

1996

Independent Christian Colleges and Universities

William Vance Trollinger

University of Dayton, wtrollinger1@udayton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/hst_fac_pub



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [History Commons](#)

eCommons Citation

Trollinger, William Vance, "Independent Christian Colleges and Universities" (1996). *History Faculty Publications*. 141.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/hst_fac_pub/141

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of History at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in History Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

"Independent Christian Colleges and Universities"

William Vance Trollinger, Jr.

The category, independent Christian colleges and universities, is not a very large one. The reason for this is rather simple: as William Ringenberg has noted in the introduction to his helpful 1988 bibliography on such schools, "there are not many contemporary colleges and universities that are both continuing Christian in philosophical orientation and independent of denominational ties in governance."¹ While this may change in the future, given the weakening of denominational loyalties among American Protestants, the fact remains that there are not too many independent Christian colleges.

For purposes of this essay I will be looking at fourteen institutions.² I have divided these colleges into two sub-categories: evangelical institutions and fundamentalist institutions. As will be further discussed, the latter schools tolerate much less theological diversity, place much stricter behavioral regulations upon students and faculty, and are much more adamant about separating from both "the world" and from Christians and Christian institutions that do not share their views.

The fact that evangelical and fundamentalist schools are quite different requires that I deal with each group separately. But I should note up front that, in a number of ways, these schools are strikingly similar (more similar than some faculty and administrators at both sorts of colleges are willing to

acknowledge). will elaborate upon these similarities in the conclusion, but one point needs to be made up front. Most independent Christian colleges are quite young, founded in the past 100 years or so (and in some cases, in the past few decades). Most were created, at least in part, in response to the well-documented "secularization of the academy."³ The desire to provide a conservative Protestant alternative to secular higher education remains central to all of these schools, evangelical and fundamentalist alike.

Not all independent Christian colleges had their beginnings in the twentieth century, and for this fact we can thank the Methodists. The oldest independent Christian college, Taylor University, was founded by the North Indiana Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1847. Started as Fort Wayne Female College, the school soon admitted men. In 1890 it was renamed for Methodist missionary William Taylor (and soon thereafter relocated in Upland, Indiana). Also in 1890, and just a few hundred miles to the south, Methodist evangelist John Wesley Hughes founded Kentucky Holiness College, which would eventually become Asbury College, in honor of America's first Methodist bishop.⁴

Both Taylor and Asbury were among the very "few colleges representing the sizable holiness branch of Methodism,"⁵ with its emphasis on the complete sanctification of the believer. As a result, frequent revivals and an intense pietism were a part of student life at Taylor and Asbury. Even as both schools gradually

moved toward nondenominational status in the early twentieth century, they continued to be shaped by their holiness heritage. One result was that, when the fundamentalist-modernist battles broke out in the 1920s, these two schools were somewhat less involved than other independent Christian schools. This point should not be exaggerated: both Asbury and Taylor held to a conservative Protestant theology, and were not at all in sympathy with biblical criticism and theological modernism. But while they were certainly inclined to the fundamentalist side of the fight, they were generally less obsessed with pressing the case against the liberals. As William Ringenberg observes about Taylor, the school "spent much less time [in the early twentieth century] rationally defending its faith than it did emotionally experiencing it."⁶

This statement certainly does not apply to the school regarded by many as the preeminent conservative Protestant institution of higher education. Wheaton College began as Illinois Institute in 1852.⁷ Established by Wesleyan Methodists, a small abolitionist group, the school struggled to stay afloat financially. In 1860 local Congregationalists rechartered the school as Wheaton College (for the town where it was located and the man who gave them land for the campus), placed it on sound financial footing, and established abolitionist Jonathan Blanchard as president.⁸

Wheaton blossomed under the leadership of Blanchard and his son Charles, who succeeded his father in 1882 and presided over the school until 1925. In terms of national prominence, Wheaton really

came into its own in the 1920s. During that decade fundamentalists, or militantly anti-modernist evangelicals, organized in an effort to scourge the major denominations of liberals and rid the public schools of evolutionists. For these fundamentalist crusaders Wheaton came to be viewed as their college. One reason was because of Charles Blanchard's leadership role in the fundamentalist movement, as seen in his appointment as chair of the Committee on Colleges and Seminaries of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association. Blanchard's school also had impeccable credentials as a theologically conservative institution, a point reinforced by the school's 1927 decision to make the WCFA creed (with its emphasis on Biblical inerrancy and premillennialism) the school's official doctrinal statement.⁹ Finally, Wheaton's nondenominational status was attractive, in that it allowed ultra-conservatives from a great variety of denominations to attend. For all of these reasons, a virtual "Who's Who of Northern Fundamentalism",¹⁰ including William Bell Riley and Lyman and Milton Stewart, actively supported and promoted Wheaton College as the fundamentalist college of choice.

Wheaton's preeminence did not foreclose the creation of other independent Christian colleges. The years of the fundamentalist crusade saw the founding of the following institutions: Southwestern Collegiate Institute (1919), in Siloam Springs, Arkansas, which would become John Brown University, and which was noteworthy for its distinctive emphasis on professional training; Bob Jones College (1926), which will be discussed below; and, Bryan

College (1930), which was established in the town (Dayton, Tennessee) where the leader of the antievolutionist crusade fought his last and most famous fight, but which did not become the great fundamentalist university that some boosters had envisioned. Then, in 1940, Westmont College was founded in Los Angeles (eventually moving to Santa Barbara), with great hopes of becoming the "Wheaton of the West."¹¹

But all of the aforementioned colleges notwithstanding, Taylor and Wheaton included, the most noteworthy conservative Protestant educational alternatives in pre-World War II America were the Bible schools. These institutions are the subject of a fine essay by Virginia Brereton elsewhere in this volume. But as a number of these Bible schools eventually evolved into independent Christian colleges, a few remarks are in order here.

The Bible School movement began in the 1880s, with the founding of New York Missionary Training Institute and, most important, Moody Bible Institute in Chicago. A host of such schools were created in the next few decades; relevant for our purposes are: Boston Missionary Training School (1889), which would eventually become Gordon College; in Los Angeles, Training School for Christian Workers, which later became Azusa Pacific University; Providence Bible Institute (1900), which would become Barrington College, before merging with Gordon College; in Minneapolis, Northwestern Bible and Missionary Training School (1902), later to add Northwestern College; and, the Bible Institute of Los Angeles (1908), which would become Biola University.¹²

These schools sought to inculcate laypersons in a conservative understanding of the Bible, while at the same time training them for work as evangelists, missionaries, and religious teachers. The schools listed above predate the fundamentalist crusade; however, as increasing numbers of conservative Protestants became alienated both from mainline denominations and their colleges and seminaries, they turned to these Bible schools for educational training and other services. In fact, Biola, Northwestern, and Gordon all served as centers of regional fundamentalist networks. It is no exaggeration to say that the Bible schools served as the educational wing of the fundamentalist movement.¹³

Most Bible schools began with few resources, minimal admissions requirements, and a short course of study. For example, the Bible Institute of Los Angeles began its existence in a "large suite of four rooms above a pool hall",¹⁴ while Boston Missionary School started "with no fixed curriculum, no formal entrance requirements, no buildings," and one instructor.¹⁵ But these schools did not remain at this point. And it is not just that they got larger. As Virginia Brereton has established, over time the Bible schools began to move toward academic respectability: they began to "demand higher educational prerequisites of students," "acquire bigger and bigger libraries," and enter "larger number[s] of liberal arts subjects [into] the curriculum." Eventually, some former Bible schools were accredited as liberal arts colleges.¹⁶

This is precisely what happened with all four of the schools

under consideration here. Gordon moved fastest to achieve academic respectability. By 1917, the school was awarding collegiate degrees; four years later, the school had adopted the name Gordon College of Theology and Missions, and was even beginning to offer some graduate courses. But in the next few decades Azusa, Biola, and Northwestern followed Gordon's march to academic respectability.¹⁷

It should be noted that the shift from Bible school to liberal arts college was not always painless. Some constituents were bound to see the increased emphasis on academics and professionalism as an abandonment of the school's mission. This was particularly true at Northwestern. The liberal arts college was established there in 1944. When founder and president William Bell Riley died in 1947, Billy Graham became president, and immediately confirmed the worst fears of Bible school supporters by concentrating his energies on the college. The resultant infighting helped convince Graham to resign in 1952. By 1956 Northwestern split, with the Bible school supporters departing to create Pillsbury Bible Institute. Without Bible school or fundamentalist support, Northwestern College limped along, finally closing in 1966. But, in an incredible twist, a gift from the wife of a pizza mogul allowed the school to reopen in 1972. The reborn Northwestern was a liberal arts college, but it also required that all students to have a second major in Bible. In this regard, Northwestern was following Biola's lead; in so doing, both institutions retained direct ties to their Bible school heritage.¹⁸

The advance toward academic respectability on the part of the former Bible schools reflects a larger trend among evangelical colleges (including independent evangelical colleges), particularly in the two decades after World War II. As Thomas Askew explains in a useful essay, in these years evangelical colleges strove mightily (and successfully) to secure accreditation, raise academic standards, improve the credentials and salaries of their faculty, increase enrollment, strengthen the financial base of the institution, and improve the physical plant. Some schools even engineered "upwardly mobile changes in location," from city to suburb: Gordon moved from Boston to Wenham, Biola moved from Los Angeles to La Mirada, and Northwestern moved from Minneapolis to Roseville.¹⁹

There would appear to be a number of reasons for this aggressive drive to move up the academic ladder in the 1950s and 1960s. Perhaps the simplest was a certain institutional imperative pressing these colleges to grow, to improve. Certainly this was fueled by the fact that, as Askew notes, "in the postwar era, evangelical families and communities were experiencing upward social mobility, and their educational ambitions and expectations were rising with them."²⁰

But there was more to it than this. In the 1940s a number of leading Protestant conservatives came to the conclusion that fundamentalism had gone too far in its emphasis on denominational separatism, anti-intellectualism, and withdrawal from American

culture. These evangelicals, or neoevangelicals, who in 1943 organized the National Association of Evangelicals, asserted that Christians needed to engage the culture, not simply resist it. But engagement was not enough; they also called on evangelical intellectuals to be about the task of shaping the life of the mind in the modern world. Of course this "shaping the mind" business is, well, a grandiose notion. But there is also no question that the emergence of this new evangelicalism, with its desire for intellectual engagement and achievement, played a crucial role in prodding many conservative Protestant colleges (including the independent colleges we have discussed so far) to strive for academic excellence.²¹

But for a number of neoevangelicals, including Carl Henry, editor of Christianity Today, these efforts were not sufficient. As they saw it, what was really needed was the creation of an evangelical university, with top-flight graduate programs. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s a number of proposals were floated, including the idea of establishing such an institution on the campus of Gordon College. But the evangelical university remained a pipe dream.²²

It is interesting to note, however, that the institution that may have come closest to fulfilling the evangelicals' vision appeared seemingly out of nowhere in the mid-1960s, and from (at least in the eyes of evangelicals in the Reformed tradition) the unlikeliest quarter. In 1965 the famous Pentecostal evangelist and healer, Oral Roberts, opened his nondenominational school in Tulsa.

Now, Roberts was not trying to create the evangelical university; his goal was slightly less expansive: to quote one historian, he sought to establish the "university of the entire charismatic movement." This is remarkable enough; even more remarkable is that, in striking contrast with all other independent Christian colleges, Oral Roberts University began its existence with huge financial resources and a spanking new campus. No years of classrooms in the church basement (or over a pool hall) for this school. With its array of futuristic buildings, including the massive Learning Resources Center (with its amazing audio-visual learning stations) and the 10,500 seat sports arena, ORU quickly became one of the leading tourist sites in Oklahoma.²³

Despite the architecture and technology, in one sense Oral Roberts University was a throwback to a time when presidents dominated life at their institutions. From the school's inception Oral Roberts viewed his university as a "semi-theocracy," with "God as the head of the school" and Roberts "'the appointed head by God.'"²⁴ Roberts ran the show, and his influence could be seen everywhere: in the 200-foot prayer tower in the middle of campus; in the requirement that all faculty and students be placed on an aerobics program (part of Roberts' concern with the "whole man"); and, most important, in the pervasive emphasis on "the charismatic working of the Holy Spirit." But the lack of a democratic governing structure did not seem to hinder ORU's growth. Within a decade of the first graduating class 4,000 students were enrolled, and a number of graduate programs had been established.²⁵

As evangelical colleges prospered and grew in the 1950s and 1960s, there also came an awareness that there may be much to be gained by working together with other evangelical schools, with whom they had much in common. This cooperative impulse seemed to be particularly strong among the independent Christian colleges, unencumbered as they were by denominational ties. When, in March of 1971, the presidents of ten evangelical institutions met to create the Christian College Consortium, four independent colleges were included: Gordon, Taylor, Westmont, and Wheaton.²⁶ (Asbury was added four years later.) At heart, the Consortium's mission was to improve and advance the cause of evangelical higher education in the United States; toward that end, the Consortium schools developed a number of cooperative academic programs for students and faculty, actively promoted "research and study among evangelical scholars on the integration of the Christian faith and academic learning,"²⁷ worked to attract curricular and faculty development grants, and continued to discuss the possibility of establishing an independent Christian university.²⁸

Probably the most important achievement of the Christian College Consortium was the creation, in 1976, of the Christian College Coalition. (One sign of a true evangelical academic insider is the ability to distinguish between the two CCCs). The Consortium established this satellite organization for the specific purpose of providing Christian colleges with a unified voice in Washington, in order to protect the freedom and promote the

interests of these schools. What is interesting is that the Coalition has become much more than just a lobbying organization. William Ringenberg's 1984 comments are even more true today: the Coalition is now "the primary interdenominational confederation of continuing Christian liberal arts colleges", in the process of "surpassing the parent organization in operation and significance."²⁹ The importance of Coalition affiliation had always been clear to the independent evangelical colleges, all 11 of which were early members of the Coalition (which had grown to 77 schools by 1993).³⁰

As evinced by the Consortium and Coalition, as well as the numerous professional organizations of evangelical scholars (e.g., the Conference on Faith and History) and periodicals such as Christian Scholar's Review, it is clear that in the past two decades evangelical higher education has come of age in America. And the independent evangelical colleges, or many of them, have been on the leading wave of this development. This is particularly clear in the development and expansion of graduate programs at places such as Azusa Pacific, Biola, and Wheaton. This is also clear in the increased visibility in the larger academic world of scholars from these institutions.

Despite these successes, a number of evangelical insiders have become increasingly ~~more~~ critical regarding evangelical higher education. For example, a number of observers, including some folks teaching at evangelical colleges, have scathingly pointed out that almost all of these colleges are overwhelmingly white,

Republican, and middle class, or, as Nicholas Wolterstoff has put it, "exclusive ethnic clubs of Euro-Americans."³¹ Most particularly, there are very few African Americans either attending or teaching at these schools.

There is also the charge that evangelical colleges have accommodated too much to the prevailing culture. In his study of evangelical college students (including students at Gordon, Taylor, Westmont, and Wheaton) James Davison Hunter suggests that, when these students complete their four years, they have "less conviction" and less confidence" in their Christian beliefs, and are "perhaps more vulnerable to worldly distractions." Douglas Frank continues a similar theme, suggesting that evangelical colleges, like evangelicalism in general, are in the process of selling their souls to "the demon of consumerism."³²

That these critics are, for the most part, on the mark is a point worth noting. But it is also important to remember that such self-criticism is also a further sign of the "coming of age" of evangelical higher education.

We have concentrated our attention on evangelical institutions. But there is a second category of independent Christian colleges, i.e., the fundamentalist schools. A little historical background helps place these institutions. When neoevangelicalism emerged out of the old fundamentalist movement in the 1940s and 1950s, there were many conservative Protestants who rejected what they saw as the evangelicals' sell-out to the

larger culture. These Protestants, who proudly retained the label "fundamentalist," maintained both their militant antimodernism, as well as their insistence on separating, not only from "the world," but also from Christians who have not remained true to the faith. This separatism is a salient characteristic of fundamentalist colleges: not only have none of the schools examined below (as of yet) joined the Christian College Coalition, but their leaders often seem to expend more energy attacking evangelical colleges than criticizing more "secular" schools.³³

All three independent fundamentalist colleges are in the Southeast, and were founded by successful evangelist-ministers. In 1926 fundamentalist evangelist Bob Jones established a college in Florida; after a stint in Tennessee, in 1947 he moved the school to Greenville, South Carolina, where it is today (and where it has been presided over by the second and now the third Bob Jones). One year before Jones left Tennessee Baptist minister Lee Roberson established Tennessee Temple University in Chattanooga, as an extension of his Highland Park Baptist Church. Finally, and following a similar path to that of Roberson, radio/TV evangelist Jerry Falwell started Liberty University in 1971, also as an extension of his church (the Thomas Road Baptist Church of Lynchburg, VA).

These schools have been characterized by extremely authoritarian leadership. For the most part, there are no challenges to presidential rule; not only is there a certain amount of fear, but there is an understanding among employees that the man

in charge is God's man, and hence deserves their allegiance. But when there are challenges to presidential authority, the response is swift and severe. Perhaps the most famous example of this occurred at BJU in the 1950s. A good number of faculty and staff had become frustrated with their very low salaries and the requirement that they must live on campus. Bob Jones Sr. and Jr. responded by building into the school by-laws a rule that no employee could complain about the institution; if such disloyalty occurred, that person was to be fired. When a good number of the faculty and staff resigned in protest, Jones preached a sermon on Judas; according to one of the departing administrators, Jones made it clear that "'Judas was a much finer fellow, for he did have the grace to hang himself.'"¹⁴

In the same vein, these schools also have quite strict rules governing both belief and behavior. At Falwell's school, the student rules are known as "the Liberty Way," with requirements regarding dress, church attendance, and relations with the opposite sex (hand-holding only, as of the late 1980s). If anything, the regulations at BJU were even stricter, with prohibitions against off-campus dating "unless the couple is accompanied by a faculty member or a married couple."¹⁵ And behavioral regulations do not just apply to students. At Tennessee Temple, at least back in the 1970s, faculty members were required "to join the Highland Park Baptist Church, to fill out a weekly activity report verifying attendance at one week-night and two Sunday services . . . and not to play cards, go to the movies, participate in mixed bathing, wear

shorts, or [as regards men,] grow a beard or wear long hair."³⁶

For all of this the strict doctrinal and behavior requirements, the extremely authoritarian leadership, the pervasive emphasis on separation -- the reality is that these schools have thrived, both in numbers and programs. Bob Jones University is a good example. Enrolling nearly 5,000 students in 1990, BJU has schools of Arts and Science, Religion, Fine Arts, Education, Business Administration, and Applied Studies. The school's success in the arts is nothing short of remarkable, particularly its film program (which actually won an award at the Cannes Film Festival) and its art museum (which has a superb collection, but, not surprisingly, no modern art). All at a place that, on separatist grounds, refuses to seek accreditation.³⁷

Of course, whether these schools will maintain their separatist stance is open for debate. Some observers (including people at BJU) feel that Liberty University is showing signs of heading down the road toward the less militant, more inclusive evangelical schools.³⁸ But if these schools do, indeed, become more inclusive, one can rest assured that new, more separatistic institutions will rise up to take their place.

Independent evangelical and fundamentalist colleges are, indeed, quite different. There is no getting around the fact that the educational experience at, say, Gordon College is not at all the same as the educational experience at Bob Jones University.

Having said this, it is interesting to note that prospective

college students and their parents will often send applications to both sorts of schools. This was brought home to me when I taught a course here at Messiah (an evangelical, albeit not independent, liberal arts college) on fundamentalism and televangelism. During one of the class discussions a couple of students alluded to the fact that the only other school they had applied to Liberty University. Stunned, I asked for a show of hands of all those who had applied to Liberty or Bob Jones; approximately half of the students in that class of 35 answered in the affirmative.¹⁹

When this happens it is not just an indication of naivete on the part of conservative Protestant families, nor is it simply a failure on the part of college public relations representatives to articulate clearly their particular school's vision. It is also an indication that evangelical and fundamentalist schools are not as different as individuals in both sorts of schools might assert. For one thing, the faith statements at both sorts of schools are often quite similar; while the statements at fundamentalist schools are typically longer and much more detailed, the fact is that, even at many of the evangelical schools faculty are required to sign on to inerrancy and premillennialism statements. Moreover, both sorts of schools engage in a good amount of "boundary maintenance." While fundamentalist schools are much more concerned with strict, impermeable boundaries, and while a good number of faculty members at evangelical schools would not be allowed to teach at a fundamentalist school, the fact is that evangelical colleges can also be quite restrictive, and, on occasion, engage in a purge.⁴

Finally, and returning to a point made in the introduction, both sets of schools have sought, and still seek, to provide a conservative Protestant alternative to what they see as the pervasive secularization of state and even denominational colleges in the United States. Certainly this feeling is much stronger at fundamentalist colleges; certainly evangelical institutions are, generally speaking, more interested in dialogue with the rest of the academy. But there is no getting around the fact that both sorts of independent Christian colleges share a rather similar vision of themselves and their place in American education and American society.

1. William C. Ringenberg, "Independent Christian Colleges and Universities," in Thomas C. Hunt and James C. Carper, eds., Religious Colleges and Universities in America: A Selected Bibliography. New York: Garland Press, 1988, p. 208.

2. My list of schools includes: Asbury College, Azusa Pacific University, Biola University, Bob Jones University, Bryan College, Gordon College, John Brown University, Liberty University, Northwestern College, Oral Roberts University, Taylor University, Tennessee Temple University, Westmont College, and Wheaton College.

I readily concede that this list could easily be contested as being either too inclusive or too exclusive. Regarding the former, I can imagine that some may argue that schools such as Liberty, and Tennessee Temple are so tied to a particular Baptist church that it does not make sense to call them independent. This point is well taken; however, these schools are not, strictly speaking, denominational schools, and I know of no other category in which these institutions can be properly located.

Others may argue that I have left out schools whose denominational ties are so tenuous as to render them, in effect, independent. This also may be true, but determining where to draw the line between "denominational" and "independent" is a very difficult task. I suspect that, as denominational loyalties further weaken in America, this task will become even more difficult.

3. For the most complete treatment of the secularization of higher education, see: George Marsden, The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

4. William Ringenberg, Taylor University: The First 125 Years. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1973, pp. 20-80; 1994-1995 Asbury College Bulletin, p. 9.

5. William C. Ringenberg, The Christian College: A History of Protestant Higher Education in America. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1984, p. 175.

6. Ringenberg, Taylor University, pp. 70-71, 112-114; Ringenberg, Christian College, pp. 175-176.

7. This date comes from InForm: Bulletin of Wheaton College, 1994-1995, p. 5. But there seems to be some confusion in this regard. In his Dictionary of American Christianity entry on Wheaton, Paul Bechtel gives the school's founding date as 1848; but in his full-scale history of the school, Bechtel observes that "Illinois Institute began its first full year in 1854." Wheaton College: A Heritage Remembered, 1860-1984. Wheaton, IL: Harold Shaw Publishers, 1984, p. 19.

8. Bechtel, Wheaton College, pp. 13-22.
9. Bechtel, Wheaton College, pp. 29-107; William Vance Trollinger, Jr., God's Empire: William Bell Riley and Midwestern Fundamentalism. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990, p. 39; Ringenberg, Christian College, pp. 173-174.
10. Thomas A. Askew, "The Liberal Arts College Encounters Intellectual Change: A Comparative Study of Education at Knox and Wheaton Colleges, 1837-1925." Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1969, as quoted in Ringenberg, Christian College, p. 174.
11. John Brown Catalog, 1993-1995, p. 7; Ringenberg, Christian College, pp. 174, 194, 241; 1993-1995 Westmont Catalog, p. 3.
12. Virginia Lieson Brereton, Training God's Army: The American Bible School, 1880-1940. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1990, pp. 71-77; S.A. Witmer, The Bible College Story: Education with Dimension. Manhasset, N.Y.: Channel Press, Inc., 1962, pp. 72-74.
13. For an example of how this worked out in practice, see: William Vance Trollinger, Jr., "Riley's Empire: Northwestern Bible School and Fundamentalism in the Upper Midwest," Church History 57(June 1988): 197-212.
14. Robert Williams and Marilyn Miller, Chartered for His Glory: Biola University, 1908-1983. Los Angeles: Associated Students of Biola University, 1983, p. 15.
15. Thomas A. and Jean M. Askew, A Faithful Past, An Expectant Future: Celebrating a Century of Christian Higher Education. Wenham, MA: Gordon College, 1988, p. 8.
16. Brereton, Training God's Army, pp. 78-86.
17. Askew and Askew, A Faithful Past, pp. 20-22.
18. Trollinger, God's Empire, pp. 151-156; Ringenberg, Christian College, p. 168.
19. Thomas A. Askew, "The Shaping of Evangelical Higher Education Since World War II," in Joel A. Carpenter and Kenneth W. Shipps, Making Higher Education Christian: The History and Mission of Evangelical Colleges in America. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987, pp. 141-144, 151n10. As Askew notes, in those years other evangelical schools that moved to the suburbs included Malone, Calvin, and Bethel (MN).
20. Askew, "Evangelical Higher Education," p. 141.

21. For discussions of neo-evangelicalism and the life of the mind, see: George M. Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987; and, Mark Noll, Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship, and the Bible. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1987.
22. Ringenberg, Christian College, p. 198.
23. Ringenberg, Christian College, p. 192-193.
24. As quoted in David Edwin Harrell, Jr., Oral Roberts: An American Life. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1983, p. 251.
25. Harrell, Oral Roberts, pp. 219-252; Ringenberg, Christian College, p. 193.
26. The other six original schools in the Consortium included Bethel College (MN), Eastern Mennonite, Greenville, Malone, Messiah, and Seattle Pacific. James Carl Hendrix, "The Christian College Consortium: 1971-1991." Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1992, p. 50.
27. Undated Christian College Consortium document, as quoted in Hendrix, "Christian College Consortium," p. 198.
28. Hendrix, "Christian College Consortium," pp. 52-73, 120-128, 194-202.
29. Ringenberg, Christian College, p. 207.
30. Ringenberg, Christian College, pp. 204-207; Hendrix, "Christian College Consortium," pp. 120-123, 153-156, 262-263.
31. Nicholas Wolterstorff, "Foreward," in D. John Lee, Alvaro L. Nieves, and Henry L. Allen, eds., Ethnic-Minorities and Evangelical Christian Colleges. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991, p. ix. For further elaboration of these themes, see the essays in this volume.
32. James Davison Hunter, Evangelicalism: The Coming Generation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987, p. 213; Douglas Frank, "Consumerism and the Christian College: A Call to Life in an Age of Death," in Carpenter and Shipps, eds., Making Higher Education Christian, p. 263.
33. For further discussion of this antipathy toward evangelicalism on the part of fundamentalist college leaders, see: R. Wesley Hurd, "Liberty University: Fortress in the War for a Christian America." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1988, p. 170.

34. Mark Taylor Dalhouse, "Bob Jones University and the Shaping of Twentieth Century Separatism." Ph.D. dissertation, Miami University, 1991, pp. 141-145; Hurd, "Liberty University," pp. 100-105; Ringenberg, Christian College, pp. 182-183.

35. Hurd, "Liberty University," pp.; Dalhouse, "Bob Jones," pp. 254-256.

36. Ringenberg, Christian College, p. 185.

37. Dalhouse, "Bob Jones," pp. 2, 239-247.

38. Hurd, "Liberty," pp. 257-263; Dalhouse, "Bob Jones," pp. 272-274.

39. I am quite aware that the percentage was skewed upward because of the course topic. On the other hand, I would have been surprised if 25% of the students had applied both to Messiah and Liberty.

40. For recent incidents at Gordon and Northwestern, see: "Catholics Need Not Apply," Christian Century, 9 October 1985, pp. 888-889; "Teacher Fired," Christian Century, 29 July - 5 August 1992, pp. 708-709; and William Thorkelson, "Christian Colleges Settle with Ousted Professors," 8 February 1993, p. 61.