bible Training School, there simply was no going back. According to Strege, “John Morrison’s successful ratification [as college president] in 1934 was a victory for liberal arts education at Anderson College and Church of God Progressive” (2016, 89). Strege further notes, “The notion of education as a liberating discovery fitted nicely with the Progressive vision of the Church of God as a community that embraced all the redeemed in Christ as brothers and sisters If not precisely a cornerstone of the undergraduate curriculum, their commitment to ecclesiological openness nevertheless resonated with the ideals of liberal arts education” (2016, 89). For many who had invested their very lives in the calling articulated by the Great Commission, these changes were radical and disturbing, igniting fear that the school had abandoned its most important work. The kind of formal education being championed by Morrison and Olt was viewed with skepticism by some and open hostility by others. Yet, Morrison and Olt never lost their resolve or their confidence that education and faithful service to God were not mutually exclusive pursuits. The strength of this commitment allowed the college to continue its unique academic unfolding.

By the conclusion of the 1930s, Anderson College’s undergraduate liberal arts program was “the backbone of the curriculum” (Strege 2016, 128). During this decade, the college offered fifteen different departments of instruction organized into four schools—a College of

Liberal Arts, the Bible School, a Theological Seminary, and a School of Music. According to the 1943 catalog, the college offered four degrees and two diplomas. All of the degrees required the completion of liberal arts coursework, some demanding as many as 68 credit hours. In 1949, the course catalog outlined a Standard College Course, a traditional liberal arts program designed to be completed across all four years of study as a complement to either two academic majors or one major and two minors. These requirements remained essentially unchanged for more than ten years.

The opening paragraph of the degree requirements outlined in the 1961 *Anderson College Catalog* demonstrates the school's commitment to providing students with a broad rather than a narrow education: "As a liberal arts college, Anderson College seeks to graduate students who have a broad personal competence, who have had opportunity for some specialization in the field of their greatest interest and who may have made a beginning in some professional or pre-professional field" (1961-62 *Anderson College Announcements*, 61). The focus—specialized study of a specific academic discipline—is identified as a beginning, not a conclusion of the student's education. And it occurs within the context of a more comprehensive cognitive development. The "broad personal competence" identified in the 1961 catalog resulted from students' active engagement with such disciplines as communication, world literature, history and world civilizations, foreign languages, social and behavioral sciences, natural science and mathematics, religion and philosophy, physical education, and the creative arts (*Announcements*, 62-63). It was the faculty's belief then, as it is now, that an "educated person" must come into his or her vocation equipped with all of these competencies—an intellectual craftsman carrying a well-stocked toolbox and the confidence to use every tool with effect.

The language used to describe the liberal arts curriculum changed again in the mid-seventies: "Specifically, the general requirements are a response to the student's need to expand and sharpen his ability to perceive, understand and learn; to enhance and increase his self-insight and self-discovery; and to assist positively in his intellectual, social aspirational and spiritual awareness and development" (1974-76 *Anderson College Catalog*, 4). The courses required for graduation were organized into two categories: Skills and Distributed Courses. The

"Skills" category included English, language, and mathematics. The "Distributed Courses" were spread among six thematic areas. Area One included courses that "emphasize the individual as a person, his self-concept and his behavioral patterns of interaction to fulfill needs and wants." The courses in Area Two provided both practice and appreciation of the arts. Area Three included courses that "set forth the major events, cultural ideas and their expressions, world views of Western and non-Western societies contributing to an understanding of self and society." Area Four courses focused on "the behavioral patterns of man and his interaction with his social environment." Area Five was concerned with "the scientific study of the natural environment with the mathematical and logical relationships as they contribute to the student's understanding." And Area Six included courses in biblical study and other areas of religion (1974-76 *Anderson College Catalog*, 4-7). What is clear in the descriptions of all six areas is a concern for the development of students' curiosity about and understanding of the larger world they inhabit and an intellectual exploration of their sense of participation in that larger world.

The liberal arts curriculum in the 1980s was still concerned with this kind of broad development of the whole person, as opposed to a narrowly-defined professional preparation. The Liberal Arts Program was modified again to include 12 components: "Freshman Seminar, courses in the use of the English language, Foreign Language, Individual Thought and Behavior, Artistic Expression, Fitness, Health and Leisure, Culture and Heritage, Societal Organization, Mathematical Sciences, Physical and Biological Sciences, Biblical Study, and Senior Capstone" (1984-86 *Anderson College Catalog*, 6-7). Faculty encouraged students to integrate what they learned in these general education courses with the things they were learning in their major. Getting these courses "out of the way" was a counterproductive goal because this misguided ambition was based on the assumption that the ideals, compelling questions, vocabulary, and dilemmas of any one discipline or professional field were unrelated to any other. This conflict reflects a generational difference between the educator's ideals, based in Enlightenment values and the student's expectations, rooted in post-modern societal priorities. This conflict, however, does not override the impulse of a liberal arts curriculum. Because it is generous in its

contribution to the student's intellectual, social and spiritual growth, a liberal arts education resists compartmentalization.

Without reducing the size or scope of the liberal arts curriculum, the faculty simplified the structure of its core curriculum in 2002 by organizing it into five content areas: Christianity and Biblical Studies, History and the Contemporary World, The Aesthetic, The Environment, and The Individual (*Undergraduate College Catalog 2002-2004*, 8-16). These five areas of the curriculum reflected five key aspects of human experience: faith and the human desire for relationship with God, the power of story to shape our understanding of our current circumstances, our need for creative expression, our relationship with the natural world, and our understanding of ourselves as uniquely gifted and responsible to others. If our work in the world is to be productive, ethical, and satisfying, then it must be informed by and responsive to these aspects of human experience.

The faculty revised the liberal arts curriculum once again in 2015. Organized in two parts—Foundational Skills and seven Ways of Knowing (Christian, Scientific, Civic, Aesthetic, Social and Behavioral, Global and Intercultural, and Experiential)—this new core curriculum reduced the total number of credit hours required for graduation and gave this essential part of students' educational experience greater clarity. The new configuration preserved the school's belief that all people serving in the church and in the world should have strong oral and written communication skills, possess at least a foundational biblical literacy, practice the habits of personal wellness, and examine the complex questions of human experience through a wide range of lenses. These "lenses," or Ways of Knowing, are relevant vocational preparation because they challenge the tunnel vision that so many people in contemporary Facebook culture have developed. For this reason, a liberal arts education has very practical, not merely esoteric, value. It can help us to become our best, rather than our worst, selves in the face of turmoil and crisis. "The university's conception of liberally educated people involves the freeing and empowering of the total person—his or her spiritual, intellectual, aesthetic, emotional and physical resources," says the 2019-20 *Undergraduate Catalog* (29).

Freeing the total person to thrive first in an academic environment and then in the world beyond the campus perimeter involves the development of essential skills and knowledge competencies. These

foundational skills include competencies such as oral and written communication, empathetic listening, qualitative reasoning, biblical literacy, critical thinking and civil discourse. Rather than a “cafeteria-style” core curriculum that presents students with the opportunity to merely sample all of the disciplines that compose the modern academy with no guiding principles directing the students’ choices, this structure pursues specific learning outcomes: critical reasoning and logical thinking, communication, cross-disciplinary view, Christian commitments and practices, intercultural perspectives, and preparation for service (*Undergraduate Catalog 2019-20*, 31-32). It isn’t enough to know a little bit about history, science, the arts, human society, and the natural world. What matters is a person’s ability to consider complex questions from a variety of perspectives and to recognize that engineers have much to learn from artists, public health professionals must consider present crises through the lens of history, and marketing specialists can promote products and services more effectively if they understand the fundamentals of good storytelling. A liberal arts education challenges the narrow-mindedness that causes so much conflict and limits human ingenuity. Seeing the world only one way limits our capacity for empathy, for invention, and for discovery. In a world with problems as big as those facing us now, we need more than ever before to meet them with greater, not less, imaginative dexterity.

Beginning in the early 1980s, the gateway to the AU liberal arts curriculum was a course required of all first-year students: the Liberal Arts Seminar. Initially, faculty determined the thematic focus for their individual sections of this course, which was populated almost exclusively by freshmen. For example, Professor Gibb Webber, chair of the Department of English, used mythology as the context and subject matter for his students’ writing assignments and class discussions. Regardless of the topical focus or the specific faculty member teaching the class, the seminar course sought to engage students in Socratic questioning and critical analysis. By the 1990s, a series of overarching themes created a common focus for all of the students participating in the seminar: “friendship,” “justice and the good society,” and, later, “romantic love.” A common reader was used by all faculty teaching the seminar comprised of selections written by scholars in a wide range of fields, historic and contemporary. Late in the life of this course, it

underwent a radical revision and a rebranding. Rather than using selected readings to engage students in discussions—sometimes debates—about a central topic, the seminar professors endeavored to nurture seven essential intellectual skills: defining terms, practicing civil discourse, actively engaging with authors and speakers, identifying purpose and rhetorical intent, identifying implied or stated assumptions and values, identifying and evaluating an argument, and constructing an argument to move people toward action.

Carrie Clay, professor of Spanish and the final faculty member to provide leadership for the Liberal Arts Seminar, sees an important connection between the three ideas inscribed on the university's seal and the goals of not just this specific seminar course but of the entire liberal arts curriculum: "Our first year Liberal Arts Seminar students [were] challenged at various times throughout the semester to think, read, write, speak, and grapple with ideas (*veritas*), regardless of their immediate utility, and to do so in the light of our Christian heritage and beliefs (*fidelitas*). But we [did] not stop there. With an eye to educating for a life of faith and service (*utilitas*), students [were] challenged to apply all they are learning to a final project that requires (or would lead to) action in response to argument. Students [were] provided an opportunity to attach their ideas to service." Although codified as the structuring mechanism for the final iteration of the Liberal Arts Seminar, these essential intellectual skills nurtured students' ability to engage productively with their peers by examining persistent human problems and facing with courage the often contradictory ideas of the world's best thinkers, an ambition that still runs across the entire curriculum. While eventually dropped as a course required of all students, the seminar course laid the groundwork for much of the cognitive growth students would experience in later courses, both in the liberal arts core and in their academic major. Interestingly, it also inspired another important change to the liberal arts core: the inclusion of critical reasoning and civil discourse as a foundational skill.

Theoretical Perspectives Regarding the Value, Utility and Relevance of a Liberal Arts Education

#1: Becoming More Fully Human

In *The Idea of a Christian College*, Arthur F. Holmes rejects the utilitarian notion that formal education is useful only to the extent that it can be used as a currency for something we desire: financial wealth,

social status, professional advancement, appointments to powerful public offices. He insists that asking, “Whatever will I do with ___?” is absolutely the wrong question “because it concentrates on instrumental value and reduces everything to a useful art. The right question is rather, ‘What can it do to me?’” (1987, 29). In this regard, Holmes and Sanders are of the same mind. Both believe that our encounters with the great stories of creation should change us in significant and often unpredictable ways. What education should do, what a liberal arts education *must*, in fact, do, is lead out those capacities and virtues that are seeded in us as human beings and pollinate whatever follows so that we can bear fruit to feed those around us who are starving.

Of course, very few people relish the possibility of having things done to them. Whether or not we aspire to be agents of leadership or innovation in the wider world, we certainly want to be agents of autonomy in our own lives. So the idea that education is supposed to do something to us may not be all that appealing for many 21st-century students. I can imagine students reading this essay, crossing their arms protectively, and saying, “Nope, I am willing to do but NOT to be *done to*.” Being “done to” by anything—surprise, love, grief, hope—requires two sources of strength: courage and vulnerability. Brene Brown (2019), a research professor at the University of Houston, insists that she and her colleagues “can measure how brave you are by [assessing] how vulnerable you are willing to be.” Students who are willing to submit to the kind of instruction that a liberal arts education accomplishes open themselves to one of the two most important gifts of vulnerability: joy (the other is love). Practicing vulnerability in our relationships and daily work is possible because the unknown loses its threat, hard things lose their sharp edges, and our fear of failure is in some measure diminished.

Holmes argues that human beings have three fundamental qualities: we are thinking, reflective beings; we are valuing beings; and we are responsible agents in creation (1987, 29-32). A liberal arts education, like the one that students experience at Anderson University, is useful not because it fills our minds with textbook content about the classic subjects of academic study but because it teaches us to think critically (which means to resist hasty judgments and approach both people and circumstances with curiosity, empathy, and openness),

strengthens our ability to make moral judgments and resist oversimplification, and to consider carefully the consequences of our own and others' actions. All of this, according to Holmes, prepares us for "creative participation in the future" (1087, 33). Students may not express the idea this way, but they come to college because they believe they are deficient, unprepared for whatever future they imagine for themselves. The ambition of the faculty at AU is to acknowledge those deficiencies—in fact to celebrate them as a natural condition of youth—and to engage students with work that will help them come to see themselves as shaping agents of that future, not passive recipients of other people's activity.

So, what distinguishes the liberal arts education at a Christian university from the general education requirements included in the curriculum at a secular institution? Many of the course requirements might be the same, but the unifying theme of the curriculum is a pursuit of "the vibrancy of life in Christ" (*Undergraduate Catalog 2019-20*, 4). If the goal of a Christian, liberal arts education is to educate and develop the whole person, then personhood cannot be conceived as something separate from Christ. Todd C. Ream and Perry L. Glanzer identify four specific aspects of personhood, informed by their understanding of human beings as children of God: identity formation as an expression of our likeness to God; creative capacities as a divine calling and responsibility; fulfillment of social identities; and discernment of truth, virtue and beauty (2013, 30-35). Becoming more fully human means becoming more fully a person created in the image of God. The acquisition of knowledge and essential skill competencies is a fulfillment of our identity in Christ because this kind of education makes us more like our creator.

#2: Pollinating the Human Imagination

The imagination must be exercised if it is to flourish. People who are accused of being unimaginative are probably merely unpracticed. Because courses in a traditional liberal arts curriculum draw students out of the siloed hallways of their academic major into surveys and seminars focused on other disciplines, students must at least consider the possibility that the knowledge possessed by people who haven't pursued their chosen career path might have some value. Conceiving of possibility—the possibility that my lab partner might agree to share a pizza this weekend, the possibility that I might live in another country

for a while, the possibility that I might own my own company—requires imagination, a belief in a preferred future. A liberal arts education can help students to see that big problems exist in the world and then inspire them to believe that the problems plaguing the human condition can be solved. Solutions to the biggest problems in previous generations required scientists and engineers to examine the problems from radically different perspectives. This is one of the gifts of a liberal arts education: it facilitates an examination of the world from a wide variety of perspectives. Students enrolled in an introductory psychology course are asked to examine human experience through the lens of the human mind. Students enrolled in a sociology course are invited to examine human experience through the lens of group migrations, social mores, and family dynamics. Students enrolled in a global literature course examine human experience through the lens of story and metaphor. All of these courses might pose for students' consideration the same fundamental and perplexing questions, but every course will tease and test answers to the questions in very different ways, and, at their best, suggest very different answers.

As a student, I took a theology course as part of my own general education curriculum. My roommate at the time took the same class, one in which we read seminal works by theologians representing a wide range of religious traditions. These scholars were Christians, Jews, Muslims, Buddhists, even an atheist or two. Halfway through the semester, my friend threw her hands up in despair, wailing, "I just want to know when the professor is going to tell us who is *right*!" Although it did not comfort her anxiety, our professor's response to her request was both gentle and wise: "No one is entirely right about anything of any importance. Your work as a thinking, believing human being is to discover what those who disagree with one another share and consider the possibility that whatever you have come to believe with absolute certainty in any given moment might be wrong. This is how you will find your way to truth."

#3: Gaining Wisdom, Which Is to Say, Humility

One of the first lessons I teach the students in any of my classes, regardless of grade classification or course focus, is the importance of humility. Humility is essential to human health and happiness because it makes us teachable and releases us from the prison of perfectionism. A liberal arts education, if embraced as a gift rather than a burden, can

teach us humility because the courses in the liberal arts curriculum so often draw us out of familiar intellectual territory and toward new fields of knowledge. The student who is energized by mathematical puzzles might be intimidated by explorations of the great Renaissance painters; students who feel quite at home analyzing poetic language or imagery in Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* might panic in the face of human physiology or the scientific method. Learning new ways to think is hard work, and it often creates confusion before it leads to clarity. This is exactly why it is so important to reach outside the intellectual circles in which we feel most comfortable and confident. One of my early mentors comforted my own feelings of inadequacy with this advice: You don't need to be the smartest person in the room; you just need to learn as much as you can from the person who is. Curiosity is innate, but humility is learned. Grappling with course content that challenges our aesthetic preferences and knowledge competencies exercises our tolerance for the unknown. This, too, is necessary for the development of intellectual humility—a willingness to welcome another person's expertise as valid and admirable.

#4: Developing Community

Establishing a new peer circle is one of the first and most fundamental tasks that new college students undertake. Very quickly, they size up a roommate, decide how to cope with sharing shower space with total strangers, and scan the faces dotting all of their orientation sessions to find at least one person who resembles them in some way. Helping students enter the macro-community of the college campus and build micro-communities through participation in various campus programs is at the heart of all student life work. Athletic teams and Greek organizations, campus ministries and social service clubs all have the same goal in mind when they recruit new students for membership. Most academic departments also work hard to nurture strong relationships with and among the students pursuing their majors.

These communities are important. They foster a sense of ownership in campus programs and spaces. At their best, they nurture a sense of belonging and assist students in what is often a bewildering process of identity formation. However, a liberal arts education offers students entry to a broader, more durable community—the society of thinking, creative human beings who share a common hunger. *New York Times*

columnist and conservative Burkean thinker David Brooks, in his book *The Road to Character*, describes a moral ecology that he believes would restore balance, civility, and generosity to American society. He argues that creating this new moral ecology begins when we pursue the answers to these important questions about our own identity, about the aspects of ourselves and others that can create either harmony or discord in society. At AU, we believe that liberal arts courses create a community in which these questions can be pursued. One of Brooks' key propositions is a belief that wisdom arises from intellectual communion: "The humble person thus has an acute historical consciousness. She is the grateful inheritor of the tacit wisdom of her kind, the grammar of conduct and the store of untaught feelings that are ready for use in case of emergency. The humble person . . . understands that wisdom is not knowledge. Wisdom emerges out of a collection of intellectual virtues. It is knowing how to behave when perfect knowledge is lacking" (266). It is very difficult to gain wisdom in isolation. We need consistent, meaningful interaction with others, particularly those who know things we don't, to become wise.

Micro-communities are desirable because they foster intimacy. College students have many opportunities to either create or join micro-communities, but these can be isolating if the boundaries become too fixed, limiting the ideas, personalities, experiences, and pools of knowledge that flow into or out of the group's membership. Courses in a liberal arts curriculum resist the silo effect that results inevitably from a consuming commitment to one field of study or one way of examining the world. An undergraduate education should be a generalist's quest, not a narrow, highly specialized educational endeavor. Because they are part of a broad curriculum rather than a narrowly defined academic major, liberal arts courses pull together diverse groups of students. At a smaller institution like Anderson University, these courses typically have modest enrollment caps; even the survey courses like Western Civilization or Global Literature enroll fewer than fifty students per section. This means students experience the rigor and unique challenges of each course in close company with their peers, with some of whom they might have no obvious commonality. At their best, AU's liberal arts courses make fertile ground of the strangeness we might feel when confronted with peers who seem to share none of our interests, ambitions, gifts, or even personal

values, giving us an opportunity to discover that differences and disagreements can draw people closer together rather than always driving them apart. Dr. Doyle Lucas, professor of management in the Falls School of Business, offers this reflection: "I have always been caught by our vision of the importance of liberal arts based learning combined with developing a sense of vocation and looking for a place in which to serve. I know that both of these have been central to me as I have sought to fulfill my sense of calling in my life." These courses are not extraneous to a transformative education; rather, in many ways, they are its essence. This is why students should choose their general education courses as carefully as they choose an academic major or seek out internship opportunities and spread those courses across the whole of their college experience rather than bunching them together like dreaded chores on a to-do list.

#5: Truth-Seeking

A person cannot become educated unless she is curious and open-minded. Nothing of beauty and very little of lasting value can be created with a fist. Yet, many students resent the liberal arts curriculum, viewing the courses with the same distaste with which one might swallow a dose of cough syrup. Consequently, they sometimes adopt an adversarial attitude toward the professors who teach these classes. Because we are naive, we often assume that whatever we need to know or whatever skills we need to perform any given task or operate in any given environment are predictable and prescribed, leading many of us to think that our education should be a simple downloading of these competencies into our intellectual bank. So we become impatient with those who suggest to us that it is actually difficult, if not impossible, to predict exactly what competencies might be necessary for the work we plan to do in the future or for the circumstances that we might face in our professional or personal lives.

I liken this attitude to a belief that a map of any landscape, once drawn, is now definitive and sufficient for navigation. Even if we assume leadership of a family business or become the fourth in our family to become a doctor, our unique life is an unexplored territory. Whatever map that history and our predecessors have drawn based on their own life experiences is merely a record of their own choices. To venture forward, we need their map AND a compass. Truth is as slippery as a fish, and it is a dynamic, living thing. In John 14:6, Jesus

says that He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Therefore, we must be in constant pursuit of truth, just as we are in constant pursuit of intimacy with Christ. A liberal arts education teaches us how to learn by introducing us to ideas we've never explored before. The human intellect and imagination are framed by limitations. Our capacity to expand these limits is great, but only if we are regularly seeking new intellectual, spiritual, and imaginative experiences. Truth is always just beyond our reach. A liberal arts education fuels our pursuit.

Alignment with Anderson University's Mission and Ethos

In mid-summer of the year 1803, Lewis and Clark gathered recruits and supplies for their Corps of Discovery, an expedition commissioned by President Thomas Jefferson to explore the Louisiana Territory and chart a northwest waterway to the Pacific Ocean. For two and a half years, Lewis and Clark—together with 33 other men and their guides, French-Canadian fur trader Touissant Charbonneau and his Shoshone wife, Sacagawea—followed the Missouri River, crossed the Continental Divide, and discovered that the northwest river passage they were seeking did not exist. Though the vision that set their quest in motion was clear, their expectations were flawed. So they faced a dilemma: turn back or find another way to get where they wanted to go. Those who remember this American frontier story know that the expedition didn't end on this northeast shoulder of the Rocky Mountains. Lewis and Clark pushed forward. Using horses they acquired from the Shoshone Indians, they crossed more than 160 miles of mountain terrain on foot to reach the Clearwater River. Then they accepted instruction from Native Americans about how to carve small canoes to follow the Columbia River and eventually reach the Pacific Ocean.

Those who seek a liberal education are actually seeking something they cannot currently see or imagine, a future that will include obstacles, surprises, disappointments and dangers. This is one aspect of Anderson University's mission: "to educate for a life of faith and service in the church and society" (*Undergraduate Catalog 2021-22*, 4). We must be willing to move away from what is known into what is unknown so that we can fulfill God's kingdom purposes.

Lewis and Clark's expedition with the Corp of Discovery was remarkable for many reasons. It required courage, ingenuity, diplomacy, and unreasonable tenacity. Those on this expedition survived brutal weather conditions, fatigue, tense interactions with

native peoples who saw them as invaders, near starvation, disease, injury, and immense geographical obstacles. They had to be a little bit crazy to launch and then achieve their quest, which was to collect scientific information about North American plants and wildlife and to test their belief in a northwest waterway to the west coast. Those who seek an education also believe fundamentally that there are people in the world who know more than they do. If students do not see their teachers as trustworthy guides, then they will spend a lot of time and far too much money resisting the very growth that real learning stimulates.

More than two centuries have passed since President Jefferson asked Congress to approve funding for this expedition. Yet, the story is not merely an anecdote from the past. It is a relevant model for our future. Lewis and Clark had a physical frontier in front of them and a commission from the U.S. government to map what was unknown to the citizens of this newly formed United States. They should have failed because they underestimated the distance and the duration of the journey, they didn't speak the language or understand the cultures of the native people whose lands they would cross, they were incorrect in their foundational assumptions about the geography of the Pacific northwest, and they lacked many of the survival skills necessary to endure and reach their destination. So why did they succeed? One reason might be that they recognized their limitations and sought training and friendship with people who possessed the knowledge they lacked. It could be that in the face of obstacles they maintained faith in their quest. And it could be in part because they found new ways to get where they wanted to go when the known methods failed. To become educated means to become willing to fail and willing to change. An education is a struggle, but it is a productive struggle. The courses in a liberal arts curriculum encourage students to struggle with hard things and to overcome whatever biases they might have developed about the subject matter examined in those courses: history is boring; literature is irrelevant to my career goals; my life will never require a working knowledge of biochemistry. These are easy lies to believe. Fortunately, a liberal arts education challenges these false assumptions, making us more receptive to new ways of thinking about the world and our place in it.

A college student's Louisiana Territory is not an earth, wind, and water

frontier, but the territory students face is a place as wild as the one that was wholly unknown to Lewis and Clark two hundred years ago. This metaphor is a fraught and imperfect one, primarily because the territory Lewis and Clark sought to explore and eventually to impose a sovereign claim upon was not unknown to everyone. Native peoples knew the land well, had made rich dynamic lives in these places, and had many reasons to resist these explorers' encroachment upon their homes. The kind of education examined here is one that pushes students to question things like the conqueror's narrative and move past discomfort to discover the parts of that narrative that are often omitted or distorted. Human choice always has consequences, sometimes benevolent and sometimes destructive. If an education succeeds in helping us to become more fully human, then it leads us toward a greater understanding of the complexity of the stories we live and the stories we tell.

Learning how to learn and gaining the resilience that comes from doing hard things we would rather avoid are two of the best survival skills students can carry into their future lives. Whether or not students *feel* adventurous, the 21st-century frontier demands that they meet the world as explorers, not as tourists. At its best, a four-year liberal arts education can train students' intellect and imagination broadly and nurture in them a vision for something that exceeds their current grasp.

Anderson University's mission is deceptively simple and direct. This mission reflects the university's heritage as the flagship educational institution of the Church of God Movement and the desire of those engaged in that Movement to be of some earthly use in the world even while practicing a holiness that keeps us in close relationship with Christ. Our liberal arts curriculum reflects the belief that being of some use in this world means identifying clearly the needs of our neighbors and then using our individual skills and knowledge to address those needs, not the least of which is to discover the hope that comes through a personal relationship with a very personal savior.

One might wonder how an academic curriculum can accomplish such a high spiritual calling. Dedicated study in the academic discipline best suited to prepare students for a particular kind of work is important spiritual as well as intellectual preparation. Dedicated study of social problems, mathematical constructs, artistic movements,

economic and technological developments, biological organisms and ecosystems, political actions, and scientific discoveries is also important, spiritually relevant, intellectual work. “[Educating students for a life of] faith and service to the church and society requires broader skills and knowledge than just specific job skills. To be an informed, educated member of society (and church) means knowing the basics of many fields, in order to understand the world and understand multiple viewpoints,” says Dr. Elizabeth Imafuji, dean of the School of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences.

Many students (and their parents) are quick to repeat the mantra, “A liberal arts education makes you well-rounded, which looks good on a resume.” Students are not stones to be smoothed and polished! The kind of education to which the faculty at Anderson University have devoted themselves for over one hundred years is not one concerned with the shape of our graduates; rather, the faculty at AU are concerned with the substance of our graduates’ capacity for intellectual inquiry, creativity, empathy, and ingenuity. The courses in our liberal arts curriculum, as well as many of the courses in our academic majors, nurture these capacities. For example, a course focused on the exploration of social problems, public health policies, or political systems will require students to articulate their own beliefs clearly, evaluate objectively the ideas of their peers (and their professors!), formulate counterarguments, and learn to participate in well-reasoned debate without fear of rejection or verbal assault. These traits are necessary in order to live out Anderson University’s core values: servant leadership, excellence, integrity, responsibility, and generosity (*Undergraduate Catalog 2019-20*, 4). And if we are to participate in Jesus’ ministry, living out the Kingdom identity that we inherit from Him, then these traits are essential for success in all the work we do, whether that work happens in the context of our professions, our church congregations, our neighborhoods, or in our families. For the student who wonders, “Well, what can I do with a liberal arts degree?” the answer, as George Anders so deftly points out, is simple: You can do anything.

5. Anderson College 1968-1972

ELSA JOHNSON BASS

*How many roads must a man walk down before you call him a man?
How many seas must a white dove sail before she sleeps in the sand?
Yes, and how many times must the cannonballs fly before they're
forever banned
The answer, my friend, is blowin' in the wind
The answer is blowin' in the wind.*

Bob Dylan, Blowin in the Wind, 1962

The words of this civil rights, anti-war protest song floated over the huge crowd gathered at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C., on August 28, 1963. Peter, Paul, and Mary sang Bob Dylan's lyrical questions to more than 250,000 people waiting for answers. They wanted answers about freedom, answers about jobs, answers about justice, answers about dignity, and answers about respect. That day, the answers came from the voice of a dreamer, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Five years later, he was murdered and a raging, howling wind blew storms of reckoning across the country, around the world, and within the Church of God. In the fall of 1968, I arrived at Anderson College against this backdrop of social and civil unrest in America. Following the assassination of Dr. King on April 4, 1968, chants of "Say it Loud," "I'm Black and I'm Proud," and "Black Power!" flooded the nation. Gains in racial relations were strained—if not broken—in the minds of many who'd supported Dr. King's nonviolent pursuit of racial equality. The rioting and violence that exploded in cities across the nation shattered hopes of a peaceful change in the status of African Americans in this country. It was time for a change, and change was on its way.

I witnessed and participated in many changes that took place at Anderson College from the fall of 1968 through the spring of 1972. I've been asked to share my reflections of that period—primarily regarding racial relations on campus. Realizing the limitations of my personal memories 50 (sometimes foggy) years later, I sought to better inform

this saga by engaging in a few informal interviews. These conversations served to remind, inform, and properly focus my story during the early stages of writing. It is, however, not a definitive record of my Anderson College experience.

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to Dr. Edward L. Foggs, Rev. Kenneth Crouch, Dr. David Stevens, Carolyn Morgan Schmies, Ralph McGhee, Daphne Davis Bethel, Samme Newell Rousopoulos, Colee Stinson Bethany, Sandra Vaughn Trieb, Gary Boards, and members of the Anderson College Black Alumni for their personal reflections, shared experiences, and stories that connected the dots of the days leading up to, during, and after my time on campus.

African Americans and the Church of God Anderson, Indiana, by Dr. James Earl Massey has been critical to my research. Dr. Edward Foggs notes in the book's cover notes that "it fills a vacuum in the literature about the role, influence, and impact of persons of color in the ongoing saga of the Church of God movement" (Massey 2005). Additionally, this essay is fueled substantially by Dr. Merle Strege's detailed narrative *The Desk As Altar: The Centennial History of Anderson University*. Insightful and well documented, this is a valuable tool that informs who we were, where we've been, and will hopefully help lead us to where God desires us to be.

Prologue

In 1964, the General Assembly of the Church of God endorsed "civil rights legislation that will guarantee justice and equality to all our citizens regardless of race, nationality or religion" (Strege 2016, 231). This and a series of other resolutions on the same general subject are found in *Leaning Forward* (2019) by Barry Callen.

As I prepared to write this essay, it was important to explore the frameworks of historical and modern racial relations on the campus. As the child of the Church of God Reformation Movement, Anderson College's mission and purpose were strongly woven together with the church at large.

Historically, people of color were welcome in Anderson's faculty, student body, and administration. Dr. James Earl Massey states that various editions of *Echoes*, the college yearbook first issued in 1922, show the faces and names of students of color at Anderson; some students were studying for a certificate, diploma, or degree, while

others were listed as “special students.” In 1926, the first persons of color to graduate from a full program of college study were international students Shumi Dimba from Zululan and Amy Lopez from Jamaica. After earning additional degrees, Miss Lopez served as dean of women and on the faculty as professor of English and missions. Among the first African Americans who graduated from Anderson College in the 1930s and 1940s were Ida Mae Coasey, Gabriel P. Dixon, and John T. Olds, the latter of whom was the first African American to receive two baccalaureate degrees from Anderson College (Massey 2005, 106).

In *The Desk As Altar*, Strege documents activities that took place on campus in support of civil rights during the sixties. In 1960, Dunn Hall, the first men’s residence hall, was named after Sethard P. Dunn, an African-American pastor from Chicago who was a charter member of the college’s Board of Trustees. Rosa Parks, Charles White, and other prominent African Americans were invited to campus (Strege 2016, 231). There were a few outspoken faculty and staff members who were staunch civil rights advocates and stood in solidarity with African-American students. Calls for equality and justice were heard increasingly as demonstrations and protests became more frequent. My pastor, Dr. David Stevens, attended Anderson College in the early 1960s. He recalled encounters with President Reardon as he and other student leaders made demands for the college to boycott off-campus establishments that discriminated against African Americans. President Reardon was unmoved by their threat to go to the Church of God at large to complain. Ruefully, he told them, Anderson College was one of the most integrated entities in the entire Reformation Movement, and they would be hard pressed to prove otherwise. However, a few years later, the “Bloody Sunday” march in Selma, Alabama, pushed the college to take a stand in support of African Americans that reached beyond the campus to the City of Anderson and to the Church of God nationally.

A Bold Step

On March 7, 1965, John Lewis led more than 600 marchers across the Edmund Pettus Bridge, where they were brutally attacked by state troopers with such violence it shocked the entire nation. It is to this day difficult to watch the footage of the savage beatings of unarmed demonstrators marching for freedom and equality. The violence of that day came with an eyewitness account from Anderson students and

staff members who had gone to Selma. One of the students, Stoney Cooks, asked President Reardon if he would permit a march in support of civil rights activists in the South and elsewhere. Reardon agreed, and the march was scheduled for Thursday, March 16, 1965, following the chapel service. Strege describes the event:

Six to eight hundred members of the college community in company with a handful of city ministers, assembled at the corner of Eighth and College. At the head of a column three abreast, Reardon was joined by Cooks and Park Place pastor Hillery Rice. The solemn march unfolded according to Reardon's expectations. Escorted by city police officers, upon reaching the steps of the county courthouse the assembly sang "America the Beautiful." Jo Morris, daughter of trustee E.J. Morris, led in singing "We Shall Overcome." Student council president Gareth Whitehurst read from the Bible, and Reverend Edward Foggs, pastor of the African American Sherman Street Church of God, concluded the brief service with prayer. (Strege 2016, 233)

To be clear, the march created divisions on campus, in the community, and in the church. Some students and professors opposed the march, and a substantial number did not participate. No more than 55% of undergraduates and seminarians joined the demonstration. There was also backlash from Southern Church of God congregations with a significant number of students on campus. Concerns were voiced that those students might be stigmatized, and many leaders felt the demonstration should have been generated by students and not by an official act of the college administration (Strege 2016, 234).

I must admit that learning about the march for the first time while working on this essay was fascinating. What an affirming moment that must have been for the African-American students on campus! The report of the displeasure of the Southern churches was no surprise. I found no documentation of the reactions from African-American congregations, but I would speculate it was a welcome gesture and a strategic boost to the Church of God and Anderson College's commitment to improving racial relations in the movement.

Student activism continued, and African Americans comprised slightly more than 10% of Anderson College undergraduates, but their voices were becoming more and more vocal. Specifically, there was the matter of the discrimination experienced by students of color in

the city of Anderson. This complaint was not new. For years, African-American students complained to their folks back home and their pastors about having to deal with the racism they often encountered in the city.

Dr. Strege records that there were local restaurants that would not serve African Americans or interracial couples. Other establishments served them meals on paper plates. The Ku Klux Klan maintained a major presence in Anderson and surrounding Madison County. There was no way the college could guarantee the safety of students beyond the confines of the campus. African Americans were not welcome in some areas, and it was crucial that they were aware of which sections to avoid. Name calling and items thrown out of cars were not uncommon when groups of African Americans walked to a commercial area near campus known as “The Bypass.”

Ralph McGhee shared that he, Paris Anderson, Rufus Thomas, John Gibson, and other outspoken students sought to address issues of racial prejudice and discrimination on and off campus. Al Simmons, a recent graduate, was instrumental in helping them plan and execute many activities designed to make the college community aware of the urgent need for action to build a better future for those coming. Gray Boards, a resident of Anderson, was recruited for the football team in the 1970s. He lived in Anderson, and he had no knowledge of the college or the African Americans in attendance. Once on campus, however, he learned about the tense racial relations and student protests that further strained the early and mid-1960s. His experience was different from ours, but he is grateful for those who stayed in the fight for equality for all students.

Frustration was growing on campus. While there were those who felt not enough was being done about demands made for more representation of African Americans among the faculty, administrative staff, and student population, conservative white students and faculty were incensed over challenges to authority. Student activists staged sit-ins in Old Main, held protests at football games, and refused to be silent. As national civil rights demands intensified, anti-war student protests against the conflict in Vietnam escalated, and the winds of discontent finally blew into a raging storm.

A Call For Action

“The assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., altered the nature

of national debate and put college administrators on the defensive” (Strege 2016, 235). Tensions ran high on the campus following Dr. King’s killing in April 1968, and there were demonstrations and sit-ins by both black and white students. Frustration with several issues prior to the sit-in held in Old Main resurfaced. Demands were made to the administration that called for increased African-American student enrollment, the hiring of Black faculty, and the removal of “race” on the college application. Seemingly none of those issues received much attention from the Anderson College administration, but a national call for action gained a swift response.

In May 1968, the leadership of the Church of God Reformation Movement was challenged by a group of African-American ministers who demanded a hearing and a course of action concerning the church’s resolutions regarding race. Melvyn F. Hester, Benjamin F. Reid, and Edward L. Foggs met with national church leaders at a gathering where Reverend Hester presented a paper entitled “The Church’s Opportunity in the Present Racial Crisis.” With regard to higher education, Rev. Hester declared,

The best black minds of the Movement must be recruited and funded by scholarships to use the kind of education the Church is providing at Anderson College, the Graduate School of Theology, Warner Pacific College, Gulf Coast Bible College, et al. (Hester 1968)

Dr. Benjamin Reid’s paper, entitled “Disillusionment, Apprehension–Hope!” stated,

In spite of the efforts of recent years (and there have been some sound ones), the Church of God basically reflects the dualism, the tokenism, and the racism of the rest of American Society. We yet present a lily-white picture on the executive level. We are yet talking in a time that demands positive action. Our major colleges are yet lily-white in faculty and administration. (1968)

Two years later in 1970, Dr. Edward Foggs, at the time director of Urban Ministries for the Board of Church Extension and Home Missions, wrote in a study paper entitled “The Black Community Within The Church of God” that black Christians should ask such questions as:

How effectively is my church meeting my needs? To what extent is my church involved in helping me to realize not only

spiritual freedom, but freedom from oppressive economic and social bondage? . . . How does my church regard me in its total affairs? Are my contributions needed? —wanted? —welcomed? (1969)

President Reardon took swift action and accepted the challenge to recruit more African-American students to the college. He circulated the presentations submitted during the meeting to his administrative staff for immediate attention. On June 3, 1968, Reardon directed a detailed course of action focusing on six areas addressing the demands of African-American ministers. Goals included the following: (1) two Black Anderson College recruiters at work that summer in Black congregations, (2) doubling the number of Black students within two years, (3) a second course on Black history and culture taught by a Black professor, (4) the recruitment of Black faculty members, (5) increased financial aid to African-American students, and (6) a summer workshop to assist Black students admitted with scholastic deficiencies. As a result, six months after the death of Dr. King, Black student enrollment increased over the previous year by 64% (Strege 2016, 236).

More Than A Minority

Very early in the spring of 1968, an Anderson College recruiter named Kenneth Crouch spoke at my church in Erie, Pennsylvania, during a Sunday evening service. His presentation had so inspired me that I began my application process that week. It was a decision I've never regretted.

Ken and I spoke recently about the tremendous impact he had on the lives of so many African-American students. A native of Anderson and a graduate of Anderson College, he was recruited by Dean Norman Beard to travel for the school. Ken agreed to do so, with the stipulation that he would recruit students from both white and Black churches when he traveled. He was aware that often recruiters would only visit white congregations. It is noteworthy that his decision was made prior to Dr. King's death and President Reardon's June 1968 call to action. While it was true the college wanted to add more African Americans to its student population, I did not sense Ken's recruitment was based solely on my race. He shared the advantages of attending Anderson College during our nation's turbulent times with hopeful sincerity, believing that our doctrine of unity made us one in Christ. During our

interview, I asked if he was surprised by the racial issues that surfaced when the students he had recruited arrived on campus. He replied that because he was on the road traveling for the college, he was unaware of many of the negative things that were happening both on campus and in the city of Anderson. As a white man, he was not subjected to racism personally, but he had roomed with student activist John Gibson and was aware of the racial prejudice African Americans faced. It saddened him that in addition to the problems of race in the city of Anderson, there were racial problems on campus as well.

A few years later, Ken left recruiting and worked on campus. He helped manage the successful Tri-S program and was a trusted advocate for African-American students on campus. In a recent Zoom call, several alumni thanked him for the influence he had in their lives. He simply replied that he is proud of the many achievements of those he recruited and the impact we have made nationwide. When Ken Crouch recruited us to Anderson College, he recruited individuals; to him we were more than a minority.

This interview was enlightening because at the core of our struggle was the failure of the Anderson College community to understand our uniqueness. Some white students had never seen or interacted with African Americans until they arrived on campus. I have even wondered how aware the administration was of our diversity. We were more than poor, disadvantaged, and underprivileged students. We were more than the negative stereotypes being fueled by media, ignorance, and racism. We were more than our skin color, and we had so much to offer.

Who were we? Where did we come from? What was our church affiliation?

Many of us came from two-parent families, and although some were disadvantaged, a middle-class and upper middle-class economic representation existed among the students. High school experiences ranged from segregated to integrated private, parochial, and public institutions.

We came from all regions of the country, north, east, south, and west, where we grew up in urban, rural, and suburban neighborhoods. Most of my classmates had some direct or indirect relationship with the Church of God, and a few did not. I might mention here that most of us came from churches that were affiliated with the National Association of the Church of God as well as Anderson.

NACOG, headquartered in West Middlesex, Pennsylvania, is mistakenly believed to have been started during the 1912 Anderson camp meeting when E.E. Byrum asked the Blacks to stop coming so more white people would get saved (Massey 2005, 89). The true origin of NACOG is as revered and as storied as the origin of the Church of God Reformation Movement is to Anderson College. For more information, I would highly recommend *The History of the National Association of the Church of God*, narrated by Dr. James Earl Massey ("Our History," YouTube, uploaded by NACOG TV August 1, 2020, <http://www.nacog.com>).

Why did we choose Anderson College?

The strong push to recruit African Americans clearly resulted in our noticeable presence on campus, but just as other students came to Anderson, so did we. We came to further our education and prepare for our futures. And oh, yes, there were those who were hopeful of finding a spouse and were successful! A few of my classmates were legacies whose parents strongly encouraged them to attend their alma mater. Pastors and church members were also influential in their decision. Others, like me, were first-generation college students, and I understood that as a trailblazer, I was a role model for those who were counting on me to be successful. As believers in Jesus Christ, many of us hoped to strengthen both our spiritual and academic lives by attending a faith-based institution. The many gifted, well-trained vocalists, musicians, and creative artists numbered among us was a welcome addition to Anderson's rich cultural community. There were also those who came because they were recruited for athletic teams. Our potential was unlimited. We were future scholars, athletes, poets, scientists, mathematicians, theologians, educators, doctors, lawyers, social workers, computer scientists, politicians, industry leaders, and entrepreneurs in training. We believed that Anderson College would prepare us to be the people we became. I also naively thought a Christian college would be different for African Americans.

In a 2015 study examining the experiences of African American students within the context of Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU), Timothy Young observed,

While students may have experienced racial tensions in previous high school or college experiences, they did not expect to experience this dynamic at a private Christian institution.

While their expectations were not explicitly communicated, students expected professors in a Christian environment to treat them differently than they would have been treated in a secular classroom. This lack of teacher advocacy further increased the feeling of working against the current and isolation from the majority. (61)

I found this study to be of great interest because forty-eight years earlier, I was surprised when reactions to my African-American classmates and me were at times no different from what I experienced in my secular education. One friend facetiously quipped after I voiced my disappointment, “So what were you expecting, four years of youth camp?”

Furthermore, I find it disheartening that after more than five decades we are still having these conversations. I am encouraged, however, that research like the Saga Project is ongoing to determine how to provide equitable education to students of color—especially at Christian institutions.

Admitted, But Not Accepted

While I believe the intention of increasing African-American enrollment was sincere, the impact, however, was confusing, troubling and, at times, disheartening. Decades later, while reflecting on some of my struggles at Anderson College, I finally understood the problem. Yes, it is true we were admitted, but I was always aware that we were not completely accepted. It was manifested in a myriad of ways: subtle queries regarding my academic ability during a study session, being addressed as “you people” (as if we were aliens from another planet), the annual announcement during chapel by President Reardon citing the number of “Negroes” admitted to campus that semester. I’m certain it wasn’t intended to be offensive, but it always made me uncomfortable and aware that we were always the “outsiders.”

The Oxford English Dictionary defines to *admit* as the process or fact of entering or being allowed to enter a place, organization, or institution. The definition of *acceptance* is the action or process of being received as adequate or suitable typically to be admitted into a group. Permission to attend did not necessarily indicate much more beyond, “You are here, now stay in your place.” That is far different from the anticipated, “You are welcome here. Come, take your place.” Just how do you find your place?

Carolyn Morgan Schmies arrived at Anderson two years before I did. She was the daughter of Drs. Clifton and Mary Morgan, the first African-American missionaries to India from the Church of God. President and Mrs. Reardon were friends of her family, and she was a frequent guest in their home while she was a student. Carolyn told me she tried out for cheerleading and made the team, but having an African American on the squad was not welcomed by some members. Several mean-spirited, undermining events designed to discourage her participation ultimately led to her resignation. Despite strong encouragement to remain on the squad, she decided the stress of coping with the prejudice she'd experienced wasn't worth it. To be sure, there were many stellar moments in Carolyn's time on campus, but she wanted it understood that even though she was a highly regarded member of the campus community, bigotry sometimes replaced acceptance.

I recalled another moment that caused me to wonder about our acceptance, not only at Anderson College but in the Church of God as well. My first year as a residential assistant (RA), I welcomed parents and students as they moved in. A prominent pastor's wife was helping her daughter unpack when I stopped in to greet them. She was pleasant enough until she noticed my ring of keys. "Do you have keys to all these rooms?" she asked. "Yes," I replied cheerfully. In thirty minutes, she had her daughter moved off my floor.

Thankfully, two years earlier I'd learned a valuable lesson regarding making assumptions about people based on appearance. It made me take a good look at not only how I was being treated but how I treated others. Arriving on the campus, sight unseen, shortly before orientation, was the beginning of my journey. I'd traveled to Anderson alone via a Greyhound bus because, as the oldest of nine children, my parents determined money used for the family to take me to college would be better applied to my expenses. Choosing Anderson College over a local secular school's generous scholarship puzzled many of my counselors, teachers, and friends. I had a wonderful experience in our large, integrated high school but I looked forward to the opportunity to continue my education in a Christian environment. A taxi took me to the designated location for registration, and then I was taken to Morrison Hall, the dormitory for freshmen women.

When I had filled out my application for a roommate, I'd requested an African American, yet when I walked into my room that day, a

bubbly blonde girl stood there beaming at me. She said, "Hi! I'm Sandra Kay Vaughn. I'm from Mt. Summit, Indiana, and we're going to be roommates." I looked her up and down and said, "I didn't want a white roommate." Not missing a beat, she replied, "Neither did I, that's why I got you!" After an awkward pause, Sandy went on to tell me she was glad that it looked like we wore the same size. She had worked all summer long and had purchased a new wardrobe that we could share. In my haughtiest tone, I told her I didn't need her clothes, I was waiting for a steamer trunk and two footlockers to be delivered shortly. Sandy remained upbeat, despite my rudeness, and showed me several outfits. She made her offer again; I declined and went to check on my trunks. After a few phone calls, I was told my trunks had been delivered to the "other" Anderson College located in Anderson, South Carolina! Fast forward, I wore Sandy's clothes for three days until my trunks arrived. Fifty years later, we are still friends.

Upon our arrival, the historic increase in the number of African-American students on Anderson's campus was lauded as a great success by the Church of God. Yet, beyond admission, there seemed to be no clear plan in place. Why was a special plan needed? If successful, this bold initiative had the potential to impact the church at large. For all intents and purposes, the Anderson College student population was the largest integrated "congregation" in our movement; it could very well become a model for building true unity in the Church of God.

One major misstep in the process, however, was the absence of African-American faculty or staff. This is not to suggest that only African-American educators should work with African-American students. Nor does it imply that an all-white faculty and staff were incapable of addressing the needs of students of color. Simply, we needed African-American role models on campus when we arrived. It would have made a great difference in those early days. In less than three months the implementation of the June 3, 1968, action plan was in place. The goal of bringing more students of color to campus was met, but who were these students, and how would they fare in a predominantly white environment?

Dr. Massey notes that the 1960s and 1970s saw a large influx of students from minority backgrounds at predominantly white schools, and the pressure of not knowing how to navigate in a campus setting produced culture shock. Furthermore, Dr. Massey explains,

Minority students can experience severe stress from loneliness and isolation that results when social frictions occur because their customs and interests clash with those of the majority, and discriminatory actions from those who do not make them feel welcome only compound that stress. Resentment or active retaliation can mar the minority student's behavior or the decision to withdraw from the campus because of apathy, depression, or feelings of hopelessness could result. (2005, 112)

Some days were harder than others. Adjusting to college life so far away from home amid mounting tensions across the country began to take its toll. Mind you, there were many well-intentioned administrators, faculty, and staff trying to understand how to best accommodate us, but they were ill prepared to address our social, emotional, and cultural needs.

Some of Anderson's social clubs held traditions that, when passed down, may have seemed harmless to the majority population, but in 1968-69 a fundraiser known as a "slave sale" created a good deal of anger for African-American students and supportive whites. It was incomprehensible anyone would think a slave auction was an acceptable "fun" activity. The practice was discontinued the following year.

It seemed we were under constant scrutiny. As the only African American in some of my classes, if the discussion turned to race, I felt like I was expected to be the spokesperson for all African Americans. Daphne Davis Bethel told me about reacting to a hostile statement a student made blaming Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., for America's racial problems. She said she found herself standing in the class, with tears in her eyes trying to explain to a room full of white people the conditions that necessitated the dawning of the modern civil rights era. It is important to note here that Daphne is the granddaughter of McKinley Burnett, a man who played a pivotal role in the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* desegregation case. He was the NAACP President who convinced thirteen families to participate in the court action (Wikipedia 2022). Her mother attended Anderson in the 1940s, and it was ironic that decades later, on the same campus, her daughter had to defend the rights of African Americans seeking justice and equality. Why was it so difficult to understand?

My admittance into the Speech and Drama Department created another challenge to my acceptance. As the only African-American female, roles for me were limited, and even those were restricted. I was cast in the controversial 1969 Homecoming play *A Hatful of Rain*, by Michael V. Gazzo. It was a student production directed by Jack Samuels, a former staffer who stepped in because Dr. Malcolm Gressman, professor of speech, had died suddenly the previous spring. The cast was predominantly male, and my character, a prostitute, was not permitted to kiss a white actor as listed in the stage directions for fear the audience would protest an interracial relationship. The following fall, Robert Smith replaced Dr. Gressman as the head of the Speech Department.

Professor Smith was a former high school speech and theater teacher from Ohio. His arrival on campus was (in my mind) designed to shift the Speech Department closer to the values of Anderson College and the Church of God after *A Hatful of Rain*. Our first year was productive because he was a knowledgeable, solid teacher, and I was eager to learn. Tensions grew as the selection of mainstage plays provided few opportunities for actors of color to have leading roles. I remember one long, emotional conversation with Professor Smith that left us both in tears. We marked that as the turning point in our relationship. Our clash of ideologies created a concerted effort to find ways to make our department more inclusive. I was given permission to direct culturally relevant student productions that informed the dominant society of our journey and affirmed our worth to the minority.

I had the opportunity of seeing Professor Smith when I returned to speak for a chapel service years later. When I graduated, we were on good terms, so we were happy to see one another. Older and wiser, I thanked him for the lessons he taught me, and he replied that he had learned just as much from me. Our earlier struggles developed a lasting, mutual respect that I value to this day.

A Home Away From Home

An important part of our spiritual growth and off-campus emotional support came the day we received an invitation to visit Sherman Street Church of God, where Dr. Edward Foggs was the pastor. Walking into Sherman Street that first Sunday was like coming home. After days of being in the minority everywhere on campus, it was such a relief to be among so many people with whom we could identify. Their warm

welcome was not limited to African Americans but was extended to everyone. Sherman Street's hospitality exceeded our expectations. We were invited to Sunday dinners, and members supported us at many of our on-campus events. This loving, nurturing fellowship became our oasis, and I forged strong friendships that have lasted for decades.

Dr. Foggs's influence was important to us because he was held in high regard in both the city of Anderson and on campus. He became Anderson College's first African-American history instructor in 1969. His assignment made him an important voice in building greater understanding between the races on campus. He vividly remembers teaching the racially mixed elective class. He told me there were some white students whom he wouldn't call racist or malicious, but they had never seen or interacted with African Americans. The text for the class was *Black Like Me*, by John Howard Griffin. This book had a strong impact on his students as they explored the life of African Americans, seen through the eyes of a white man who passed for black in the South. Dr. Foggs believed the class was instrumental in transforming the hearts and minds of many students. The guidance, wisdom, and support we received from Dr. and Mrs. Joyce Foggs and their congregation will always be one of my greatest treasures.

Finding Our Place

African American students on campus had no formal organization, so most encounters took place during mealtimes or in the student center after classes. Student activists, led by John Gibson, hoped to gain the administration's approval for a black student union in 1968-69. The request was denied on the grounds it fostered separation rather than the Church of God doctrine of Christian unity. President Reardon consulted several influential African-American ministers who also opposed the proposed union (Strege 2016, 238). Gibson and others reworked the constitution to state clearly that membership was open to all students regardless of race and met other conditions laid out by Reardon. Reardon tentatively approved the Onyx Society but then rescinded his approval, which led to angry reactions and harsh criticism. In an act of protest, a small group of students walked out of the Senior Chapel, which the president viewed as an insult to such an honorable occasion (Strege 2016, 239).

Most African-American students believed the Onyx Society did not discriminate any more than the overwhelmingly white social clubs did.

Responding to this criticism, the administration launched an all-out effort for social clubs to recruit and accept African-American pledges. The response was not impressive, but Daphne Davis Bethel and I decided to pledge Camarada. We were accepted, but other African-American students remained skeptical. Camarada was a highly regarded women's club, and although our membership may have come because of pressure from the administration, I found most of the women were interested in creating a bond of sistership and service both on and off campus.

One of my friends in Camarada was Samme Newell Rousopoulos. We've reconnected on Facebook, and I mentioned this writing assignment to her. I wanted to know what her thoughts were about the racial situation on Anderson's campus while we were there. Samme said her upbringing was different from many of our classmates. She'd attended integrated schools and was raised to believe all people were equal. This was not an empty mantra for Samme, who was a genuine friend from the start. She said seeing African Americans in positions of authority was not unusual for her based on her upbringing.

In 1971, I was elected the first African-American president of a women's social club in Anderson College history. As president of Camarada, I had to interact with more conservative members of the campus community. My views on social justice, racial equality, and the Church of God's responsibility to live its doctrine of unity did not change, but as a campus leader, I realized the importance of wise counsel. I benefited greatly from the wisdom shared with me by Dr. Clea Anderson and Dr. James Earl Massey at important stages of my campus life.

Dr. Anderson was appointed dean of women in 1968, and she was also a much-needed ally for African-American students on campus. The epitome of grace under fire, she taught me the value of civility to those with whom you disagree. She was instrumental in arranging group sessions for RA's handling issues sometimes caused by cultural differences in the dormitories. It was the "I'm OK—You're OK" era of transactional analysis that often led to intense conversations about how African Americans were viewed and treated on campus. She listened more than she spoke, and I appreciated her honest, candid advice when she did speak. Dean Anderson was a genuinely kind human being who saw the worth and value of every person.

Dr. James Earl Massey was without equal as an academician and theologian. His arrival as campus minister in 1969 was key to the survival, retention, and success of many students regardless of race. He and Mrs. Gwendolyn Massey became an integral part of the Anderson College community, and African-American students welcomed them enthusiastically. The Masseys were strong supporters of campus cultural events and hosted student gatherings in their home. Dr. Massey's door was always open to students, and he taught us the importance of being responsible for our own success. We had the ability to achieve our goals with hard work, discipline, and above all, growing and living our faith in Jesus Christ. Dr. Massey's impact during those challenging years can never be underestimated. His roles as professor and campus minister allowed him to build bridges spiritually, academically, and racially. He was a wise, trusted leader who wanted the Church of God and its people to live our doctrine of holiness and unity without compromise.

A few years prior to his death, I spoke with Dr. Massey at West Middlesex during our NACOG camp meeting. He was gracious as always when I thanked him once again for putting up with me at Anderson. He smiled at me and said, "Elsa, you made them respect you." He taught us, he corrected us, he loved us, and that made all the difference.

The improvement in racial relations at Anderson College from 1970-1972 was remarkable. Dr. Massey noted several factors that contributed to the changes:

The administration had planned with great forwardness and insight. The college leaders were conscious of biblical values, and they were aware of what the times were demanding, and they were courageous enough to deal aptly with those demands. Students were granted greater involvement in planning for campus life, and their cooperation gained them more respect and trust. (Massey 2005, 115)

By no means did racial issues disappear. But for those African-American students who stayed the course, better tools and strategies for coping in a white majority were developed. White students, faculty, and administrators willing to have courageous conversations and do the work necessary for change were also key to the growth in better racial relationships. When Eunice Holloway was crowned Homecoming

Queen in 1971, it sent a message throughout the Church of God that times were indeed changing for African Americans at Anderson College.

An enrollment of 102 African-American students in 1971 required additional support, which came with the hiring of Rev. Thomas J. Sawyer in an administrative position as a full-time counselor to African-American students. He also taught in the religious studies department and was named an associate dean of students in 1974. Rev. Sawyer's presence solidified the college's commitment to the success of students of color. The Onyx Society was finally given approval with Rev. Sawyer as its sponsor. This was welcome news for students who fought for years to establish an organization where African Americans could unite on campus and create a platform to address issues that impacted them locally and nationally.

The Onyx Society produced a publication entitled *Pamoja*, which is a Swahili word for "together." Rev. James Marshall, an African American who joined the faculty in the early 1970s, allowed us to use his office as our staff room. The first issue was dedicated to Malcom X, and student articles that were considered by some to be rather provocative passed Rev. Sawyer's scrutiny. I was the editor of the first issue, dated May 1, 1971. My dear friend Colee Stinson Bethany witnessed firsthand the impact our class had when she and her husband lived in Anderson in the late 1970's. There were more African Americans in key positions on staff and a greater tolerance was evident on campus. She believes our journey made a tremendous difference for those who followed us, just as we stood on the shoulders of African Americans who came before us.

Epilogue

*Like the rushing of a mighty wind
Come and fill our hearts again
Just like the rushing of a mighty wind
Let it overflow. Let it overflow. Let it overflow
Let the people come from miles around
As You send Your Spirit down
To revive the church again
Come like the rushing of a mighty wind.*

Andrae Crouch, *Mighty Wind*

The changes that took place on Anderson College's campus from

the fall of 1968 to the spring of 1972 may have started with an action plan and come about because of better racial understanding and acceptance. But the changes that took place *in* the hearts of faculty, students, and members of the Anderson community, I believe, were orchestrated by God.

In February 1970, a revival took place at Asbury College in Wilmore, Kentucky, that spread to Anderson College, where it continued for more than a month. Dr. Massey viewed the “Anderson Revival,” as it was called, not as mere emotional fervor but as a “phenomenon of integrity.” His article in *Vital Christianity* in April 1970 highlighted how the revival had influenced moral choices and human relations: “The Revival has enabled many to establish worthy convictions and higher loyalties. The Revival has allowed us all to sense community as God willed it” (Massey 2005, 116). The change in our lives was genuine. It felt like a huge wind had blown across campus and shaken us to our core. Difficult conversations became civil and productive, apologies were made and accepted, and you could feel the change in the classrooms and dormitories.

My prayer for the Church of God Reformation Movement, Anderson, Indiana, is that God would send a mighty wind so we can become the Church this broken world is waiting for.

6. A Tale of Two Ideas

On the Importance of Holiness and Unity

JASON R. VARNER

The Anderson University¹ story has been told before. A number of times, actually. The university's founders published first-hand accounts. A handful of scholars have contributed historical narratives in the years since. As we embark on the Anderson University Saga project, a group of faculty and friends of the university have assembled to tell the story anew, and even though the story we are telling is the same, each storyteller will undoubtedly tell the "same" a bit differently. As an intellectual historian,² I am often drawn as much to the ideas that undergird a story as I am to the events that compose the narrative itself. And so, in this essay I'd like to tell the Anderson University saga from an ideological perspective. Characters, setting, and plot certainly matter, but I want to suggest that ideas themselves often exert a palpable sort of force within stories—featuring, at times, as prominently behind the curtain as people and places and things do in front of it. This is certainly true of the history of Anderson University. Two ideas—holiness and unity—have driven the Anderson University saga and continue

1. A preliminary note on the name of the institution: Anderson University actually began as Anderson Bible Training School (1917) and then became Anderson College (1929) before becoming Anderson University (1987). For the purposes of this paper, the name Anderson University will stand for all three iterations.
2. To identify oneself as an "intellectual historian" does not mean to imply that one's ideas are somehow more intelligent than those of others. Rather, to quote Richard Whatmore, "The intellectual historian seeks to restore a lost world, to recover perspectives and ideas from the ruins, to pull back the veil and explain why the ideas have resonated in the past and convinced their advocates" (2016, 14).

to dictate, to a compelling degree, the unique character of our contemporary identity.

To better understand the relationship between our fundamental ideas and the narrative of our history, I will lean quite heavily on an intellectual framework that came to prominence with the eighteenth-century philosopher George Wilhelm Hegel. Hegel is quite notorious: notoriously difficult to read but also quite notorious for having laid the philosophical foundations for a number of ideas that have shaped the West, among them Karl Marx's critique of capitalism.³ But the significance of his work goes far beyond the notorious: Hegel's employment of dialectic as a mechanism for explaining everything from consciousness to epistemology to history itself has left an indelible mark on Western ways of thinking.⁴ But I also want to suggest that Hegel's dialectic helps to explain how the Anderson University saga has been shaped by ideas.

A dialectic, as the reader might have guessed by the prefix "dia," implies a dynamic back and forth between two things. The dialectic process begins with a thesis, which is an initial thought or idea.⁵ Now within this initial idea, however, an antithesis—a negation of the thesis—is inherently present. By saying that something is, one also says, implicitly what that something *is not*.⁶ There exists a tension between these opposite ideas, but importantly for Hegel, this tension is not static but serves as a springboard for progression. The push and pull of the dialectic leads to a new and improved reality—one that incorporates the spirit of both the *thesis* and the *antithesis* in establishing a *synthesis* that reflects them both.

3. *The Communist Manifesto* appropriates Hegel's dialectic philosophy to tell a story of civilization that centers around the tension between labor and capital.

4. For a comprehensive overview of Hegel's system, see Charles Taylor (1975).

5. Note that it could also be a historical event or a thing, but for the purposes of our task, we'll explore the dialectic in terms of ideas.

6. A classic example of this would be to call something cold. In this case you are noting, implicitly, that there is an absence of heat. The thesis "cold" brings with it the antithesis "not hot."

Perhaps an example will prove helpful at this point. My favorite painting is *Der Mönch am Meer* (*The Monk by the Sea*) by the German Romantic painter Caspar David Friedrich. In fact, a copy of the painting is the first thing I see each time I step into my office here at Anderson University. Friedrich's masterpiece depicts a solitary monk standing on the shore of a blue-gray sea, looking out into a horizon that is dominated by an indeterminate sky. I say indeterminate because it is unclear to the viewer whether the lighter areas in the sky mark the first hopeful moments of the new day or whether that light is giving way to the encroaching gloom of night.

From the first time I saw *Der Mönch*, I found myself somehow drawn into the work. The fact that the monk looks away from the viewer and into the distance seems to invite me to join him in his gaze. What kind of future does the sky portend? I have also always been struck by the way Friedrich subtly played with myriad shades of blue and gray in this single, relatively small, piece. The foreboding blue of the deeps, the meeting of rich indigo and green-tinged royal at the place where the sea meets the sky—deep blues and pale blues and blues that are barely there at all.

But at some point, a number of years ago, this natural affinity for *Der Mönch* led me to ask deeper questions about the piece. Who was Caspar David Friedrich? When did he paint? Why the tenuous dance between gloom and glow in so many of his paintings? And so, I began to devote little bits of time, here and there, to reading about the artist, his context, his other works, as well as speculation from art historians and critics as to what he might have been trying to “do” with *The Monk by the Sea*. I learned, for instance, that in a number of Friedrich's paintings, his subjects look away from the viewer and into the distance.⁷ It turns out that my inclination to follow the gaze of the monk was precisely what Friedrich had in mind. I also learned that Friedrich achieved his stunning kaleidoscope of blues by grinding

7. These *Rückenfiguren* are actually a hallmark of Friedrich's work and help to embody the longing that typifies the Romantic movement. See Hampton (2019, 213).

up cobalt glass into a blue powder called “smalt.”⁸ And perhaps most importantly for an intellectual historian, I confirmed my suspicions that Friedrich approached his art within a cultural context that had been profoundly shaped by the overreach of the French Enlightenment and the corresponding correction of the German Romantics. I found all of this to be quite interesting and even fulfilling. Who doesn't like learning more about the things (or people or places) that have become important to them over time?

However enjoyable my initial encounter with *Der Mönch*, or the subsequent satisfaction I experienced in learning more about the piece and the artist, the painting truly took its place as my favorite when I found myself standing before it, in the same room for the first time. While leading a group of Anderson University students on a cultural-learning trip to Berlin, we took part of a day to explore the Old National Gallery, where *Der Mönch* is permanently housed. It was here that the drawing-in of my initial encounter, combined with the further knowledge I had discovered about the painting, came together in a moment of deeper, even profound, engagement.

My experience with *Der Mönch* illustrates what Hegel was seeking to convey with his dialectic. You see, my initial encounter with the painting represents a *thesis moment*. I became aware of, and even moved by, Friedrich's depiction of the monk contemplating the horizon. It was a raw encounter, but, as you will remember, the power of this initial encounter caused me to step back in an attempt to better understand the work to which I was initially drawn. In order to gain this better understanding, however, I had to leave my *thesis moment* (the raw encounter) to go in a different direction—in this case to my computer and then to the library to find out more. This movement away from the painting itself represents Hegel's antithesis. But here is where things get interesting: Having gained some categorical knowledge of *Der Mönch* (a biography of Friedrich, the painting's place within German Romanticism, the method by which the deep blues were achieved, etc.), I then returned to the painting, where I experienced the fruit of my initial encounter combined with the insight

8. <https://www.tate.org.uk/about-us/projects/changing-properties-smalt-over-time>. For more, see Alfeld, Mösl, and Reiche (2021, 50).

gained from my study. Just as the thesis moment had to end for me to enter a new stage, so too did the *antithesis moment* have to cease; I had to leave the library and return to the painting in order to enjoy my *synthesis moment*: the richer, informed encounter. So, we have the *thesis moment* (my moving towards the painting), the subsequent *antithesis* (my moving away from the painting for the purpose of reflection and greater clarity), and the *synthesis moment* (where all the good things of the thesis moment and the *antithesis moment* come together).

For Hegel this synthesis is not to be seen merely as a compromise between a thesis and an antithesis. There is real power in the synthesis moment—a dynamism Hegel captured with the German word *Aufhebung*. Unfortunately, this word does not translate well into English. Attempts often render *Aufhebung* as “sublation,” which “literally means a ‘lifting up’ of something” (McGilchrist 2012, 203). But the German word *Aufhebung* can also mean an annulment or abolition—in short, an end or death of something. In his comprehensive monograph on Hegel, the philosopher Charles Taylor maintains that both meanings (the “lifting up” and the “annulment of”)—which seem to contain an inherent contradiction—are possible and wholly legitimate ways one might use this same word. In fact, according to Taylor, Hegel intentionally “combined [both meanings] to make his term of art” (Taylor 1975, 119). For something to become *aufgehoben* (the verb form of *Aufhebung*), it must in one sense die (to be “annulled”) in order to experience its “lifting up.”

Thankfully, in his preface of *The Phenomenology of Mind*, Hegel provides an example of what *Aufhebung* looks like in practice. Turning to nature, he writes,

The bud disappears when the blossom breaks through, and we might say that the former is refuted by the latter; in the same way when the fruit comes, the blossom may be explained to be a false form of the plant's existence, for the fruit appears as its true nature in place of the blossom. These stages are not merely differentiated; they supplant one another as being incompatible with one another. (Hegel 1807, preface)

In other words, the plant-as-bud must die for the plant-as-blossom to come into being, and the stage of plant-as-blossom must also end for the plant-as-fruit stage to occur. But essentially, even though the bud

and the blossom are no longer physically present in the fruiting plant, they are necessary, and, in a certain sense, “present” as the plant bears its fruit.⁹ Again, to invoke my experience with *Der Mönch am Meer*, my initial moving encounter (the bud) with the painting had to happen for the desire to explore it further (the blossom) to occur in me. But for me to enjoy the fruit—the real payoff—I had to leave the library and engage the painting anew (the fruit).

This same dialectic process can be seen at work in the Anderson University saga. At the core of this community, woven into its very DNA, are two seemingly contradictory ideas: holiness and unity. New members of the Anderson University community—not to mention a good number of inquisitive outsiders—have often asked just what it is that makes Anderson University unique. What about its mission and ethos is, to quote the fifth president of the University, John Pistole, “distinctive and compelling”? All too often, long-time members of the community have struggled to explain just what it is that makes our identity unique.

For some liberal arts universities, this task is rather simple. Some universities can point back to a charismatic individual who galvanized a community and founded a university to educate students in keeping with the values of that pioneer’s own ministry or mission. Other universities were founded for the propagation of a particular creed or doctrine, often as a response to what members of these communities felt to be broken in the larger society. Still others have at their core a social ideal—a notion that the world could be and would be better if a new generation of young people were educated with a particular set of skills and values.

Perhaps the reason we have struggled to tell our story is because things haven’t been as straightforward for us. Rather than enjoying the relative simplicity of tracing our identity to a founding individual, or to a well-defined creed, or even to one overarching idea, I want to suggest that Anderson University’s core identity is rooted in a dynamic—and

9. One thinks here of Aristotle’s concept of “entelechy” in which the potential of a thing is present in its current form. By way of example, Aristotle points out that “we call ‘corn’ what is not yet ripe” (Aristotle, 1017b).

often uneasy—tension between the seemingly contradictory ideas of holiness and unity. In this, the ethos behind the mission of Anderson University is Hegelian to its core. In this essay we will begin by exploring these two ideas before offering an example of how the impulse for each has actually shaped events in the history of the university.

Holiness and Unity

As the other essays in this collection have noted, the roots of Anderson University run deep into the soil of the Church of God movement. Without the felt need among the Church of God to educate young people for the sake of the extension of their mission, Anderson University would not exist. One of the two key ideas that drove this mission was the doctrine of holiness, or sanctification. From the beginning, the Church of God pioneers asserted that, in addition to justification by faith alone, the mature Christian should strive to experience “*sanctification* by faith...a second definite instantaneous work of grace” (Rowe 1898). The former covered the conscious sinfulness of the individual; the latter, however, spoke to the flawed nature of the Christian. Sanctification, in other words, required the believer to think beyond simply “doing” things better, and instead focus on “being” a better doer of things.

The importance of this qualitative transformation in the life of the Christian can, to quote Church of God historian John W.V. Smith, “hardly be over exaggerated” (Callen 1978, 47-48). The idea of holiness stands at the very center of the movement. According to Smith, “If a single truth were to be designated as the basic root from which the reformation sprang, it would probably be considered most basic” (Callen 1978, 47-48).

Early Church of God thinkers asserted that the pursuit of sanctification was quite possibly *the* primary theme of the narrative of Scripture. While the first work of grace justified a believer before God, it was the additional work of the Holy Spirit that allowed contemporary women and men to enter into a new kind of existence in the here and now, reversing that which was lost in Adam and Eve’s fall. To this end, D.S. Warner, the founder of the Church of God movement, argued, “as the fall of man effaced the image of God from the soul and sent a current of depravity down through the entire race, the perfect restoration of the soul, must, necessarily, reinstate its former purity

and divine likeness” (Warner 1978, 12).¹⁰ Another early Church of God writer, F.G. Smith, echoed Warner’s understanding: “[T]he original state of holiness was forfeited by sin; hence in this respect and to this extent the image of God was lost.” The work of Jesus, then, goes beyond the forgiveness of our sins and makes it possible for believers to be “restored in the image of God” (Smith 1945, 39).¹¹

The practice of seeing holiness through this narrational lens has actually been evident throughout the entire history of the Church of God movement. In his landmark *Christian Theology*, Anderson University Professor Russell Byrum interpreted Pauline scriptures with the *imago dei* in mind. “In the work of regeneration,” he argued, “the divine image is described as recreated or restored” (Byrum 1925, 300).¹² Boyce Blackwelder, writing some thirty years after Byrum, explained to his *Gospel Trumpet*¹³ readers that faith in the death and resurrection of Jesus provided forgiveness for the particular sins of the individual believer. However, the indwelling of the Spirit was still “required to deal with the principle of sin, the innate tendency or proclivity toward evil” (Blackwelder 1978, 129).¹⁴ More recently, Church of God theologians like Gilbert Stafford have expounded on this theme. According to Stafford, thanks to the sacrifice of Jesus and the subsequent regeneration by the Holy Spirit, we are “no longer...to think of ourselves primarily as members of Adam’s fallen race but as members of Christ’s body” (Stafford 2001, 447-448).¹⁵ It is quite clear

10. See also L.F. Robold (1913, 492).

11. See also A.T. Rowe, who explained that the reversal of “inherited, or Adamic, sin” was achieved through “*sanctification* by faith...a second definite instantaneous work of grace” (1898).

12. Byrum refers to Ephesians 4:24 (“Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness”) and Colossians 3:10 (“And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him”) in making his argument.

13. *The Gospel Trumpet* was the Church of God’s weekly publication and ran from 1881 to 1961.

14. Boyce Blackwelder, “Baptism of the Holy Spirit,” *The Gospel Trumpet*, May 19, 1956 in Callen, *A Time to Remember*.

15. See also Barry Callen’s argument in *Contours of a Cause*: “Holiness is

that in the Church of God tradition, holiness has never been seen simply as the absence of sin in a believer's life. Rather, holiness has consistently implied something more robust: the *historical* reversal of the "inbred sin or depravity" brought on by the disobedience of Adam and Eve (Blackwelder 1978, 129).¹⁶

With this qualitative transformation, then, comes the implication that the old way of being in the world has been put to death, even as a new way of being human has become possible. In this, the sanctified Christian is to be "set apart," or holy. To be clear, Warner and other early Church of God thinkers acknowledged that all justified Christians were in some sense "set apart." But, as Warner argued, "An individual may be sanctified in the sense of being set apart, and not be sanctified in the sense of being holy and pure in heart" (1892).¹⁷ Truly—and fully—saved Christians, in Warner's estimation, needed to exhibit set-apart lives through altered belief and behavior and additionally through a complete and radical qualitative transformation of the heart. This would allow believers "to be both separated and to live pure lives for Christ" (Warner 1892). Or in other words, to enjoy the forgiveness of sins and to devote one's activities to the service of Christ (thereby making one set apart from the world) was not enough. Rather, true holiness meant one must be set apart in a deeper, qualitative way; that is, as we have indicated, sanctification must extend beyond the perfection of the person's "doing" and transform the person's very "being" as well.

One more comment on the early Church of God and the doctrine of holiness. John W.V. Smith has noted the fact that "the doctrine of holiness is not just an abstract theological concept"; it works itself out

not a static adoration of the holy (distant) God or a perfect performance in relation to some catalog of right and wrong actions. It is renewed life on the move, transforming and *being transformed into the image of the Holy One* who is active in the midst of our world. It is a believer whose personal life story has merged with the biblical story of the God who yet journeys among us" (1995, 152). Emphasis added.

16. For more on this theme, see Merle Strege, *I Saw the Church: The Life of the Church of God Told Theologically* (2002, 14-15).

17. See also John C. Blaney, "Perfection in Christ," *The Gospel Trumpet*, February 2, 1899.

in our “everyday practical living” (1985, 86). Believers who have experienced transformation can also be said to be “set apart” in that they are no longer held back by a disfigured *imago dei*. There is power here that opens possibilities for action. In the words of Church of God historian Merle Strege, for early Church of God thinkers, “[T]o be saved was...to be delivered in the sense of being *enabled* to live a holy life” (Strege 2002, 15, emphasis added). Holiness from this standpoint, then, meant that the individual was not just free *from* an old way of being but also free *to* live into a powerful new way of life in the here and now. An early Church of God hymn captures this sentiment well:

Adieu to this world if you'd follow the Lord,
For none but the pure are received by his word;
Unspotted from sin and made perfect in love,
As pure *in this world* as in heaven above. (Warner and Warren 1911, 413, emphasis added)

As Strege and the hymn writers suggest, there is a very real qualitative transformation that sets a believer apart from the person he or she used to be. However, this setting apart can never remain within the bounds of the ontological. The believer is freed to become—is empowered to be—set apart in terms of a new kind of power-infused activity in this world.

Clearly, holiness implied a number of things in the early Church of God. But it is interesting that in all cases, to be sanctified—to pursue holiness—involved movement: a transformation of one way of being, or one kind of behavior, to another. In Hegelian terms, the call to be set apart represents a radical thesis—an ethical and ontological statement that necessitates a kinetic response. The call of Christ demands movement away from the “place” where one begins into a future guided by the Holy Spirit.¹⁸

While holiness may have been primary in the emerging Church of God movement, it was actually the addition of the second idea—unity—that made the Church of God distinctive from other nineteenth-century religious movements. Whereas holiness called the believer to movement away, unity demanded the opposite; it pulled the believer back towards. As with holiness, the unity impulse was

18. See, for instance, Mark 1:14-15.

present from the early days of the movement. The first historian of the Church of God, John W.V. Smith, noted that the pioneers made this one of their chief concerns. In fact, “the aspect of the church probably most often mentioned in the early Church of God was unity. God does not have churches, they said, he has a church. God’s will is a single, united, visible church” (1980, 89). In *The Cleansing of the Sanctuary*, D.S. Warner reminded his readers that Christ himself said that unity would be the mark of His church (Warner and Riggle 1903, 241).¹⁹ The apostle Paul later expounded on this language, envisioning the Church as members of one body, with Christ functioning as the head.²⁰ Given the reality that “there is absolutely but one body, and one Christ its head,” Warner reasoned that “the call to join various bodies must proceed from antichrist” (Warner and Riggle 1903, 241).

This uncompromising view on unity is perhaps best captured in the early hymnody of the Church of God. In keeping with the thinking of Warner and his fellow pioneers, Charles Naylor saw the Church of God as participating in the restoration of God’s initial idea for His Church:

The light of eventide now shines the darkness to dispel,
The glories of fair Zion’s state ten thousand voices tell;
For out of Babel God doth call his scattered saints in one,
Together all one church compose, the body of his Son.
O Church of God, the day of jubilee
Has dawned so bright and glorious for thee;
Rejoice, be glad! Thy Shepherd has begun
His long divided flock again to gather into one. (Naylor and Byers 1953, 430)

Much as the pursuit of holiness was embedded into God’s overarching narrative plan for the world, so too did the appearance of true biblical unity in the early Church of God represent the delivery of a long-awaited scriptural promise. In fact, the central claim of this hymn is quite radical: the emergence of the Church of God represented the historical reversal of the scattering at Babel in Genesis 11. There is a sense in which the unity imagery of the New Testament bears eschatological import. And as F.G. Smith, the third editor of *The Gospel*

19. The Scripture referred to here is John 17:21.

20. I Cor. 12:12-27 and Col. 1:18

Trumpet, noted, the theme of unity is at the very heart of the New Testament message:

We read of one Lord, one salvation, one God, one faith, one Spirit, one mind, one mouth, one body, one baptism, one new and living way, one Bible, and one heaven. And in order to serve this one God aright, follow this one Lord according to his one new and living way, and obey his one revealed Word, we must be “ALL ONE IN CHRIST JESUS.” (Smith 1945, 164)

It bears mentioning that the kind of authentic biblical unity to which Warner and Smith point could only be achieved through the power of the Holy Spirit. Transformed people, it seems, were uniquely equipped to enjoy a new sort of unity. Anything less than this new, transformed unity was to be rejected as human attempts at community or fellowship, however noble in their intent, were doomed to fail. On this point, the 1921 *Yearbook of the Church of God* was clear. “The unity which God demands is not a mere outward union or confederacy of man-made churches, but is a soul fellowship resulting from the experience of spiritual birth into the family of God” (Morrison 1921, 5).²¹ Writing a decade later, C.E. Brown urged his readers not to settle for anything less than transformative unity. The call to true unity, according to Brown, required “the total abolition of all formal organic denominational divisions among Christian people; not to merge the denominations, but to abolish them is our duty” (Brown 1978, 429).

This, then, leads us to something of a paradox. Early Church of God thinkers believed that transformative biblical unity could only be enjoyed by those who had rejected human-made organizations.²² Thus, the pioneers called men and women to “come

21. This view had been held as central from the movement’s early days. In *The Cleansing of the Sanctuary*, D.S. Warner and Riddle argued: “We can not hope to be one in any earthborn association; but we can, and must be one in God and in Christ. They put darkness for light, and light for darkness, who talk of joining some sect in order to be united” (1903, 251).
22. The centrality of paradox in the living out of faith has been part of the Church of God experience from the beginning. For a modern

out” and “away” from their denominational churches—from “protestant sectism”—in order to attain true Christian unity (Warner 1883). On this, D.S. Warner was unequivocal. Addressing his detractors in an 1882 edition of *The Gospel Trumpet*, Warner noted that leaders in the denominations agreed with him in asserting that there could only be “but one church of God” (qtd. in Byers 1966, 303). The problem, as Warner noted, was that even as they asserted the unity of the body, his critics did so from their positions in different “churches”—each with its own creed and parochial policies for membership. “You say that sects are wrong,” wrote Warner, “but advise God’s children to continue in the wrong. I claim that sects are wrong, and therefore say, Come out from among them, as saith the Lord. Men professing godliness should act consistently with their belief” (qtd. in Byers 1966, 303).

Later thinkers affirmed the idea that unity could only be attained by a people whose lives had been thoroughly transformed. According to F.G. Smith, “[T]he same experience of salvation which brings the person into living touch with Christ also brings him into vital relationship, through the Spirit, with all others who have received a like experience” (Smith 1945, 159).²³ Paradoxically, the experience of being set apart—of movement away—made possible the fruit of movement towards, or unity. Or as Smith put it, “In the early church, purity and unity went hand in hand, for wherever perfect holiness is, there is spiritual unity of believers as a natural result” (Smith 1945, 162). In detailing the core beliefs of the movement, the 1921 *Yearbook of the Church of God* also underscored the link between holiness and unity. “According to the Bible, the church of God is the universal body of the saved, believers. All who are truly regenerated by the Spirit are ‘born again,’ are partakers of Christ, hence are accounted members of the Body of Christ (Rom. 12:4,

assessment of the importance of this theme, see Barry Callen, *Caught Between Truths: The Central Paradoxes of Christian Faith* (2007).

23. In his *Gospel Trumpet* article “The One Essential of Christian Unity,” Robert L. Berry argued that “the Holy Spirit...waits to give the Children of God a vision of how unity may be achieved. Of this we feel certain” (qtd. in Callen 1978, 178).

5; 1 Cor. 12:13)” (Morrison 1921, 4).²⁴ For the early Church of God, holiness and unity were inextricably bound, as the latter testified to the true experience of the former. On this, perhaps Warner and Riggle said it best: “The perfection of the saints is attained in entire sanctification,” the “unity of faith [is] its inevitable fruit” (1903, 263).

Holiness, Unity, and Anderson University

It should be clear by now that the movement-away of the holiness impulse and the movement-towards of the unity impulse together formed the identity of the early Church of God. It should come as no surprise then, that the educational institution that emerged out of this church also found itself driven by this Hegelian tension. The limitations of this present work do not permit a comprehensive narrative account of the push and pull of holiness and unity throughout the history of Anderson University. But in the space we have left, perhaps events that occurred between 1928 and 1930 might offer a case study in how the university’s story has been shaped by the dialectic of holiness and unity.

Given that the Church of God emerged from within the wider American holiness movement of the latter nineteenth century, it was to be expected that the idea of holiness would play a significant role in the founding of the university. The centrality of holiness can be seen in a number of ways in the early years of the institution, but the holiness impulse is especially noticeable in the decision for the university to begin offering liberal arts courses in 1928. By the early 1920s, the Bible Training School²⁵ had managed to remain solvent and to attract a modest number of students who felt called to the ministry. However, President John Morrison realized that the school could not hope to remain viable over the long term without some major changes to the curriculum. More students would be needed to cover the rising costs of the school’s operations. And while preparing young men and women for vocational ministry was at the heart of the school’s

24. See also John W.V. Smith and Merle Strege (2009, 89) and D.S. Warner and Barney Warren (1953, 414).

25. In 1925, upon formal separation from The Gospel Trumpet Company, the school became Anderson Bible School and Seminary (Strege 2016, 44).

mandate, restricting the curriculum to this one end certainly limited the pool from which students might be drawn.

In addition to the need to widen its base, an increasing number of families and young people from the Church of God movement were considering the possibility of higher education as a means to prepare for a range of vocations (Morrison 1962, 154). A brief article dedicated to education in the 1921 *Church of God Yearbook* seems to have spoken to this emerging need. “Every Christian parent,” the article noted, “is justly interested in the education of his children, whether they be preachers or not” (Morrison 1921, 9).²⁶ Given the need to increase enrollment, and noting the cultural shift that brought with it greater demand, President Morrison lobbied the wider Church of God movement for permission to offer college courses beyond the purview of ministerial preparation at the Anderson Bible School and Seminary.

In addition to need and demand, a review of the extant evidence shows that Morrison and other proponents of the curricular change justified the need for it in two ways—both of which related to the issue of holiness. The first rationale given for the adding of college courses was to ensure that young people would remain set apart from the worldliness associated with secular institutions of higher learning. In fact, this concern constituted the first justification offered by E.A. Reardon in a resolution presented to the General Ministerial Assembly on June 19, 1928, for the purposes of expanding the School's curriculum.²⁷

Just months later, after having received the permission he sought from the church, Morrison took to *The Gospel Trumpet* to announce the change to the wider movement. After highlighting the widening of curricular focus, Morrison turned his attention to what seems to

26. It is, perhaps, no coincidence that the editor of that year's yearbook also happened to be the president of the Church of God's leading educational institution.

27. “Whereas, the reformation has lost and is losing many of its promising Young people who imbibe unchristian and unscriptural philosophies of life while attending some of the institutions of higher learning of our country...” (Minutes of the General Assembly, June 19, 1928, Box #, Folder 25, Church of God Archives).

have been a concern from some quarters.²⁸ “With the advancement in academic standards there must be a corresponding advancement in spiritual ideals.... We pledge to do all in our power to shield [students] from the blight of worldliness and to protect them from the spiritual paralysis of that unbelief which is all too prevalent in the institutions of higher learning today” (Morrison 1928).²⁹ This was not a new message for Morrison. As early as 1921, he had used the preservation of holiness as justification for a more robust institution. He argued,

The time is propitious for some liberal-hearted saint of God in this evening light whom God has blessed with worldly wealth to found and equip an institution which would offer a college training to our boys and girls and at the same time quicken their faith in the good old Book and *in the principles of this reformation*. (Morrison 1921, 9, emphasis added)

The assumption seems to have been that prospective students would have committed themselves to holiness (“our boys and girls”), that they had set themselves apart in either the volitional sense (justification) or the ontological sense (sanctification).³⁰ To parents of the latter, the message was that Anderson College would provide the environment that would ensure that their children remained fully set apart; to the former, the promise of progress in holiness beckoned.

The second justification Morrison offered for the addition of ordinary college courses was that college-trained young people would be better equipped to spread the unique message of the Church of God. “If we would see the truths of this grand reform rapidly spread to the ends of the earth, we must have an efficient ministry. This means a ministry of

28. A skepticism towards the formal education of clergy had persisted in the movement since its earliest days. See Strege (2016, 23; 55-60).

29. In the same article, Morrison indicated that “earnest...efforts” would be made “to lead these hopeful and trusting young men and young women *out and up* into a fuller and richer experience in the abiding things of God.” Italics mine. It is impossible to say whether Morrison had the Church of God doctrine of sanctification in mind here, but the use of the words “out” and “up” certainly would have conjured up holiness imagery in the minds of his readers.

30. Or both in the case of sanctified Church of God students.

unbounded faith in the principles of this reform..." (Morrison 1921, 9-10). In a world that was increasingly placing emphasis on higher education, Morrison argued that ministerial education would need to evolve to keep apace of culture. In addition to training in biblical principles, the church would also need "a ministry of ripe mental training" who would then spread the "truths which gladden our hearts...throughout the world!" (Morrison 1921, 9-10). A rising generation of young people properly equipped for the task would be required for the movement-out of holiness, and away from sectism, which was at the heart of the Church of God message.

We see both of the aforementioned justifications evident in personal correspondence between Morrison and a prospective student in 1928. In March of that year, the student, Felix B. Arnold, wrote to Morrison to explore the possibility of transferring from his current Presbyterian college to the Anderson Seminary. The problem for Arnold was that he found the "religious conditions" lacking at his current institution. Apparently, through connections to Church of God saints in his hometown of Piggot, Arkansas, Arnold had become convinced that the spiritual climate at Anderson would be more to his liking.³¹ In fact, he had narrowed his transfer choices to two: Anderson and the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago. Unfortunately, neither school offered general college courses, and Arnold was beginning to feel the call to medical missions. Were he to follow that call, Arnold explained, "[I]t would be necessary to take my premedical subjects in a standard college so that I could meet the entrance requirements of a first class medical college."

Morrison's response was a long time in coming, as he awaited the decision of the Church of God's General Assembly on the curriculum question. It is telling, however, that within days of receiving the Assembly's affirmation, Morrison wrote his response to Arnold. In a brief letter dated June 27, Morrison made Arnold aware of the fact that the seminary would be adding "regular college courses" to its catalog of

31. Arnold begins his letter by thanking Morrison for sending him an application, which makes likely the fact that a Church of God congregant from Piggot had initiated the chain of correspondence. Felix B. Arnold to John A. Morrison, March 28, 1928, AC Box 1, Folder 2, Church of God Archives.

offerings. He then referred to the “tone” of Arnold’s letter, indicating his belief that Arnold would be “delighted” with what he would find at Anderson. In closing the note, Morrison spoke directly to Arnold’s religious concerns. “This school stands committed to the conservative view of the Scriptures and for *full salvation* and the surrendered Christian life” (emphasis added).³²

Morrison’s response underscores the essential role the holiness impulse played in the evolution of the seminary into a college. It is telling that Morrison and other leaders in the movement felt that there was a real need for a college that would go beyond offering “the conservative view of the Scriptures.” If sound hermeneutics were enough, Church of God pastors and families simply would have sent their young people to Chicago. Traditional hermeneutics might have sparked Arnold’s initial interest, and it is interesting that Morrison readily affirms Arnold’s categorization, but Morrison hastens to add what would have represented *the* real distinctive for Anderson: “full salvation,” or sanctification.³³ At Anderson, those who had chosen to set themselves apart for vocational training would encounter an environment that would foster strength in their commitments, and where those called to vocations would encounter an environment with which they would resonate. But perhaps more importantly, each student would be encouraged to grow in their “set-apart-ness”—to experience the full measure of holiness.

Further, Morrison’s response to Arnold—who quite clearly was not already in formal fellowship with the Church of God saints—demonstrates in deed what Morrison had written about for years. In addition to helping students live “set apart” lives, the new Anderson College was intent on spreading the message, this final reformation of the Church, to people outside the camp. How better than by equipping not just the next generation of preachers but also

32. John A. Morrison to Felix B. Arnold, June 27, 1928, AC Box 1, Folder 2, Church of God Archives.

33. Matthew Preston has done substantial work on the link between fundamentalism and the twentieth century Church of God. See Preston (2019).

of teachers, and in the case of Felix B. Arnold, doctors, for the transformation of society?

Just as the holiness impulse was calling the campus community out into new iterations of itself, a controversy related to the other Church of God distinctive—unity—threatened the young institution. As we acknowledged in our brief overview of unity in the early Church of God, the pioneers believed that the first step to true Christian unity was, ironically, to step away from one's community. In fact, true unity could only be achieved through the repudiation of any and all human-made "bodies" that might prevent the coming together of Christ's one universal body. There could only be one church of God, and leaders like D.S. Warner and F.G. Smith believed that their young reformation represented God's first move in bringing His "long divided flock again together into one" (Naylor and Byers 1953, 430). In *The Desk as Altar*, Merle Strege offers the term "reformationists" to describe ministers and lay believers who held to this traditional view of Christian unity (2016, 165). However, as time passed and the End to which this gathering pointed did not arrive, another camp began to emerge within the Church. This second camp, whom Strege calls the "progressives," thought it was time for the Church to reconsider its predominant—and exclusive—stance on Christian unity (2016, 59-60).³⁴

The progressives challenged the reformationist view on several fronts. The first employed a rationale that was built into the movement's own self-understanding. As we have noted, early Church of God thinkers took a narrative approach to the reading of Scripture, and they had no qualms about extending biblical history into the eschatological present.³⁵ In fact, they referred to themselves as the

34. John Morrison implies that the reformationist position hardened in the second generation of Church of God leaders, and that there were at least some leading figures of that generation who resisted the idea of the Church of God as the "last reformation" (1962, 165). In a letter to John Morrison dated May 14, 1929, the minister E.F. Adcock acknowledged that "many of [the] leading brethren" held this newer vision of Church unity (AC Box 1, Folder 2, Church of God Archives).

35. For a primer on this hermeneutic, which Merle Strege calls the

“Evening Light saints” because of their belief that in their gathering, the prophecy of Zechariah 14:7 was being fulfilled: “At evening time it shall be light.” One of the early Church of God hymns tells the story of the wider church in four acts—each act receiving its own hymn verse. In the first age, the early Christian Church enjoyed “the morning bright/like crystal so clear her light.” But with the formalizing of Roman Catholicism around 300 CE, a “long, dreary Papal night” of darkness set in. Verse three relates that some 1260 years later, the Protestant Reformation brought with it the promise of “the gospel ray” breaking through, but the formality of the emerging Protestant churches quickly clouded out the rising dawn. Finally, in the fourth verse, which represents the present age, the songwriters celebrate the fact that the “gospel” has come “so clear and bright” that “the mists are all cleared away.”³⁶

The clear theme of the hymn “The Biblical Trace of the Church” is that God’s vision for the church has been revealed progressively over time and that each successive generation has enjoyed a greater sense of clarity. It was precisely this principle that the progressives invoked in laying the groundwork for their fresh interpretation of church unity. In a 1928 *Gospel Trumpet* article, W. Burgess McCreary, exhorted his fellow saints, “[We] should keep our minds open to truth, as God gives us to see the light.” While he acknowledged that the application of reformation principles may have shifted over time, “as God [has] let the light dawn upon us,” the principles themselves had remained firmly in place. Those who clung to the strict reformationist view, in McCreary’s estimation, seemed to have failed “to recognize that these progressive stages are of God.”³⁷ God was still about the business of increasing

“Church-Historical” method, see *I Saw the Church*, chapter 5 (Strege 2002).

36. The introduction to the 1897 hymnal proclaimed that “the pure gospel is now shining now as it never has shone since the days of primitive Christianity” (Warren and Byers 1897).
37. The term “progressive” as a descriptor for this new group of Church of God thinkers should be seen not as denoting an affinity with the wider Progressive Movement that was reshaping American culture during this time, or with the adoption of higher criticism for the study of

the clarity by which His people saw the true church.³⁸ The idea that more might be revealed alarmed the reformationists, who feared saints would spend too much of their time pursuing further revelation, thereby devoting less to the building up of the church. But the real danger, in McCreary's estimation, was not that the church would look for further light but rather that "human prejudice" would "hinder the full, free flow of God's Holy Spirit in revealing truth and making the pathway of this movement shine more and more unto the perfect day."³⁹

The second and perhaps more condemnatory criticism levied by the progressives was that the Church of God had actually begun to resemble the very thing it had sought to eradicate. In fact, several leaders of the progressive camp took time to voice concerns that the Church was dangerously close to entering back into the sectarianism that it had fled. In a letter to President Morrison dated May, 24, 1929, the Reverend U.G. Clark privately expressed a concern that the Church of God was in danger of getting "lost in the fogs of sectarianism."⁴⁰ W.

Scripture. Rather the term "progressive" in the context of the second and third generation of Church of God thinkers suggests that adherents held to the belief that God was continuing to reveal Himself to his church through "progressive stages" (McCreary 1928).

38. This view was clearly articulated at the 1929 Church of God Camp Meeting by the influential preacher E.A. Reardon. Speaking of the work God was doing to advance the cause of unity throughout the wider church, Reardon closed his message enthusiastically: "If we get a clearer vision of His great work and a larger portion of the Spirit's power, this work will grow and nothing can stop it" (qtd. in Callen 2000, 136).
39. McCreary wasn't the only one concerned about this. In a private letter to John Morrison dated to May 14, 1929, E.F. Adcock expressed concern that reformationists might compel the "School...to restrain" the teaching of the progressive perspective, "and get in the way of reformation progress" (Adcock to Morrison, May 14, 1929, AC Box 1, Folder 2, Church of God Archives).
40. U.G. Clark to John A. Morrison, May 24, 1929, AU Box 1, Folder 29, Church of God Archives.

Burgess McCreary voiced publicly what Clark intimated in private. Writing in *The Gospel Trumpet*, he warned: “All of us have our prejudices. If we are not careful, even in this good, glorious reformation, we will push those prejudices and make them into the tenets of a sectarian creed” (McCreary 1928).

Perhaps the most consequential critique came from the influential minister E.A. Reardon. In a controversial sermon delivered at the 1929 Anderson Camp Meeting, Reardon offered what must have seemed to his audience a distressing observation: “As I look out upon the horizon of this movement, it seems to me that I can see a tendency to sectarianize it.” While Reardon believed the founding ideas of the Church should be cherished and even emphasized, he cautioned the saints against becoming parochial in their pursuit of the cause. “There is such a thing as stressing the reformation to such an extent that we cause our people to be reformation-centered—*reformation sectarians*” (qtd. in Callen 2000, 136, emphasis added). For the progressive thinkers, the holiness impulse, unrestrained by its unity counterpart, put the Church at risk of flipping the original paradox on its head; a separation designed to unify was in danger of becoming a “unity” that divided. Perhaps in the case of the pursuit of holiness, one really could desire too much of a good thing.

While calls for a progressive understanding of the doctrine of unity came from across the movement, it was actually the college that took the lead in effecting change. In fact, no one person did more to advance the progressive cause than Anderson Professor Russell R. Byrum. For some time, Byrum had been teaching the progressive view of unity in his theology course at the seminary. Extant notes prepared for a lecture on the theme allow us to reconstruct the essential points of Byrum’s position. In a section of the lecture entitled “How Will Christian Unity be Affected,” Byrum first noted that the pursuit of unity—however difficult its implementation—was worthwhile because “Jesus taught it and prayed for it.” But he then quickly turned his attention to the historical difficulties. Byrum began by noting that the Roman Catholic church was the first to preach a provincial view of Christian unity—that unity was only possible through “coming to them” (n.d.). The same mistake was later made by the early Protestant church and then still later by a group he simply refers to as “Christian Disciples.” But in a twist of irony that seems to have alarmed and even upset

his students, Byrum then accused the Church of God of making the same mistake.⁴¹ Surely by now, Byrum argued, it was apparent that unity would not be achieved “by all coming to one group.” Speaking directly about the Church of God movement, Byrum was quite blunt with his students: “We haven’t succeeded. Doesn’t look as though we were going to succeed” (n.d.).

In 1929, Byrum took his message to the wider church. At the Indiana Ministerial Assembly of the Church of God, Byrum moved beyond general critique of the Reformationist position and offered a robust explanation of the progressive view on Christian unity. Despite the initial hope of the founders that all true Christians would come out of denominations to join the one true church of God, Byrum noted the distance of the founding vision from the reality of the situation in 1929. In fact, he argued,

Probably but few thinkers among us at present expect all true Christians to come to us, or to come into an operative unity with us as we as a group are with one another. Some still try to hold that position or shrink from recognizing that they no longer hold that narrow theory, because it would be unorthodox and seems to them to be a surrender of the Bible doctrine of unity. Such brethren need to find a truer ground for unity. (Byrum n.d., 4)

This new ground, Byrum suggested, consisted in the “loving fellowship” of believers whose “hearts [were] united,” in their commitment to Christ (Byrum n.d., 3). “This loving fellowship,” Byrum argued, was “the purpose of God in creating us...the source of the highest human happiness, and it is the end of our existence. It is obedience to the two greatest commandments and it is in this that true Christian unity really consists” (Byrum n.d., 3). After proposing his alternative view, Byrum turned his attention back to the Reformationist perspective. To demand that other Christians come into “operative unity” with the Church of God wasn’t just unrealistic, it also represented

41. One student, Nettie Owen, later testified that Byrum’s lecture had “destroyed” her faith. F.G. Smith related that several students had come to him from Byrum’s lecture on unity “in tears” (E.F. Adcock to Ethel and Walter Shrock, June 26, 1929, AC Box 400, Anderson University Archives).

the kind of stubborn “sectishness” that Warner and others had sought to eradicate in their initial outward movement (Byrum n.d., 4-5).

As word of Byrum's address spread throughout the country, reformationists fought back. They believed that, unchecked, the progressive view would serve to undermine one of the two main pillars of the church, resulting in “much damage to the movement.”⁴² The controversy culminated in what might best be described as a formal heresy trial, as Byrum's position on unity, as well as his teaching at the college, came under investigation.⁴³ In the end, Byrum was acquitted of all charges, but the tenor of the controversy left him shaken.⁴⁴ He tendered his resignation the following day, writing in his journal that he did so “for the sake of the peace of the church” (1930).

The importance of this episode in the life of the university cannot be overstated. Had Byrum not sounded the alarm, had he not called the Church back to the kind of unity it had set out to create in its early days, there is a very real possibility that the movement would have become ingrown to the point of organizational death. In his 1929 sermon, E.A. Reardon had predicted this very thing: “If [the sectarian tendency] is allowed to go to seed, it won't be long until we shall be numbered among the dead” (qtd. in Callen 2000, 136). But the impact of Byrum's stand extends beyond the Church and into the life of the university. His teaching on unity—which, it bears noting, he enacted in his resignation—kept the university from becoming the kind of place whose identity hinged on fixed ideas or cultural positions. In calling the Church and the university back-towards, Byrum, perhaps paradoxically, laid the groundwork for new and fresh movement-out into new places. This had a profound impact on the emerging identity of the university and helped shape the contours of its unfolding saga.

The *Aufhebung* of Holiness and Unity

In this essay we have argued that two theological ideas have had a

42. R.L. Berry and Mrs. F.G. Smith to Morrison and the Doctrinal Committee, April 29, 1929, AC Box 400, Anderson University Archives.

43. For an excellent account of the events surrounding the trial, see Stregge (2016, 60-68).

44. Morrison observed that the “most conspicuous factor in the whole procedure was brotherly love—conspicuous by its absence” (1962, 169).

profound impact on the formation of Anderson University. And yet, on this we must be clear: holiness and unity as theological ideas have not in themselves shaped our saga. Instead, as we look back over a century of service to church and society, it seems to me that it is actually the characteristic movements inherent in each idea that have woven themselves into the fabric of the university. Sometimes this movement has expressed itself theologically. We see, for instance, the holiness impulse in the bold decision to appoint Sethard P. Dunn, an African-American pastor from Chicago, to the university's board of trustees at the height of Ku Klux Klan activity in Indiana (Massey 2005, 99). Surely this represents a radical expression of our desire to be set-apart from the injurious nature of the broken world we inhabit.⁴⁵ And yet at other times, the holiness impulse has also expressed itself indirectly—and profoundly—in the openness of the university to genuine academic discovery. One thinks here of the inscription at the base of the Helios sculpture that sits just outside the science building at the heart of the university's campus: "...and there was light."⁴⁶ Our desire to pursue the Author of Truth transcends the arbitrary divisions of category. Genuine transformation—the qualitative movement from one thing to another—leaves no part of us unchanged. From this vantage point, then, we do not hesitate to say that every honest pursuit of Truth has holiness at its core.

Similarly, unity in the life of the institution has often been a matter of explicitly theological concern. There are echoes of John 17, for instance, in the act of R.R. Byrum's resignation, or later in the refusal of Rev. Lillie McCutcheon to let theological differences lead to the defunding of the university by the Church.⁴⁷ But at other times, the unity impulse has

45. I'm thankful here for my friend and fellow professor, Dr. Cassie Trentaz, who introduced me to the concept of "social holiness"; that is, the idea that a genuinely transformed life will be evidenced, at least in part, through active love for the Other; through, among other things "gifts meeting needs" (Trentaz 2018, 17).

46. The glass installation is in the shape of a DNA helix, linking the "light" of intellectual pursuit to the original light of Genesis 1.

47. Despite their theological differences, Rev. McCutcheon and Anderson University president Robert Reardon came together to broker a

been apparent in more tacit ways. One thinks here of the steadfast refusal, over the years, to require Anderson University students to testify to Christian faith in order to be admitted. Or the fact that we have honored students who have answered the call to serve their countries through military service, even as we have celebrated those students who have represented us as conscientious objectors.

The point is that the movement-away of the holiness impulse and the movement-towards of the unity impulse have been persistently at work throughout the unfolding of the university's saga. The presence of each has combined to create a soil for education that is as fertile as it is unique. But the real power—the true distinctive of this place—is in the fruit that has come from the tension between the two. It is here that we return to Hegel, *Aufhebung*, and *The Monk and the Sea*. One of the tragic realities of modern Western culture is that we have retained the thesis and antithesis of Hegel's dialectic but seem to have forgotten that it is the synthesis that bears the fruit. And so we remain entrenched in our dichotomized ideological camps, insisting that we somehow possess the fruit the other seeks. We live in a culture desperate for *Aufhebung*.

This, perhaps, then, brings us to the distinctive promise of the Anderson University saga. When the movement out and away of the holiness impulse has had its run, has led us beyond the horizon to new places, when it might seek to run on, past the beyond, to places of discontinuity, it is then that the unity impulse has brought us back-towards our abiding identity. And at other times, when the movement-towards of the unity impulse has been too eager to protect the community we have created, has encouraged us to revel in the achievements of the past, or to stand silent in the face of new challenges, it is the holiness impulse that calls us, yet again, to new seasons of transformation.

At some point, the dialectic push and pull of holiness and unity—the legacy gift of our founding church—embedded itself into the very way the institution goes about the pursuit of its mission. Within every

compromise that honored the concerns of conservative members of the church, while still funding the ongoing work of the College (Smith and Strege 1980, 445).

attempt at service to the church and society, when we are at our best, is our native dialectic, urging us forward and yet calling us back. The tension between the holiness impulse and the unity impulse creates “this something”⁴⁸ that we find so hard to explain because it simply won’t stop moving. It is dynamic, even demanding. Life in the tension can be uncomfortable and perhaps a bit bewildering to the uninitiated, but there is no denying the fruit it has produced over a century of service. We have no charismatic founder; nor do we have one seminal idea. What we do have, however, is a dynamic movement that is intrinsic to our way of being in the world.

The monk in Friedrich’s masterpiece stands contemplating an uncertain sky. Again, I find myself drawn in. Looking out into an institutional future that has yet to be determined, fully cognizant of the strengths of our saga, one wonders if the continued success of the university depends on the degree to which we embrace the tension. May we linger there long enough for the fruit of *Aufhebung* to arrive.

48. The concept of “haecceity” in philosophy gets at the difficulty of expressing the unique nature of something. Writing in the thirteenth century, John Duns Scotus famously argued that every individual thing is importantly distinct; that each thing possesses a “thisness” which differentiates it from other like things. Anderson University is not the only midwestern Christian university; and yet it possesses its own haecceity. For more, see Anthony Kenny (2006, 168-169).

References

Alfeld, Matthias, Kristina Mösl, and Ina Reiche. 2021. "Sunset and moonshine: Variable blue and yellow pigments used by Caspar David Friedrich in different creative periods revealed by in situ XRF imaging." <https://doi.org/10.1002/xrs.3195>.

Anders, George. 2017. *You Can Do Anything: The Surprising Power of a "Useless" Liberal Arts Education*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.

Anderson Bible Training School. 1917. *Annual Catalog, 1917-1918*. Anderson, IN.

Anderson College. 1929. *College Catalog, 1929*. Anderson, IN.

_____. 1961. *Anderson College Announcements, 1961-62*. Anderson, IN.

_____. 1943. *College Catalog, 1943*. Anderson, IN.

_____. 1974. *Anderson College Catalog 1974-76*. Anderson, IN.

_____. 1984. *Anderson College Catalog 1984-86*. Anderson, IN.

Anderson University. 2002. *Anderson University Undergraduate College Catalog 2002-2004*. Anderson, IN.

_____. 2015. *Undergraduate Catalog, 2015-17*. Anderson, IN.

_____. 2021. *Undergraduate Catalog, 2021-22*. Anderson, IN.

The Andersonian. 1947. "Sermon." 2, no. 1 (September 9, 1947).

_____. 1956. "Welcome Visitors." 11, no. 8 (April 26, 1956). <https://cdm15705.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15705coll56/id/1041/rec/2>.

Aristotle. n.d. *Metaphysics 5*, translated by Hugh Tredennick. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Retrieved from <https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0052%3Abook%3D5%3Asection%3D1017b>.

Bengtson, Dale F. 2007. *Memoirs*. Anderson, IN: Self-published.

Blackwelder, Boyce. 1978. "Baptism of the Holy Spirit." In *A Time to Remember*, edited by Barry Callen. Anderson, IN: Warner Press.

Blaney, John C. 1899. "Perfection in Christ." *The Gospel Trumpet* 19, February 2, 1899.

Brooks, David. 2015. *The Road to Character*. New York: Random House, 2015.

Brown, Brene. 2019. *Brene Brown: The Call to Courage*. Directed by Sandra Restrepo. Los Angeles: Netflix/UCLA. Streaming Content. <https://www.netflix.com/title/81010166>.

Brown, C.E. 1978. "A New Approach to Christian Unity." In *A Time to Remember*, edited by Barry Callen. Anderson, IN: Warner Press,

Byers, A. L. 1966. *Birth of a Reformation: Life and Labors of D.S. Warner*. Guthrie, OK: Faith Publishing House.

Byrum, Russell. 1925. *Christian Theology*. Anderson, IN: Warner Press.

Callen, Barry L. 1995. *Contours of a Cause*. Anderson, IN: Anderson University School of Theology.

_____. 2000. *Following the Light*. Anderson, IN: Warner Press.

_____. 1992. *Guide of Soul and Mind*. Anderson, IN: Anderson University Press and Warner Press.

_____. 1988. *Preparing for Service: A History of Higher Education in the Church of God*. Anderson, IN: Warner Press.

Crouch, Andrae. 2005. *Mighty Wind*. Brentwood, TN: New Spring Publishing.

Dylan, Bob. 1962. "Blowin' in the Wind."

Ervin, Preston, Jr. 1980. "Byrum, AC Pioneer, Dead at 91." *The Andersonian* 36, no. 3 (February 28, 1980).

Foggs, Edward L. "The Black Community within the Church of God." February 26, 1969.

Francis I. 2015. *Pope's Speech during the Families' Festival in Philly*. September 26, 2015. <https://youtube/es05JbRpU-4>.

The Gospel Trumpet. 1928. "Anderson Seminary Opening Twelfth Year." September 13, 1928.

Hampton, Alexander. 2019. *Romanticism and the Re-Invention of Modern Religion: The Reconciliation of German Idealism and Platonic Idealism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hegel, Georg W. F. 2003. *The Phenomenology of Mind*, tr. J. B. Baillie. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.

Hester, Melvyn F. 1968. "The Church's Opportunity in the Present Racial Crisis." Lecture, May 28, 1968.

Hodgson, Geraldine. 1908. *Studies in French Education from Rabelais to Rousseau*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holmes, Arthur F. 1987. *The Idea of a Christian College*, rev. ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Hunter, Nora. 1905. "For What Is Your Life?" *The Gospel Trumpet* 25, no. 10 (March, 1905). <https://cdm15705.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/aupublic/id/864/rec/1>.

Irons, Charles. 2021. "Religion during the Civil War." Encyclopedia Virginia. Accessed August 4, 2021. <https://encyclopediaivirginia.org/author/charlesfiron>.

Kenny, Anthony. 2006. *An Illustrated Brief History of Western Philosophy*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Martin, F. David. 1972. *Art and the Religious Experience: The "Language" of the Sacred*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.

Massey, James Earl. 2005. *African Americans and the Church of God in Anderson, Indiana*. Anderson, IN: Anderson University Press.

McCreary, W. Burgess. "An Educated Sectarian." *The Gospel Trumpet* 48, June 21, 1928.

McGilchrist, Ian. 2012. *The Master and His Emissary*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Morrison, John A. 1962. *As the River Flows: The Autobiography of John A. Morrison, First President of Anderson College*. Anderson, IN: Anderson College Press.

Morrison, John, ed. 1921. *Yearbook of the Church of God*. Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet Company.

National Association of the Church of God. 2020. "Our History." YouTube, August 1, 2020. <http://www.nacog.com>.

Naylor, Charles W., and A.L. Byers. 1953. "The Church's Jubilee." In *Hymnal of the Church of God*, 25. Anderson, IN: Warner Press..

Newell, Arlo F., and Randall W. Vader. 1989. *Worship the Lord: Hymnal of the Church of God*. Anderson, IN: Warner Press.

Nicholson, Robert A., ed. 1953. *Hymnal of the Church of God*. Anderson, IN: Warner Press, 1953.

_____, ed. 1971. *Hymnal of the Church of God*. Anderson, IN: Warner Press.

Old South Leaflets. n.d. "New England's First Fruits." III, no. 52 (n.d.).

Otto, Rudolph. 1950. *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational in the Idea of the Divine and Its Relation to the Rational*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pew Research Center. 2015. "America's Changing Religious

Landscape.” Accessed May 12, 2015. <https://www.pewforum.org/2015/05/12/americas-changing-religious-landscape/>.

Preston, Matthew. 2019. “Disrupting Evangelicalism: Charles Ewing Brown and Holiness Fundamentalism in the Church of God (Anderson), 1930-1951.” Ph.D. Diss, Boston University. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/2144/38722>.

Reid, Benjamin F. “Disillusionment, Apprehension . . . Hope!” Lecture, 27 May 27, 1968.

Ream, Todd C. and Perry L. Glanzer. 2013. *The Idea of a Christian College: A Reexamination for Today’s University*. Eugene: Cascade Books..

Robold, L. F. 1913. “Sanctification.” *Camp-Meeting Sermons: 1913*, 478-492. Anderson, IN: Warner Press..

Rowe, A. T. 1898. “What We Believe.” *The Gospel Trumpet* 18, January 6, 1898.

Saliers, Don E. 2005. “Sounding the Symbols of Faith: Exploring the Nonverbal Languages of Christian Worship.” In *Christian Worship*, edited by Charlotte Kroeker. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.

Sanders, Scott Russell. 2002. *The Force of Spirit*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Smith, F. G. 1945. *What the Bible Teaches*. Anderson, IN: Warner Press.

Smith, John W.V. 1985. *I Will Build My Church: Biblical Insights on Distinguishing Doctrines of the Church of God*. Anderson, IN: Warner Press.

Sowers, Richard L. 2022. “Choral Music at Anderson University.” Interview with Jeffrey E. Wright, January 14, 2022.

Stafford, Gilbert. 2001. *Theology for Disciples*. Anderson, IN: Warner Press.

Stout, Harry S. 2021. “Religion in the Civil War: The Southern Perspective.” *Divining America*, TeacherServe. National Humanities Center. July 20, 2021. <http://nationalhumanitiescenter.org/tserve/nineteen/nkeyinfo/cwsouth.htm>.

Strege, Merle D. 2016. *The Desk as Altar: The Centennial History of Anderson University*. Anderson, IN: Anderson University Press.

_____. 2002. *I Saw the Church: The Life of the Church of God Told Theologically*. Anderson, IN: Warner Press.

Strege, Merle D., and John W.V. Smith. 2009. *The Quest for Holiness and Unity: A Comprehensive History of the Church of God Reformation Movement*. Anderson, IN: Warner Press.

- Taylor, Charles. 1975. *Hegel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trentaz, Cassie. 2018. *Love in a Time of Fear: Hearing Our Neighbors Across Lines that Divide Us*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock.
- Warner, Daniel S., and H.M. Riggle. 1903. *The Cleansing of the Sanctuary*. Anderson, IN: The Gospel Trumpet Company.
- Warner, Daniel S. 1884. "The Devil's Preacher Factory," *The Gospel Trumpet* 6, no. 16 (October 1894). <https://palni.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/aupublic/id/20/rec/19>.
- _____. 1892. "Satisfy Them in All Truth." *The Gospel Trumpet* 12, April 28, 1892.
- _____. 1978. "A Second Work of Grace." In *A Time to Remember*, edited by Barry Callen. Anderson, IN: Warner Press.
- _____, and B. E. Warren. 1911. "Whiter than Snow." In *Select Hymns*, 413. Anderson, IN: Gospel Trumpet Company..
- Warren, Barney, and A.L. Byers, eds. 1897. *The Evening Light and Salvation Echoes*. Moundsville, WV: The Gospel Trumpet Company.
- Whatmore, Richard. 2016. *What Is Intellectual History?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Wikipedia. 2021. "McKinley Burnett." Wikimedia Foundation. Accessed October 30, 2021.
- Young, Timothy. 2015. "The Invisible Wall: Exploring the Experiences of African-American Students At CCCU Institutions." *Growth: The Journal of the Association for Christians in Student Development* 14, no. 14: 54-68.

About the Authors

Elsa Johnson Bass is a retired educator and the founder and artistic director of the nonprofit Cross Culture Christian Theater. An ordained minister of the Church of God since 1997, she serves as an associate pastor and minister of worship arts at the Christ Center Church of God in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Nationally, Elsa has served the Church of God as a member of the Christian Women Connection Board of Directors and the National Association of the Church of God as dean of the In Service Training Institute. Elsa attended Anderson College (University) from 1968 to 1972. She holds an MA in Theater (Hunter College, New York) and a MEd in Educational Leadership (Cabrini College, Pennsylvania).

Jerrald Fox has been a member of the faculty of the Falls School of Business at Anderson University since 1985. He returned to teach at his alma mater after a brief career in finance and development. Dr. Fox holds an MBA from Indiana University and a PhD from The Union Institute. His grandfather was the first generation of his family on the Anderson campus, coming to the Anderson Bible Training School in 1919, the third year of existence of what would become Anderson University. Dr. Fox's children are the Fox family's fourth generation of AU grads.

Kimberly Majeski has been in full-time preaching ministry for more than twenty years. She is an ordained pastor in the Church of God, Anderson, Indiana. After nearly two decades as a professor of biblical studies, Dr. Majeski now serves as the executive director of Christian Women Connection, leading women around the globe to serve the church and build up the kingdom. Kimberly's scholarship is featured on the History Channel, A&E, and in many books, articles, and publications. She lives at the heart of the justice movement as an activist and the founder of Stripped Love, a non-profit serving victims of sex trafficking. A widely sought-after preacher, Dr. Majeski launched in 2019 the Preacher Girl School, a dynamic online women's preaching clinic. She now convenes the Arise Academy with the same charisma and enthusiasm. Kimberly is married to Kevin and is mama to Max. She loves to golf, shop, and laugh until she cries.

Deborah (Zarka) Miller Fox attended Anderson University from 1985 to 1989. After completing a graduate degree at Kansas State University, she returned to AU in 1992 to serve first in the Department of Student Life and then as a professor in the Department of English, where she is currently the department chair. Professor Miller Fox has served on many university committees and as director for several programs, including her current role as co-director for the Honors Program. In 2019, she received the institution's highest honor, the John A. Morrison Award for Outstanding Service. In addition to her work as a teacher, Professor Miller Fox is an accomplished writer, publishing poetry, non-fiction, and fiction as well as producing grant proposals that have earned AU several million dollars in funding from Lilly Endowment.

David Thomas Murphy is professor of history in the Department of History and Political Science at Anderson University. Joining the faculty in 1992 after earning his PhD in history from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Dr. Murphy is the author of three books and numerous articles on modern German and European history. Dr. Murphy is the recipient of grants from agencies including the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies of the United States Memorial Holocaust Museum, Harvard University's Center for Hellenic Studies, and Cambridge University's Independent Social Research Foundation. He also serves as director of the University's Jeeninga Museum of Biblical and Near Eastern History.

Jason R. Varner serves as the associate professor of the history of Christianity at Anderson University's School of Theology and Christian Ministry. Dr. Varner earned bachelor's and master's degrees from Anderson University prior to moving to Scotland, where he studied history at the University of St Andrews. After completing his MLitt in early modern history and PhD in modern history, Dr. Varner returned to his alma mater to teach. He also serves as the director of the university's Peace and Conflict Transformation program. Dr. Varner's research interests include topics related to Christianity and culture in early modern America as well as European encounters with the other. His most recent scholarship was a paper entitled "The Transformation of Trauma: on Liminality and Identity in Seventeenth-Century New England," which he presented at the European Association for Early American Studies conference at the University of Poitiers, France.

Nathan Willowby (PhD, Marquette University) is the dean of the School of Theology and Christian Ministry at Anderson University. He is an ordained minister in the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana). He teaches courses in theology and ethics. He also serves the Church of God as historian.

Jeffrey E. Wright, dean of the School of Music, Theatre, and Dance at Anderson University, joined the faculty in 1995 after completing his PhD in music education at Northwestern University. As a music educator and administrator, Dr. Wright consults with college music programs across the nation. His research interests include the intersection of aesthetic and religious experience, and his most recent scholarly presentation was at the Conference on Christian Congregational Music at Ripon College in England. He is co-editor of and contributor to the book *On the Nature of Musical Experience*, published by the University Press of Colorado, and he has served as a music education consultant with the Ravinia Festival (summer home of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra), the Merit Music Program of Chicago, and the National Endowment for the Arts.