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PREFACE

“The ESR Story — A Quaker Dream Come True” is an interpretive history of the Earlham School of Religion from its inception in 1960 to its 25th Anniversary in 1985. This is intended to be my own “inside story” written by someone who has lived with it from its birth through its first twenty-five years. It is intended primarily for persons who are acquainted with ESR, and therefore is only secondarily addressed to the wider public.

No claim is made to complete objectivity and freedom from bias about the development of the Earlham School of Religion. On the other hand, I have tried to be accurate and fair in the interpretation of the facts.

The research task was made immeasurably easier because of careful historical records and files which have been kept from the beginning of the school. These records, newspaper clippings, articles, letters, and a limited number of manuscripts have been kept in looseleaf notebooks and are deposited in the Earlham Archives in Lilly Library. In addition, two dozen letters were sent to a selected list of persons associated with ESR in the early days asking them to write about their reflections on the beginnings of ESR. Partial responses to these are included in Appendix I. Also included in the appendices is a Summary Report of the original feasibility study done for the establishment of the School, together with other important material and statistics pertinent to the history and development of ESR.

Several persons need to be thanked for helping with the preparation of this book. Earl Conn provided helpful practical advice about the focus which I should have in mind as I began to write. The current and past Deans of ESR, Tom Mullen and Alan Kolp, as well as the ESR faculty have supported me in the project and provided released time to do the research and writing. Landrum Boiling, Tom Mullen and Tom Brown have read the manuscript and have offered many helpful suggestions. I am also indebted to Landrum Bolling for writing the Introduction, which puts in perspective the roles of many persons in establishing the Earlham School of Religion. Finally, Sue Kern of ESR’s office staff
has typed various drafts of the manuscript and has been untiring in helping to put together final copy for publication.

The writing of this history has served as a happy conclusion to my twenty-five years of close association with ESR. Much credit is due my wife, Emily Cooper, and our family for having joined and supported me in this venture. They have shared the struggles and frustrations, as well as the accomplishments and joys which were a part of these years of hard work. With their support and that of a host of others, and by the grace of God, I have been able to have a significant hand in helping ESR become a reality. For what has been accomplished so far we are thankful, and I think that it is altogether fitting that we now celebrate the achievements of the School’s first twenty-five years. We hope that readers of this book will find the story informative, interesting and inspiring.

Wilmer A. Cooper

March, 1985
INTRODUCTION

More than any other individual, Wilmer Cooper is responsible for the existence of the Earlham School of Religion. To be sure, he had a great deal of help, before and after he began his work to create and sustain this unique Quaker institution, but it was his energy, patience, persistence and faith that brought it about. That plus an extraordinary ability to win the confidence and cooperation of many and diverse members of the Society of Friends. It is right that he should tell the story of how it all happened.

There were, of course, many fathers and mothers to the thought. It would be impossible to list all of the men and women who at some time or other, over the past century, expressed at least a hope that Friends would some day attempt to establish something like a theological seminary. Nor would it be possible to name all the Friends, weighty and otherwise, who opposed it.

Through many generations it had been a controversial proposition; and so it remained, down to the day the School opened, and beyond. Wil has given an objective account of that debate, and in as much detail as is required. The point is not that there was some great organized opposition that prevented the establishment of the School of Religion or has later threatened its existence. Serious people are likely to have honest differences about a new idea, particularly the development of a new institution within any given human community. This would likely have been true about the founding in those years of a seminary connected to any other church-related college in America. But for Friends this was a peculiarly difficult decision. So much so that the founding of ESR was a daring, almost revolutionary step for both the Society of Friends and the College.

The weight of a venerable tradition was against this venture. Early Quakers had scorned the “hireling ministers.” George Fox had expressed bluntly his doubts about the spiritual powers that might be conferred by training at Cambridge and Oxford. Gifts in the ministry were conveyed by God, were likely to be laid upon any member of the meeting, and it was up to the meeting simply to recognize those to whom such gifts had been given. Moreover, Quakers have had a high level of tolerance, generally, for the less-
than- compelling spoken ministry of those members whose perceptions of their gifts might not be universally shared by others.

Despite that long tradition of the unprogrammed, open-participation form of Quaker worship, the pastoral system had been adopted by a large number of meetings, particularly in Middle America, before the end of the Nineteenth Century. Paid ministers (though not very well paid) came to be accepted. Some of them received formal theological training at seminaries such as Hartford and Yale, and a few even became theology professors as well. Nevertheless, the reasons for not establishing a Friends seminary were convincing to most Quakers, as this book explains. On the surface, by the late 1950’s, it seemed that the idea was pretty well abandoned.

When, in the early days of my Presidency at Earlham, I began to discuss the needs and possibilities for an expanded, explicitly Quaker program of training for ministry, I was more often told by leaders among midwestern Friends that it “couldn’t” be done rather than it “shouldn’t” be attempted.

“We have needed our own seminary for a long time,” one highly respected Quaker said to me. “But, unfortunately, it is too late. Perhaps if we had tried harder 50 years ago, the project might have succeeded; now the circumstances are not favorable.”

Among the negative circumstances cited were 1) the continued stagnation, if not actual decrease, in the numbers of Quakers; 2) the increasing acceptance by rural and small town Quaker meetings of pastors drawn from other denominations, trained in non-Quaker colleges and Bible schools, and with little understanding of the traditions and beliefs of Quakers; 3) the continuing, perhaps increasing, fragmentation of Quakers along theological and political lines; 4) the discouraging record of Quaker financial support for existing Friends organizations service projects and educational institutions, including Earlham. All of this added up to a mood of pessimism about the Society of Friends, with an honored past, that was now widely thought to be in decline.

Earlham, moreover, was probably not a suitable place for such an undertaking: It was too liberal for the more conservative pastoral meetings. It was too conservative for the
more liberal, largely eastern, nonpastoral meetings. It had a hard enough task to raise funds for the maintenance of its regular liberal arts undergraduate college program, without taking on the well-nigh impossible responsibility of raising funds for a graduate program in religion. In addition to all that, reasoned some Earlham supporters, the weakening of the ties between Earlham and Indiana and Western Yearly Meetings in preceding years had probably been good for Earlham, had enhanced its independence1 broadened its appeal to non-Quakers and to the more liberal eastern Quakers. The conventional wisdom on a number of church-related campuses was summed up for me by one college president who said: “The best thing I ever did for my college was to dissolve all the formal ties of control and influence with the denominational body that founded us.”

Against that prevailing tide toward disaffiliation and secularism, my predecessor, Thomas E. Jones, had firmly set his face. He spent the twelve years of his administration trying hard to relate Earlham more firmly to its midwestern Quaker roots and to its natural midwestern Quaker constituency. In this cause he was ably, vigorously assisted by Professor D. Elton Trueblood who had come with President Jones to Earlham in 1946. Both had grown up in rural Quaker communities, Jones in Indiana, Trueblood in Iowa. Jones was a graduate of Earlham, Trueblood of William Penn. Both had received their doctorates at distinguished Eastern universities, Columbia and Johns Hopkins. Both had achieved academic distinction in non-Quaker universities: Tom had served for twenty-two years as President of Fisk, Elton had been Dean of the Chapel and professor of philosophy and religion at Stanford. Both were “coming home” to midwestern Quaker education, to serve a particular Quaker college and a broad spectrum of Quaker constituencies in ways that it had been impossible for them to do before. (Both, incidentally, held theology degrees: Tom from Hartford, Elton from Harvard.)

If they had not had other heavy and immediately pressing responsibilities, they might well have tried to persuade the Earlham Board and faculty to launch a seminary a decade earlier than the actual starting date under the next administration. The reinvigorating of Quaker meetings, the training of Quaker leadership, the strengthening of ties between Earlham and the yearly meetings these were goals to which they were both committed.
There were just too many other tasks that had to be carried out first: the building of new buildings and the refurbishing of old ones, the enlargement of the student body and faculty, the overhauling and strengthening of the curriculum, the expansion of the sources of financial support. It was a time of unparalleled development for Earlham and of superhuman labors by Tom Jones. It was also a time of experimentation in reaching out to the Quaker constituencies—through the sending out of deputation teams of students and faculty members to Quaker meetings in the area, through special lecture programs, through seminars and extension courses for pastors and lay leaders, and by re-intensified efforts at recruiting Quaker students—and, ceaselessly, by spirited preaching. Tom Jones was, above everything else, an enthusiastic evangelist for the faith in which he had been raised and the causes to which he opened his generous heart.

Meanwhile, Elton’s fame as preacher, lecturer and writer of religious books was continuing to spread across the nation and the world. He became the name most widely identified with Earlham. He was in on the founding of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam. He was a leader in the movement for lay renewal, for encouraging the ministry of the laity. He was a major factor in the development of Protestant and ecumenical retreat centers, and got one started on the edge of the Earlham campus. He involved himself in the expansion of ministries to prisoners. He founded the Yokefellow Movement. His one major leave from Earlham was to serve as adviser on religion to the Voice of America. Like Billy Graham, he was sometimes asked to pray at the opening of the U.S. Senate and to counsel Presidents. He conducted the funeral service for his friend and fellow Iowa Quaker, President Herbert Hoover. Elton Trueblood gave visibility and credibility to Earlham as a center for religious training.

It has to be said, however, that for all the successful activism of Tom Jones and Elton Trueblood, and for all their attentive wooing of assorted Quaker constituencies, many of the responses were wary, among both liberal eastern Friends and in the conservative, evangelical pastor-hiring Quaker churches. Old suspicions and antagonisms die slowly and new ones inevitably arise. Not all deeply held opinions, especially in matters of religion, can be reconciled, compromised, or ignored. It is just not possible to win the trust of all factions where questions of doctrine are at stake, compounded by differences
in lifestyle and socio-economic status. If Tom Jones and Elton Trueblood, with their great powers of persuasion and their broad experience in dealing with many kinds of Quakers, could not win a consensus for a Friends school in religion, it probably couldn’t be done.

That is where things seemed to be when I became Earlham’s eighth President on July 1, 1958. And absolutely nobody was pressuring me in any way to do anything at all about starting a theological seminary. I had enough of a challenge to continue the Jones-initiated campaign for the strengthening of Earlham as an undergraduate liberal arts college. Extraordinary progress had been made in those immediate postwar years. My task was to keep the momentum going. Why should I get involved in what many would regard as a hopeless and diversionary exercise in futility? Fair question. But no one could be sure about the right answers.

Theoretically at least, I did not believe that the task would be a hopeless one, and I was determined that I would not allow us to be diverted from the central task of building a stronger, more significant Earlham. I was sure then, as I am now, that the religion-based, undergraduate liberal arts college is one of the most important cultural and educational institutions in American society. I was determined to help make Earlham one of the best of them all. At the same time, I saw no inherent contradiction between that ambition and the desire to join with others in providing improved opportunities for the training of new leadership for the Society of Friends. On the contrary, I reasoned, those objectives could be complementary. But, clearly, we needed a researched, informed assessment of the whole idea and of its chances for success. We would seek a grant to enable us to undertake a feasibility study. The Lilly Endowment responded with the necessary money.

We wanted that survey to be done by somebody outside the immediate Earlham family. Yet we hoped to find a person who understood Quakers, their special problems about a trained ministry, and the nature of theological education. If that individual turned out to be a Quaker, we hoped it would be someone who had sensitivity to and rapport with the diverse streams of Quakers and was a good listener. We found all these
qualities, and more, in Wilmer Cooper, then on the staff of the Friends Committee on National Legislation in Washington, D.C.

When he began his work I made it clear that this was not to be one of those feasibility exercises in which a consultant is employed to report back with results that confirm what he thinks the employer already thinks or the hopes somebody wants validated. I repeatedly stressed that this was to be a completely open-minded inquiry. If the weight of the evidence and the accumulated opinions should prove negative, the study would still have been worthwhile. If the considered judgment should encourage efforts to establish a Friends school of religion, we should deal with that recommendation in a cautious manner. It might still not prove right to locate it at Earlham. We should remain open to the possibility that it might better be placed at some other Friends institution or in the neighborhood of some major non-Quaker university or as part of some consortium of seminaries. We were not, at any point, to be engaged in some self-serving empire building for Earlham.

Wil Cooper went at his task with meticulous care. He traveled from coast to coast visiting Quaker colleges, meetings, administrative offices, talking with all manner of Friends. He also consulted numerous seminary professors and deans. He listened to hundreds of assorted Quakers. The most indefatigable note-taker I ever saw, he filled countless pad and notebook pages with his neat, readable, small-script jottings. Whatever he might recommend, there was no question that by the time he was finished he knew what present-day Quakers thought about the needs and problems related to the training of Quaker ministers and other leaders. He had gathered all shadings of opinion.

The report was generally favorable to the starting of a program of training for the ministry at Earlham, but there were enough expressions of uncertainty, enough warnings about the amount of work and money that would be required, enough indications of reservation and opposition, that we could have gone either way. Wil writes in this book factually and sensitively on the soul-searching that went on in the Board and in the faculty before the decision was reached.
Perhaps I should close with some reflections on why, as President, I came down on the side of the belief that we should go forward with this admittedly high-risk endeavor. That requires me to reach back in time and recall some of my own feelings, perceptions, fears and hopes about Quakers and about Earlham, about organized religion and higher education.

I was not a birth-right Friend. I had been brought up a Southern Baptist, grandson and nephew of Baptist pastors. Although I had been attracted by some of the things I read about Quakerism, I don’t think I had ever met a Quaker until I had graduated from college. Although I married a Quaker and became a regular attender of a Friends meeting, I resisted joining for some years. During World War II, after first registering as a conscientious objector and having a draft-exempt position teaching college level courses to Air Force officer-training cadets, I volunteered for military duty and wound up going abroad as a war correspondent. For a hundred years, all my presidential predecessors had been rooted Quakers, trained at Quaker colleges (mostly Earlham), active leaders in the Society of Friends. I was, in some considerable measure, an outsider.

Despite that background, and maybe because of it, I had a highly-developed sense of the remarkable significance of the Society of Friends, of the importance of Quaker education, of the past distinction and emerging potential of Earlham College. At the same time, once inside the family, I was appalled to discover how small and how terribly divided this religious movement really was. “As bad as Baptists,” I said to myself, “and without their vast numbers.” It seemed to me that a more unified and effective approach to the training of ministers might do something meaningful about both the numbers and the divisiveness, to the benefit of the Society of Friends and to the enhancement of its contribution to the Kingdom of God.

While the non-creedal nature of the Quaker faith, its great stress on the leadings of the Spirit, and its democratic polity all work in favor of a high degree of individualism in belief and practice, it just might be that the Society could profit from a more systematic examination of the Christian religion, its history, its beliefs and social witness than most Quakers, even many of its ministers, had been exposed to. So I thought.
Back of all these ponderings were some increasingly strong convictions about the interrelationships of faith and intellect, of religion and science, of belief and behavior, of vocation and worship, of the church and the academy. Many of the agonizing, destructive, violent crises of our age are rooted in the separation of skills from morality, the discontinuities between religion and education. The secularization of the academy could once have been defended on the grounds of the need of the free mind to escape from the controls of a too rigid religious orthodoxy. But that has not been our problem for a long time. The problem of our age is how to bring power, and the wielders of power, under some discipline of responsible ethics, how to make sure that skills and knowledge and competence are directed toward the serving of noble purposes, how to help the individual and the community find fulfillment in acts that transcend our selfish desires. To accomplish those ends there needs to be a strong, working, mutually-respectful partnership between the institutions of education and of religion. It is essential that there be well trained, intellectually powerful religious leaders and that there be academicians whose intellectual powers are motivated and guided by spiritual insights.

As I wanted Earlham to be more securely rooted in its Quaker values, so also I wanted to see the leadership in the Society of Friends more knowledgeable and more effective in proclaiming those values. I sense that I was part of a considerable company of people who shared those desires. Together it just might be that we could, through the Earlham School of Religion, do something worthwhile toward accomplishing both of those goals. But, in the final analysis, I knew that it was all in the hands of a power greater than any of us.

As long as I remained at Earlham, I continued to say that ESR was an experiment. It might succeed and it might fail. It did receive, through many miracles, small and large, enough support to get started. It, in time, drew more students than once we thought would ever be possible. It was given greater operating funds, in small and large contributions, and from more people than we could have imagined. And our graduates went out to serve in more different kinds of Quaker communities and institutions than we had any right to hope for. I have to believe that it was all God’s doing, but I think I would have felt the same if it had turned out otherwise.
I can truthfully say that after we made the decision to go ahead with the School of Religion I never lost one moment’s sleep over whether it would succeed or fail. I am sure others did, chiefly Wil Cooper. But, clearly, he never gave up when difficulties came upon him and ESR. His book is a testament to faith and vision, and a kind of documentation of the enormous amount of hard work he and others invested in the vision. That vision, as Wil makes clear, is only partly realized and will, no doubt, be revised as the years go by. Meanwhile, it is enough to say that what has been done so far, experimentally, has been in response to “right leadings” that many of us felt, though we had not the evidence or the resources to prove that it could be done at all.

Landrum R. Bolling
CHAPTER I
The Need and Vision for a Quaker Seminary

From before the beginning of the Twentieth Century various members of the Society of Friends had dreamed about a Quaker seminary. Only in 1960 did one come into being on the campus of Earlham College at Richmond, Indiana. There were abortive attempts before this, some of which seemed to have promise, but they were short lived for a variety of reasons; most simply died for lack of support.

While some Friends were dreaming of such a reality others were sure such an endeavor was “not in the right ordering of the Lord,” or at least, was contrary to Quaker tradition. Friends from the beginning of the Society in the Seventeenth Century had grave reservations about theological schools or places that attempted to train persons for ministry. It was hard to go against the implications of an early judgment of George Fox:

...As I was walking in a field on a First-day morning, the Lord opened unto me that being bred at Oxford or Cambridge was not enough to fit and qualify men to be ministers of Christ...¹

Fox further wrote,

As I was to bring people off from Jewish ceremonies, from heathenish fables, and from men’s inventions and windy doctrines, by which they blew the people about this way and the other way, from sect to sect; and all their beggarly rudiments, with their schools and colleges for making ministers of Christ, were indeed ministers of their own making but not of Christ’s...²

Of course Fox’s real concern was that “...none can be a minister of Christ Jesus but in the eternal Spirit, which was before Scriptures were given forth; for if they have not his spirit, they are none of his.”³

Similar statements of concern were made by Friends down through the years, epitomized by the view that theological schools are the seedbed of “notional religion” rather than a means of preparation for the ministry of the Spirit and of the living Christ. Even when American Quaker meetings were moving toward a “planned” and “paid” ministry, in the latter part of the Nineteenth Century, warnings were again issued. At the very important gathering of Orthodox Friends in the 1887 Conference of Friends in
Richmond, Indiana a prominent Baltimore Friend, Mary S. Thomas, spoke against the trend toward pastoral ministry in the Society:

Dear Friends, if you let this method in, and I believe in the bottom of my heart that it has nothing to do with the Society of Friends at all, if you let it into the church you will find the theological seminary at the end of it.4

Even stronger opposition to theological training for Friends’ ministry was voiced by David Updegraff when Penn College at Oskaloosa, Iowa attempted, under the leadership of Dr. William Pearson, to establish what Updegraff called an “ecclesiastical Trueblood Training College,” referring to Benjamin Trueblood, then President of Penn College. In a letter to Leander and Annie Woodward, dated December 13, 1881, David Updegraff declared: “I shall oppose this great project...” About the same time he editorialized in the Friends Expositor that such a ministerial training program would “spoil” the Quaker preacher, and he quotes George Fox to show that “the whole scheme is unquakerly.”5

At Earlham also there was apprehension among some Friends about the Earlham Biblical Institute which had been established in the 1880’s for the purpose of preparing persons for ministry. At one time twenty-three students were enrolled in this program. In President Mill’s report for 1893 he wrote:

Fears have been expressed that it would encourage young people to educate themselves for the ministry who had received no divine call for that service; that its fruits would appear in “professional” pride; intellectuality at the expense of spirituality; empty rhetoric in preaching instead of the “demonstration of the spirit;” mercenary motives in the work of the gospel; and the suppression of the “gift of prophecy” in the membership of the church by the “one-man power” of the trained “pastor.” Those who have had this special department of instruction and training in charge have not been unmindful of these possible tendencies. But, after a trial of over eight years, the work of the Biblical Institute has been found in a most gratifying degree free from the prejudicial results above referred to. On the contrary it has already sent forth a numerous band of humble, earnest, capable ministers, missionaries and Bible teachers, who are daily “making full proof of their ministry,” and showing themselves “approved of God.”6

By the turn of the century a majority of American Friends had adopted programmed meeting for worship with hymn singing, prepared messages and paid pastoral leadership. In spite of the opposition represented by Mary Thomas and David Updegraff the concern grew that if Friends were to have pastors they should be nurtured and trained under Quaker influence. The alternative, it was feared with reason, was that the majority of men
and women in leadership roles in ministry either would have no such preparation, or what they had would be provided in non-Quaker colleges and seminaries of other religious persuasions, or in schools of questionable educational standards. Those fears reflected reality. In his *History of Quakerism* (1943) Elbert Russell says: “after the First World War efforts were made to establish a graduate theological school in the Five Years Meeting for the higher training of ministers, but it proved impossible to secure adequate funds or to agree on the location and type of such a school.”

**Education for Ministry**

Despite their protracted reluctance to undertake explicit training for the ministry, Friends have, of course, had a long and impressive history of involvement with education. However, as Helen Hole has pointed out the early emphasis of Quaker education was traditionally “in whatsoever things were civil and useful in creation,” which largely took the form of practical training. By the turn of the Twentieth Century, nevertheless, a number of important attempts were being made in the direction of education and training for the ministry and for furthering the life and work of the meeting. The history of those efforts still has to be researched and written. All that we can do here is to acknowledge those experimental efforts and to refer to some of them. With the rise of the pastoral system among Friends in mid-America it is not surprising that George Fox College (formerly Pacific College), William Penn College, Friends University, Earlham College and Guilford College should be among the Friends schools that attempted to establish special training programs for ministry. For the most part these were fifth-year programs beyond the bachelor’s degree, offering in some cases the M.A. degree in religion, as a means of formal preparation for ministry and pastoral work.

Another approach was offered by the Bible colleges sponsored by Friends, chief of which were Cleveland Bible College (later renamed Malone College in Canton, Ohio), and Friends Bible College at Haviland, Kansas. Many Friends ministers received their education at these schools. A 1957 survey showed that out of 185 pastors answering a questionnaire about their background, the largest number, twenty-nine, had graduated
from Cleveland Bible College. The next highest number, twenty-three, were graduates of Earlham College. William Penn College ranked third with eighteen graduates.\

Although the traditional unprogrammed meetings did not acknowledge any need for training pastoral leadership, there was in various sections of Quakerdom a concern for upgrading the religious knowledge and preparation of the general membership in order to bring greater vitality into the ministry and to strengthen the religious education programs for children and new members. One response to this need was the Woodbrooke Settlement for Religious and Social Study, opened in 1903 at the estate of George Cadbury in Selly Oak, Birmingham, England. J. Rendel Harris became its first Director of Studies. Among Eastern Friends in the United States, Woolman School was organized by Hicksite Friends in 1915 at Swarthmore, Pennsylvania. It was patterned after Woodbrooke in England and was the forerunner of what became Pendle Hill in 1930. It has served as a Quaker postgraduate center for religious and social studies ever since. Its first director was Henry T. Hodgkin from England. Later Howard and Anna Brinton, one time faculty members at Earlham, had a long tenure of leadership at Pendle Hill.

Although it did not attempt to establish a formal program of training for the ministry, Haverford College near Philadelphia, established the T. Wistar Brown Fellowships for students who wished to undertake a year of graduate study, chiefly in philosophy and Quaker studies under Rufus M. Jones and, later, Douglas V. Steere. Many Quaker students from the other Friends colleges benefited from this year of advanced study leading to a Master of Arts degree at Haverford.

We should not overlook the fact that over the years an increasing number of Friends have enrolled in various denominational seminaries in the country, ranging from Asbury in Wilmore, Kentucky and Western Evangelical in Portland, Oregon to Princeton, Yale, Harvard and Union in the East. But the one seminary where probably more Quaker students attended than any other was Hartford Theological Seminary in Hartford, Connecticut, where two Quakers were prominently on the faculty for many years: Alexander Purdy and Moses Bailey. It is estimated that more than a hundred Quakers attended Hartford Seminary, most of whom graduated. This represents a significant
contribution that Hartford in particular, and many other seminaries in general, have made to the Society of Friends.

**Initiative from Five Years Meeting**

Until the 1940’s most of the initiative for special training and preparation for ministry rested with the Friends colleges or Bible schools. By 1944 Five Years Meeting of Friends appointed a Committee on Ministerial Training which took up work in four areas:

1. Contact with ministerial students
2. Program recruiting for the ministry
3. Educational programs for in-service ministers
4. Information service and placement of personnel

Growing out of these recommendations a variety of meetings and consultations were held at Quaker Hill in Richmond, Indiana. These finally culminated in a National Conference of Friends on Ministerial Training held at Germantown, Ohio on November 22-23, 1957. Most Friends who had had an interest in the subject, including the author, were present at that meeting. The following recommendations came from the Germantown meeting: a proposal for a summer school program at Butler School of Religion in Indianapolis; a proposal that a Quaker teaching chair be endowed at an accredited seminary where this person could have oversight of a Quaker student center; and the appointment of a full-time secretary at the Five Years Meeting to carry out the functions of the Committee on Ministerial Training.

The first of these recommendations was carried out in 1958. The second was considered by the Executive Council of Five Years Meeting but was not deemed possible at that time. The third had already been approved in principle by Five Years Meeting in 1955 and resulted in the establishment of a Board on Training for Christian Vocations, later renamed Board of Vocation and Ministry. Subsequently this Board employed a full-time Secretary in the person of James Higgins (1964-1969). With these significant developments in the Five Years Meeting of Friends, clearly the time was ripe for a more formal consideration of a Friends school for ministry.
Earlham College’s Involvement

Although Earlham College had no special priority in the developing concern for a new and vital ministry among Friends, there did emerge at Earlham at the close of the 1950s a few key Friends who felt the time had come to do something about it. There was the recognition that for those meetings which had already opted for pastoral leadership, it was important that such leadership be prepared for their calling; ministry among pastoral Friends should not become a shoddy affair. The words of Elton Trueblood in his first “Plain Speech” editorial in *Quaker Life* (January, 1962, p. 14) state with candor the conditions of Friends which called forth the establishment of a Friends school for the ministry:

There is no doubt that a great deal of what passes for Quakerism today is highly discouraging. There are a few bright spots, but the general picture is far from satisfactory... All that we have left, in many neighborhoods, is a little congregation, dutifully droning through three gospel songs, listening patiently to a sermon and a benediction. This is not Quakerism; it is simply Protestantism at the end of the line.10

Although Elton Trueblood was addressing other aspects and sectors of Quakerdom in this editorial which he entitled, “A Quaker Forward Movement,” undoubtedly the weight of his concern was for that large number of pastoral meetings affiliated with the Five Years Meeting of Friends (reconstituted in 1965 as Friends United Meeting). These meetings were floundering for lack of the kind of leadership which had a sense of who Friends were and where they should be going.

Thomas E. Jones, President of Earlham (1946-1958), who had been brought up a farm boy in a rural Friends church in northern Indiana, was particularly concerned about the future of the pastoral meetings. He hoped that the relationship of Earlham to the two midwestern yearly meetings—Indiana and Western, with which Earlham was, and is, affiliated—could become an increasingly significant factor in the development of Quaker leadership. He encouraged a variety of contacts between Earlham and the scattered Quaker communities of Indiana and neighboring states, frequently spoke at Quaker gatherings and encouraged similar participation by faculty members and students. Quaker groups were invited to the Earlham campus to attend college lectures and to hold conferences. Tom Jones was deeply, personally determined to find ways to narrow the
gap which over the previous quarter century had developed between the more conservative midwestern Friends and the College. On the question of setting up a seminary, he was inclined to accept the conventional wisdom that “it was too late,” and tended to favor a fifth-year master’s degree program in religion, similar to those already initiated at Haverford and Guilford. Yet when his successor, Landrum Boiling, proposed to explore the possibility of setting up a more ambitious school of religion, he was immediately supportive.

Soon after Landrum Boiling became President of the College, in 1958, he expressed the hope that something concrete could be done to implement the longtime dream of Friends that a Quaker seminary be established as a means of providing better trained leadership. The Master’s program in religion was already a beginning. Between 1943 and 1958 Earlham had granted seven M.A. degrees in religion and had offered other instruction useful to Friends’ pastors. President Jones, Professors Elton Trueblood and Hugh Barbour had already established the College’s serious interest.

One of the early moves which Landrum Boiling made was to consult with Harold Duling of Lilly Endowment in Indianapolis about possible financial support for a feasibility study on the establishment of such a school. The Endowment, with a long history of grant making for theological education and the general improvement of the church-related and independent colleges in the state, responded with the initial funds. During the summer and fall of 1958 negotiations were begun with the author, Wilmer Cooper, then Administrative Secretary of the Friends Committee on National Legislation in Washington, D.C., to join in the exploration of a Quaker school for the ministry. Having earlier completed my seminary studies at Yale Divinity School and my doctoral studies in theology at Vanderbilt University, I was predisposed by training and interest to feel that the Friends seminary possibility should be seriously examined. On April 1, 1959, I joined the Earlham staff to conduct a survey about the possibility of establishing a school of the ministry at Earlham College. The study lasted for six months. I traveled more than 15,000 miles seeking information and opinions, visiting as many Quaker centers and yearly meeting headquarters as possible. I also consulted with seminary administrative and faculty members and a variety of other educators, librarians and
Quaker leaders throughout the country. The result was a seventy-page report for President Boiling and the Earlham Board of Trustees, presented to them in October, 1959. The report was shared widely with Friends across the country, especially with yearly meeting officials and persons concerned with ministry and counsel. The overwhelming body of opinion gathered during the survey favored the establishment of a Friends school of ministry; there was less agreement on who should launch it and who should sponsor it. There were also differing views about what should be the teaching emphasis of the school. It was clear that it would be impossible to satisfy all Friends. Probably the only way such a school would ever be established was for a responsible group to simply start it and try to win the support of enough Friends and other interested people to make it a viable undertaking.

After the Board of Trustees and other concerned groups had studied the report a first step recommendation was made by the Earlham Trustees in February 1960 that a two-year experimental program be launched, building on the experience which Earlham already had with the M.A. degree in religion. As will be explained more fully in Chapter IV, Lilly Endowment which had originally funded the survey, at this point made a further launching grant of money to enable the school to get underway for a two-year period. Students were recruited and the first classes were held in the autumn of 1960.

A distinguished Friend and former Earlham Professor, Alexander Purdy, just retired as Dean and Professor of New Testament at Hartford Theological Seminary, was invited to Hugh Barbour and Joe Elmore from the College Philosophy join me to help form the teaching faculty. Elton Trueblood, and Religion Departments were also critical faculty resources was employed, and the first Earlham School of Religion office opened in three small rooms at the south end of Carpenter Hall on the Earlham campus in the summer of 1960.

The launching of the Earlham School of Religion was indeed a venture of faith, and certainly from a secular point of view, a high risk gamble. The trend in theological education was to merge or close schools rather than begin new ones. Reports in such papers as the New York Times (April 16, 1961) were pointing out the decline in seminary
enrollments and recruitment of ministerial students by all the churches and synagogues.\textsuperscript{11} Howard Thurman later commented about the “audacity of Friends” to undertake the establishment of a seminary when others were closing. To many, ESR seemed like a prescription for failure. In spite of dire predictions, there was a clear sense among a core group of supporters that the School should make a beginning. Those who had given most thought to the proposal believed that now was the time to move ahead and that if we didn’t a crucial, unique opportunity would be lost.
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CHAPTER II
People and Circumstances that Shaped the School

It is difficult to say what made the Earlham School of Religion go. Probably the most important thing was the right set of circumstances and the right combination of people. There were years of struggle, as later chapters will show, but the ingredients were right for this thing to happen at Earlham in the 1960’s.

Earlham was blessed with some dreamers as well as practical minds who were willing to work hard to see a vision realized. Tom Jones was one of these. Although he saw no way to launch the School of Religion during his Presidency at Earlham it was for him an appealing dream into which he was prepared to pour his enthusiasm and energy. Elton Trueblood had not only dreamed but had thought seriously about the basic ideas that ought to undergird such a school. His years at Earlham, which saw his books and his popularity as a speaker draw a national audience, helped the College to gain important credibility. Landrum Bolling was also a person of vision and practical ideas. He had the capacity to bring the right people together to get a job done and the courage to issue the call to begin. Help from Lilly Endowment was vital. Without its risk-taking grants ESR (and many other Earlham programs) would not have seen light of day. Harold Duling, trained as a Methodist minister, a former Army chaplain, but with later Quaker connections, understood the issues as few foundation executives could have.

I must, of course, attempt to describe what I believe my own role was in this new Quaker undertaking. Landrum Boiling convinced me that I had special gifts for this assignment and an unusually appropriate background of training and experience. My roots were in rural Ohio, in one of the more conservative branches of Quakerism, and in Wilmington College. Yet I had as graduate degrees an M.A. from Haverford, a B.D. from Yale Divinity School, and a Ph.D. from Vanderbilt. My years with the Friends Committee on National Legislation had brought me into working relations with the whole broad spectrum of Quakers. I also knew that a special personal asset was my ability, willingness and patience to give careful attention to details, details which others often
overlook or ignore. Coupled with this was my capacity to persevere with a hard and difficult assignment which others might have abandoned.

My previous work experience with Friends was a distinct advantage. I had not only learned how to work with people, and sometimes difficult people, but I was quite familiar with the variety of Friends whose good will and support would have to be gained if this experiment were to succeed. I had already traveled widely among Friends in two other Quaker jobs which took me from coast to coast and into almost every American yearly meeting and every Quaker college. During the seven years with the Friends Committee on National Legislation I had learned a little about how to function in the political arena. Although Friends claim not to be political, the fact is that there is such a thing as “Quaker power” operating in most Friends’ circles, and one has to know how to make constructive use of this power “after the manner of Friends.”

Landrum Bolling, President of Earlham 1958-1973
Wilmer Cooper, Administrative Secretary 1960-62; Dean of ESR 1962-78; Professor of Quaker Studies 1978-85

Quaker elder statesmen and promoters of ESR. Left to right: Elton Trueblood, Errol Elliott, Alexander Purdy and Tom Jones.

Thomas E. Jones, President of Earlham 1946-58

D. Elton Trueblood, Professor of Philosophy 1946-66; Professor at Large 1966-
But underneath the entire enterprise there has been a shared basic Christian faith and Quaker sense of integrity which has helped us to realize the dreams and visions which God placed before us. I do believe that the School was in “the right ordering of the Lord” in spite of the misgivings of many Quakers. I know that I had a special sense of divine leading about it, as did others. We simply felt that the time was ripe for this to happen, that the right combination of circumstances and persons had coalesced at this particular juncture of Quaker history. This meant that those of us who were engaged in the enterprise were able to respond with energy to the task before us. Now there is nothing particularly miraculous about all that; it is simply the way we ought to be living our lives all the time!

Credit must also be given to a large number of other persons who soon became part of the development of the Earlham School of Religion. In addition to Alexander Purdy who joined us in 1960, there was Harold Cope, the Earlham Business Manager, and Hugh Barbour, a Harvard- and Yale- trained Quaker scholar in the Department of Religion, both of whom were very supportive of ESR. In 1962 we made the joint appointments of Calvin Redekop and Richard Baer, Jr. to the teaching staffs at Earlham and ESR. And in 1963 Charles Thomas and Leonard Hall, experienced pastors/administrators, became full
time appointments to ESR’s teaching and development staffs, respectively. The development of our faculty will be described more fully in Chapter V.

Not directly connected with Earlham were Friends in the wider Quaker circle who played an important role. This group included Errol Elliott, then recently retired from the Five Years Meeting Secretaryship and Editor of the *American Friend*. He became the first chairman of ESR’s Board of Advisors in 1960. But even before this he had given encouragement to this new venture, and in 1958 he had taught the first Quaker classes in an experimental arrangement with Butler School of Religion in Indianapolis where a number of Friends ministerial students were enrolled.

Then one has to think farther out and remember the people in Friends United Meeting, Glenn Reece and Lorton Heusel and many others across Quakerdom who had a hand in the ESR venture of faith. This was especially true of those who joined our Board of Advisors and who came to our financial support in those struggling years when Lilly Endowment said that unless the Quakers got behind the School they would not be able to continue assisting us. There were the Replogles of New Jersey, the Wares of New England, and the Marshburns of California — none of whom had ties to Earlham but who caught the vision and shared generously of their resources. One cannot forget the commitment of a few who sacrificed for the sake of the School. There was Horace Cook from Anderson, Indiana who came to give the first thousand dollars to Landrum Boiling and said he had been praying and saving for a long time for this kind of Friends school of the ministry. And there was Barbara Beane from Iowa who saved $7.50 a month from her small income to send to ESR because she saw it fulfilling a great need among Friends.

Last but not least were the students who were adventurous and vulnerable enough to risk their educational future to the School of Religion. This was no small commitment on their part. ESR was not to be fully accredited for fifteen years, but they were willing to risk this new venture because they believed in it and wanted to be a part of an exciting Quaker experiment in theological education. Although we are thinking here primarily of Quaker students, mention should also be made of some very promising non-Quaker students. There was Keith Miller, an Episcopalian, Robert Foster, a Congregationalist,
and David Haney, a Southern Baptist, who came within the first two or three years, primarily at first to have an opportunity to study with Elton Trueblood. All of these, however, stayed to graduate.

From the beginning years ESR was blessed with both the dreamers and the doers. It took both of them to make it become a reality. But there were also the skeptics and the doubters who helped us to keep our feet on the ground. It would not be fair not to mention this side of the ESR story.

**The Opposition: The Skeptics and the Doubters**

On the Board of Trustees and in the faculty and administration at Earlham were honest and concerned skeptics about the wisdom of trying to establish a school of religion. A few argued actively against the founding of the School. The dominant consideration seemed to be the fear that such a venture would draw away from the basic undergraduate liberal arts programs of the college the resources necessary for the survival of Earlham. Some felt the Quakers didn’t need such a school or that it was inappropriate in the light of traditions of Friends. Some clearly felt that the pastoral meetings were already too far gone to try to save by the way of a ministerial training program. One of the most searchingly critical questioners of the project was Edward G. Wilson, a prominent Earlham alumnus and new member of the Board of Trustees in 1960, who later became its very influential Chairman. He had an open and honest disagreement with those who felt Earlham should sponsor ESR. He always did his homework when preparing for an important meeting where this matter was to come up. Many years after the issue was settled he recalled his early opposition:

I had planned not to open my mouth in Board meetings during my first year on the Earlham Board. But at the very first Board meeting I attended, ESR was proposed. I was aghast that Earlham, an outstanding liberal arts college with very limited financial resources, would consider also adding a theological seminary.¹

After the initial approval in February, 1960 for the two-year experimental phase of the School, a small committee of the Board of Trustees was formed to deal in more detail with the School of Religion proposal and bring a recommendation. That committee consisted of Marcus Kendall, Eurah Marshall, Wendell Wildman and Edward G. Wilson.
They co-opted Alexander Purdy and myself from ESR who provided them with the information they desired. Near the close of this inquiry Ed Wilson personally addressed a four-page memorandum to the Board of Trustees making clear his own reservations and urging that the decision about the School be delayed. He also expressed some question whether the opposition had been heard:

I know that, in varying degrees as has been evident from the beginning, other members of the Board also have reservations and unanswered questions. But I permitted the recommendation of our Committee to be adopted without requesting expression of opinion of other Board members.

Other paragraphs from Ed Wilson’s memorandum spell out the basic reason for the opposing point of view which he voiced for himself and others, including a few Board members and several Earlham faculty.

We trustees must, I believe, remember that we are Trustees of a liberal arts college. Being Quaker contributes greatly to what Earlham is. But Earlham’s being Quaker does not change our primary obligation which is to preserve and improve a liberal arts college. As Trustees, therefore, we should, if we go forward, decide that adding a B.D. degree will enhance rather than detract from Earlham as a liberal arts college. If your Committee is able to point the way to Earlham’s being guaranteed the financing of the program, we as Trustees will need little more guidance. But if you are not able to do that and the responsibility will be on Earlham to finance a substantial part of the B.D. program, I hope, if you recommend that the Trustees assume this obligation for the College, that you will supply us with full written answers to the concerns expressed above and to other questions such as those which follow.

At the time Ed Wilson wrote this memorandum to the Board his concern was for Earlham College to stick to its main purpose as a liberal arts college, and secondly, his belief that ESR could not be financed without becoming a burden upon Earlham College. But in the recent correspondence referred to above Ed Wilson makes it clear that he has had additional reflections about ESR. He writes:

I, of course, soon realized that the Quaker members of the Board felt that ESR was needed as a positive influence in the Society of Friends to provide needed leadership for Meetings, particularly in Indiana and other States in the Middle West, as there was considerable evidence of splintering and straying from beliefs commonly ascribed to Quakers.

I received my most convincing argument in favor of ESR from Alexander Purdy .... He answered my “Why another theological seminary?” He pointed out that since World War lithe emphasis in Protestant churches and in all seminaries had been on form and ritual. He convinced me that there was need for a school which would
emphasize “spirit.” This was not too hard for me to accept as I am a birthright Quaker and was long a member of a Meeting.

After discussions at several Board meetings, it was obvious that a vast majority, if not all members were ready to approve. I said I would go along.\(^4\)

Ed Wilson’s concerns represented the most formidable opposition to the development of ESR within the Board of Trustees. They were also shared by a number of Earlham faculty. Those who raised these reservations served a useful purpose in checking the leadings and enthusiasm of others. It cannot be said that the decision was made without much careful study and debate about the wisdom of the course of action taken.

There was also opposition to the starting of ESR from various segments of the Society of Friends across the country. Because Friends have been so divided for more than a century, it is hard for any group to organize some new project that can win the support of most Friends, let alone all Friends. There are theological differences. There are inter-yearly meeting and inter-collegiate rivalries. There are those who agree with the historic testimony of Friends that theological education and training for ministry seem antithetical to Quakerism. As in all human associations, a considerable body of Friends are simply passive or lukewarm toward new ideas. Proponents of fresh visions cannot count on automatic and universal support, as was evident to all of us who worked during those years on the founding of ESR. Yet, despite indifference and footdragging, the remarkable thing is that so many people of such varied backgrounds and viewpoints rallied behind an idea that, in many ways, seemed out of step with the times.

The truth is that there was a general attitude among seminaries in the 1950s and ‘60s that tried to discourage the starting of new schools. This was particularly reflected by the new accrediting association for theological schools, the Association of Theological Schools for the United States and Canada (then called The American Association of Theological Schools). Talks with Charles Taylor, the Executive Secretary, tended to center on reasons why it was not wise to open another school when some existing seminaries were either merging with larger ones or were closing their doors. It was pointed out in particular that seminaries previously founded in conjunction with liberal arts colleges were being disengaged from the parent college or discontinued entirely. A prime example at the time was the Oberlin School of Theology affiliated with Oberlin...
College. Because the College was the main business of the Board of Trustees the Theological School increasingly became secondary in the attention of the trustees and in terms of administrative and financial support. Because Earlham College was in the process of joining with Oberlin and several other colleges in the Great Lakes College Association, the example of the demise of Oberlin School of Theology was not to be taken lightly by the planners at Earlham. The question of accreditation, which will be dealt with later, was also in the back of our minds as we considered whether we wanted to run counter to the advice of AATS, the very agency which might later accredit ESR.

**The Beginning Two Years**

Let us return now to the beginning of ESR when the Earlham Board of Trustees in February, 1960 approved a two-year experimental program utilizing Earlham’s existing M.A. in religion degree. This marked a provisional acceptance of the recommendations embodied in my Survey Report prepared in 1959. The Board had spent many hours considering this report. Dwight Young, chairman of the Board at that time, describes more fully a late night meeting which adjourneyed until the next morning to reach a final decision (See Appendix I). In spite of some opposing views there seemed to be clarity in the morning to authorize the President to go ahead with the recommended plans. Action was also taken to approve President Bolling’s recommendation that I, Wilmer Cooper, be appointed Administrative Secretary for the two-year experimental phase of the School. It may be noted that at the same Board meeting approval was given to building the new Earlham Library, which was completed two years later and dedicated in October, 1963 as the Lilly Library. It housed the Kelson Religion Section for use by ESR and the Religion Department of the College.

When classes opened at Earlham in the fall of 1960 eleven students were enrolled in the School of Religion for the year, only four of whom were *bona fide* M.A. candidates. Three of the four were Earlham College graduates in June, 1960, and the fourth a graduate of Haverford College. The others were special students, some of whom were registered in extension courses which were begun at Fairmount and Indianapolis during
the academic year 1960-61. Alexander Purdy and I taught these extension courses, which went under the name Adult Education in Religious Studies.

Because potential for enrollment on campus for regular term courses was very modest to begin with, this extension program of the School became an important feature of ESR in the early days. The idea was to take the School out to the Quaker constituency rather than expect all students to come onto the campus. The Adult Education in Religious Studies courses were organized as weekly three-hour evening classes for ten weeks. They usually were held in Friends churches in Indiana and Ohio, in such places as Fairmount, Kokomo, Muncie, Winchester, Carmel, Indianapolis, Greenfield, Xenia, Ohio and Wilmington, Ohio. Each student had to pay $25.00 a course whether taking the class for audit or for credit, although scholarship aid was given where a need existed and where local meetings were willing to match the scholarship provided by ESR. Often auditors outnumbered the credit students. The Adult Education in Religious Studies program went on for a dozen years, with Charles Thomas taking a leading role in teaching courses after he joined the faculty in 1963. This program provided an important link between ESR and the meetings in the surrounding area during the beginning years of the School. It gave meetings “out there” a sense that the School of Religion was for them. Gradually as the School grew it became difficult for a very small faculty to service these extension courses, so they were gradually, though regrettably, discontinued in the 1970’s.

Of equal importance in the beginning years of the School was a summer school program, which began in 1960. Prominent visiting professors were invited to teach in these two-week in-service seminar programs. Among those who joined us for that purpose were Wayne Oates, Franklin Littell, Arthur Roberts, Elmer Homrighausen, Walter Horton, H. Shelton Smith and T. Campbell Wycoff. All of these were distinguished scholars and teachers from other colleges and universities. These summer seminars were well attended during the early years of the School with twenty-two enrolled in 1960 and again 1961. As the on-campus program of ESR developed and more and more students enrolled in the year-round program, the summer school offerings, like the extension courses, became less popular and more difficult to service.
By 1966 the summer program on campus was discontinued. However, in 1968 an experimental three-week summer school was held at Whittier College in California in cooperation with the Board on Spiritual Life of California Yearly Meeting. It was taught by Arthur Roberts from George Fox College and Canby Jones from Wilmington College. Although it proved successful, circumstances did not develop for its continuation. By 1979 fresh interest in a summer school developed on campus and summer sessions were resumed through 1984. In 1985 there has been a temporary suspension of summer classes, hopefully to begin again in another year.

During the 1960’s another attempt to serve the Friends constituency was an annual pastor’s conference held each year beginning in April, 1961. Outside visiting lecturers to the School were utilized at these annual events, sometimes running for two days and drawing from 75 to 175 pastors, both Quakers and non-Quakers. Among some of the outside speakers were: Howard Thurman, Hans Ruedi-Weber, Joseph McCabe, as well as some of the summer school faculty mentioned above.

The second year of the two-year experimental period of ESR saw an increase in credit students from eleven in 1960 to twenty-three in 1961-62, including credit-seeking students in the extension program. By 1962-63, enrollment increased to twenty-nine, eight of whom were candidates for the M.A. degree.

Academic year 1961-62 was a time of decision about the continuation of the School and its expansion to include the Bachelor of Divinity degree (B.D.), in addition to Earlham’s M.A. in religion. At that time the accredited seminary degree was the B.D., which took three years to complete.

At the October, 1961 Board of Trustees meeting under the new chairmanship of Howard Mills, tentative approval was given to launching the three-year B.D. program for ESR. But it was not until the Board’s February 9-10, 1962 meeting that final action was taken as reflected in the following minute:

Recommended that by the fall of 1963 the School of Religion expand to a three-year program equivalent to the B.D. program of most seminaries. It is further recommended that a school of sufficient quality be established to warrant accreditation by the American Association of Theological Schools.
Still keeping in mind the reservations some had about this decision and the extended period of discussion about the propriety of such action, chairman Howard Mills summed up his own feelings, shared by others, when he said: “My head says no but my heart says we have to do it.” Three additional actions were announced and approved as part of the plan: (1) Estimated funding of upwards of $200,000 for the next three years would be integrated into the forthcoming Ford Challenge campaign goal in which ESR would participate along with Earlham College. (2) Enthusiastic approval of Tom Jones as Chairman of ESR’s Finance and Development Committee with the prospect that he would become engaged in the fund-raising effort as soon as he could get free from his consultative work with college presidents. (3) Approval of President Bolling’s recommendation that I be named Dean of the expanded Earlham School of Religion. Thus final and definitive action was taken by the Earlham Board to proceed with plans as previously set forth.

Following the decision to go ahead my first official letter as Dean of the new School was to write to the ESR Board of Advisors, dated, February 13, 1962 reporting the action of the trustees. This letter was framed and has hung in my office at ESR since 1962. In the concluding paragraph I wrote:

We have been working for three years on plans for the School of Religion and now a decision has been made which will certainly have historical consequences for Friends. We have before us a tremendous challenge and opportunity. So far we have been coasting along on the initial enthusiasm for the school and the financial support of Lilly Endowment, but now the hard work of implementing a program and raising funds is before us. Every member of the Board and each of us here at Earlham associated with the program must re-dedicate ourselves to the task ahead.

A next step in ESR’s development in the summer of 1962 was to move its headquarters from Carpenter Hall to the Jenkins House on the corner of College Avenue and National Road West. This new location, owned by the College, lent itself to later expansion into the large residence at 228 College Avenue in January, 1965. This building had once been the President’s home. Since 1957 it had housed the Yokefellow Institute, which moved to its new facility on the south side of the Earlham campus at the end of 1964, thus giving vital space for the expansion of ESR.
The advances made in the first two years, modest though they were, gave a clear sense that the Earlham School of Religion was on its way. There was a green light to proceed with a fully developed Friends seminary. Years of struggle and development lay ahead, but the important thing was that a decisive start had been made. One year hence, June, 1963, the first three students graduated with M.A. degrees recommended by the ESR faculty with the approval of the Graduate Committee of the College. It was still another year before the first Bachelor of Divinity degree (B.D.) would be granted in June, 1964
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CHAPTER III
The Vision and Philosophy of the School

From the beginning the Earlham School of Religion has tried to be accountable in two ways: first to the historic Quaker understanding of ministry, and secondly, to current needs in the Society of Friends as they have been perceived. Given the diversity of practice among Friends today, much of which represents departures from the early tradition of Friends, this has been a very difficult task.

Early Friends believed that Christ is head of the Church and that all ministry should proceed from the Spirit of Christ which can be present within, teaching us God’s will. Because Friends have always believed that the Holy Spirit (or Light of Christ within) is authoritative for ministry, certainly any Quaker ministry today should honor that authority and try to respond to it. This has also been the vision which has guided the development of the Earlham School of Religion.

The need of the present and the pressure from various quarters of Quakerdom to provide ministerial leadership has naturally caused us to be attentive to contemporary demands as well as the tradition and claims of the past. Because of the pressures of the present it is all too easy to try to answer these claims first. At the same time Friends’ view of continuing revelation always keeps us open to what new ways God is speaking to us now and how we should respond. It is part of our faith and practice as Friends that the Spirit of Christ is alive and working in our midst now, and it is here that we are called to live and work in response to God’s leadings.

As is clear from the opening chapter of this history of ESR, Friends had felt for a long time the need to prepare persons for ministry, especially as it related to the pastoral! programmed meetings which came into being late in the Nineteenth Century. But even though it has been assumed that only these Friends are concerned about trained leadership and an educated ministry, the fact is that Friends in the unprogrammed tradition have increasingly called for further education and training for persons serving in leadership roles in their meetings. For example, there has been a long-felt need for
persons trained and skilled in religious education based on Quaker experience and tradition. Secondly, an increasing number of these Friends groups have employed part-time or full-time meeting secretaries, quarterly meeting secretaries, and yearly meeting workers. They too, need skills training as well as greater knowledge about the faith and practice of Friends. Thirdly, it is common among these Friends to employ skilled workers in their outreach work in service and peacemaking. Examples include the American Friends Service Committee, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, the Friends World Committee for Consultation and other such agencies which had their initial start from Friends in the unprogrammed tradition.

It goes without saying that Friends in the pastoral tradition developed early on a need for trained leadership, even though as Friends moved toward pastoral leadership they tended to give too little attention to well prepared ministerial leadership. Because Friends place such a high priority on the primacy of the Spirit in ministry the notion was prevalent that if anyone was called by God to minister, that was sufficient. In a sense that is in agreement with the understanding of George Fox and early Friends about the priority of the Holy Spirit in ministry. On the other hand, Fox did not disclaim education for ministry to the extent that some have assumed. He clearly said “that being bred at Oxford and Cambridge was *not enough* to fit and qualify one for ministry” (italics added). On the other hand, we certainly know that Fox encouraged the development of schools for the education of each new generation of Friends. Moreover, some of the most prominent persons in the early Quaker movement were well educated and could not have accomplished some of the things they did had it not been for their preparation of the mind and spirit for ministry. Obvious examples were Robert Barclay, Isaac Penington and William Penn. There has been a tendency among Conservative Wilburite Friends (the last remnant of the Quietistic tradition of the Eighteenth Century), and among the less educated of Friends to disparage education, especially for ministry. It is strange that any who regard themselves in the Gurney tradition would down-grade education, because Joseph John Gurney was among the best educated and sophisticated Friends ever to appear in the Quaker ministry. Indeed this was part of the charge against him by Friends
in the Quietistic Wilburite tradition, namely, that he relied too much on the education of the mind and did not rely enough on the Holy Spirit, or the Light of Christ within.

Be all that as it may this is the setting of the Twentieth Century which has necessitated that more attention be given to preparation of persons who are educated in the Quaker tradition and who are gifted and skilled in religious education and ministry. One of the significant surprises that has come with the development of Earlham School of Religion is that whereas it was assumed in the beginning that it was being started primarily for the pastoral/programmed Friends, the fact is that in twenty-five years an increasing number of students have come from the unprogrammed tradition of Friends. The proportion has increased so that as ESR celebrates its 25th anniversary more than half of the Quaker students come from unprogrammed Friends, and are likely going back to work with those Friends. There is a spiritual hunger among these Friends for a deeper understanding of the Biblical and Christian roots of Quakerism, and a sense that Quaker leadership needs to be schooled in this heritage as well as in social and spiritual matters. Obviously this calls for more centers where persons can be nurtured in this manner.

**Paradox of the Quaker Ministry**

One of the great services that Elton Trueblood performed for Friends and the Earlham School of Religion was to point out the paradox in the Quaker ministry and to articulate the dual concept of “the universal ministry of every person” and “the specialized ministry” of those who have a particular calling and gift in ministry. The universal ministry of every person is the ministry to which all members of the meeting are called. It may or may not be a vocal or preaching ministry, but it may be a ministry of service in many forms in the life and work of the meeting. There are others, however, who are gifted in special ways and who are called to special tasks in ministry and service to the whole body so that they need to be educated and trained for this service and then liberated by the meeting to carry it out. It is here that Elton Trueblood saw a special need for a school of the ministry among Friends. This became a very important contribution to ESR’s understanding of the Quaker context of ministry. Elton Trueblood presented this in the form of a Quaker lecture at Indiana Yearly Meeting in 1960 entitled, “The Paradox of
the Quaker Ministry,” which was later published in *Quaker Religious Thought* (Autumn, 1962).

An important aspect of what were called the universal and specialized ministries was what Trueblood called the “equipping ministry.” He found the source of this in Ephesians 4:11-12, which speaks of the gifts given by Christ to the people of his church.

And his gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, for the equipment of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ...

Thus it is our responsibility in the church to equip one another for the universal ministry to which we are all called, but in order for this to happen some must be released to the specialized ministry for the equipping of others. Such persons need to be schooled and trained with skills for this ministry, and therefore such a school for the ministry is necessary among Friends for this to happen. Trueblood quoted Robert Barclay in support of this understanding of the specialized ministry:

...we do believe and affirm that some are more particularly called to the work of the ministry, and therefore are fitted of the Lord for that purpose; whose work is more constantly and particularly to instruct, exhort, admonish, oversee, and watch over their brethren; and that as there is something more incumbent upon them in that respect than upon every common believer, so also, as in that relation, there is due to them from the flock such obedience and subjection as is mentioned in these testimonies of the scripture, Heb. 8:17; I Thess. 5:12, 13; I Tim. 5:17; I Pet. 5:5. Also besides these who are thus particularly called to the ministry, and constant labour in the word and doctrines, there are also the elders, who though they be not moved to a frequent testimony by way of declaration in words, yet as such are grown up in the experience of the blessed work of truth in their hearts, they watch over and privately admonish the young, take care for the widows, the poor, the fatherless, and look that nothing be wanting, but that peace, love, unity, concord, and soundness be preserved in the church of Christ...

One can easily see that what we believed we were doing in the School of Religion was equipping persons for this kind of specialized ministry among Friends. There was often reference to equipping one another for the universal ministry. At the same time this called for persons with specialized skills and preparation for this equipping work. Some are more gifted than others, or gifted in special ways; therefore all must be equipped according to the gifts that come natural to us by the grace of God. This is our responsibility toward one another in the life of the church—in the Friends meeting.
Although it may be obvious, it needs to be pointed out that this understanding of ministry goes beyond what many Friends in an earlier period understood. Usually ministry was confined to the spoken word or to preaching, which is indeed central to the ministry of Christ in the church. But the concept that Elton Trueblood spelled out is a much fuller understanding of the ministry based on the many gifts of the Spirit. Although all have a ministry, people’s callings are diverse and some have gifts of remarkable Christian service beyond and apart from the vocal ministry in meeting, as important as that is. Because of this the Earlham School of Religion has had a concept of the ministry from the beginning which has a broader and more universal application than has been generally understood. This approach has at times drawn criticisms from some Friends in the unprogrammed tradition, reflecting their interpretation of the continuing applicability of Fox’s question about educating persons to become ministers of the Gospel. On the pastoral/programmed side of Friends many saw ministry only in terms of what they called “pulpit ministry,” which is hardly a Quaker way of understanding ministry either. Those who saw the ministry primarily in terms of the gifted and inspired pulpiteer, have undoubtedly been resistant to the philosophy of the Friends ministry fostered by Earlham School of Religion. Yet over the years ESR has increasingly emphasized the need for a spiritual preparation for ministry, if it is to be in the name and Spirit of Christ; otherwise, it will be very thin and spiritually superficial. Anyone who prepares for ministry needs to be rooted in the life of prayer and the life of the Spirit, as well as schooled in the traditions of the Church and the Society of Friends.

Out of this wider view of ministry fostered by ESR, especially early in the life of the School, explicit reference was made to preparation of persons for leadership roles in the Society of Friends, as well as preparation for ministry. In more recent years, especially under the deanship of Alan Kolp, the trend has been to speak of “ministry” almost exclusively and to interpret it in the broad terms that embrace a variety of leadership roles. Along with this emphasis has been an increasing concern for spiritual preparation for ministry in the belief that no one is qualified to go forth in ministry who is not nurtured in the life of the Spirit and who does not sense a call to ministry. This suggests a
correspondence between ESR’s view of ministry and the early Quaker understanding of ministry espoused by George Fox and his followers.

**What the Catalog Says about the Philosophy of the School**

People may or may not read school catalogs which set forth the history and philosophy of particular schools. But often these statements are carefully worked out by persons knowledgeable about the school and are important to an understanding of the school’s development. This is true of the statement in ESR’s catalog, “The Philosophy of the School” If one were to examine all the catalogs of ESR one would find portions of the present statement which have evolved over the years with each rewriting of the catalog. Some of the early words of Elton Trueblood are still retained, as well as the central ideas of his philosophy of ministry as spelled out above. There has been faculty participation in the writing of this section on philosophy, but most of the work and modification thereof has been done by Charles Thomas, who used to edit the catalog, and in more recent years by myself as editor. Changes have and will continue to be made, but what follows gathers up the essence of what most of us thought we were trying to do in the development of ESR. There is one statement worthy of special note which has appeared on the flyleaf of almost every catalog since the beginning of the School: “We hold that Christ is present, that He guides and directs, and that His will can be known and obeyed.” This was not taken from George Fox, as some have supposed, but was intended to reflect what some of us believe to be authentic Quakerism, as well as reflect the essence of the early Quaker message.

As I read and reflect now on the catalog statement of the philosophy of the School I sense one emphasis which seems less fully stated than is probably needed. This has to do with the corporate witness of the “body of Christ,” the “people of God,” or the “children of the Light,” which expresses a central theme of early Friends. Those terms imply a covenant relationship between God and his people, and help to overcome the contemporary notion that Quakerism is everyone doing his or her own thing, a kind of rugged individualism which is so much a part of Quaker pluralism today. The community aspect of ESR has been real and it has been significant, and the basis for this is a religious
community of faith and practice that prompts us to become the “children of the Light,” as well as “the Christian people of God.” It is in this context that a network of accountability is possible which can overcome the devastating individualism which plagues so much of modern Quakerism. If this is not countered within the Society of Friends it can become a Twentieth Century form of Seventeenth Century ranterism, which threatened the Quaker movement in the beginning.

The following statement is taken verbatim from the 1984-86 ESR catalog and represents the latest revision of the philosophy of the Earlham School of Religion.

**The Philosophy of the School**

*The Inward and Outward Journey*

Quakers witness to both an inward and an outward dimension of the religious life. On the inward side, religious experience is personal: the direct relationship of the individual with God. The outward manifestation is a quality of personal living that bears the fruit of a life in obedience to the Living Christ. As such it is a constant vocation of mission in which the spirit and insight of Divine Light are brought to bear upon the world in which we live.

*The Theological Stance*

ESR is related to the Religious Society of Friends and is committed to a historic view of Quakerism grounded in Christian faith and life. We believe that this faith and life are informed by the Biblical message, illumined by the Light of Christ, and inspired by the Holy Spirit. Scripture is held to be authoritative as a witness of God’s living acts in history and human responses to them. The Bible serves not only as a sourcebook of the Christian faith, but as a sourcebook of our living faith today in response to the leading of God’s Holy Spirit.

While the School is committed to the Biblical revelation of God in Jesus Christ as the source, guide, and object of faith, it is also committed to the historic Quaker concept of continuing revelation. This means that Christian truth is to be discerned within the context of worship and prayer, listening and dialogue, study and research, and in a spirit of respect, love, and understanding of one another. The dynamic character of this faith is embodied in a long-standing statement of the School: “We hold that Christ is present, that He guides and directs, and that His will can be known and obeyed.”

The church as a community of faith is viewed as a worshipping, redemptive, witnessing, and ecumenical fellowship, which is gathered together by Christ to be sent out into the world in order to transform it. In keeping with this vision, the School attempts to nurture such a fellowship within its own community.

*The Educational Perspective and Goals*

The presence of these emphases in the School does not mean that these beliefs or any others are forced upon members of the community in a narrow or sectarian way.
Courses are taught from a nondogmatic stance in which alternative points of view are studied historically and systematically.

ESR is concerned with the education of whole persons in all of their relationships. This means that there must be integration and coherence in the teaching program of the School, which in turn means close cooperation and communication among faculty who teach in the various areas of the curriculum. If any education should be wholistic, it should be theological education, and the ESR faculty is dedicated to the realization of this objective.

The specific educational goals of the School of Religion seek to:

1. Assist students to develop a faith consistent with personal religious experience and the Christian revelation
2. Maintain a Christian way of life and a community of worship and fellowship conducive to spiritual vitality and integrity
3. Achieve academic learning and competence in the Biblical, historical, and theological disciplines
4. Develop practical skills for ministry and actualize in ourselves and others an equipping and enabling style of ministry
5. Become a graduate center for Quaker women and men
   - for developing Friends leadership for both programmed and unprogrammed meetings
   - for fostering unity in the Society of Friends
   - for providing a research and learning center for Friends
   - for fostering Friends involvement in current theological and cultural dialogues
   - for clarifying and sustaining the Quaker vision
   - for assisting Friends meetings in the development of their life and ministry.

6. Keep contact with and participate in the larger Christian community and its concerns for the peoples of the world.

In keeping with these goals ESR is concerned that students develop a deep understanding and commitment to the Christian Gospel, and that this be reflected in their life and ministry.

It can be noted in passing that not everything that ESR tried educationally survived the test of time. There was always an interest in making ESR’s educational experience as practical and experimental as possible, which meant relating the classroom to the laboratory of fieldwork. A couple of early experiments which held high hopes at the start finally had to be given up. One was Richmond Industrial Ministry designed to place students in industrial work and ministry experiences while they were in school. Another project took the form of the purchase of a house in North Richmond, adjacent to Townsend Community Center, which served as a laboratory living and working experience for students in this blighted area of the city. The center was called “Earlham
Friendship House.” Several ESR students and families lived and worked there during the 1960’s. Our Mennonite faculty member, Calvin Redekop, took the lead in developing these programs. Upon his leaving in 1973 they had to be phased out.

Let me close this chapter by quoting from an appraisal I wrote in *The Earlhamite* in 1976 (Winter issue). This is just as applicable at the end of twenty-five years as it was at the end of fifteen. I began by quoting a brief statement of purpose which the ESR faculty hammered out in faculty discussion, and I especially remember that Alan Kolp helped us formulate these words: “The purpose of ESR is to be a seeking, caring, seminary community after the manner of Friends.” Commenting on this I wrote:

ESR is indeed a community of seekers after the truth, the meaning of life and the relevance of the Christian message for today’s world. ESR is at the same time a caring fellowship of students and faculty who have a deep sense of respect, love and concern for one another. It is also a seminary in the root meaning of that word, namely, a seedbed from which germinal stock originates. In this sense it is a nurturing ground for ministry and is engaged in the education and training of persons for this vocation. Finally, a valiant effort has been made at ESR to fashion the school and its educational program “after the manner of Friends” insofar as this is possible and feasible.

In the same article on “What is Earlham School of Religion?” I concluded with these remarks which summarize the mood today just as well as they did ten years ago:

ESR has become not only a crossroads for Quakers where significant cross-fertilization of ideas and beliefs has taken place, it also serves as symbol and model for a new kind of Quaker dialogue and encounter which is leading to greater understanding and unity among Friends. If Quakerism is to have staying power in terms of its usefulness for the future, then such nurturing places are essential in the Society of Friends. From such efforts as these can emerge a new Quaker identity and a sense of common purpose which can help shape a living and vital Quakerism for the future. ESR is clearly trying to help facilitate such an objective.

*Notes*

1 Robert Barclay, *The Apology*, Proposition X, Sec. 26
CHAPTER IV
The School in Its Struggling Years  Getting Started

Once it became clear that Earlham intended to help launch a Friend’s seminary, questions arose immediately whether Earlham College in Richmond, Indiana was the right location and the right auspices, and secondly, what should be the name of the school? Although other Friends’ colleges had attempted to develop special training programs for ministry, the only real contender in 1960 was Guilford College’s Program of Training for Religious Leadership. In February, 1958 Guilford College printed a special bulletin setting forth plans for its expanded M.A. program in religion. The bulletin also refers to the Eighth Ward Lecture given at Guilford’s Annual Founders Day on November 8, 1957 by Sumner Mills, Clerk of Five Years Meeting of Friends on the topic, “Developing Leadership for the Society of Friends.” This graduate program at Guilford drew a number of students for several years, chiefly from North Carolina Yearly Meeting (FUM), but was eventually phased out as a separate program of study. Eventually it became a pretty well accepted supposition that whoever could bring together the resources to establish a Friends’ seminary would largely determine the location and the name of the school. One cannot overlook some concern, if not a bit of jealousy, among some Quaker colleges as Earlham began to assert leadership in establishing such a school. Although there was wide support for the idea, it is fair to say that other colleges at that time hoped they might succeed with such a venture. The naming of the school tended to highlight the feeling which the various Quaker constituencies had. Should the school carry the Earlham name? If so there were those who counseled that this would cause unnecessary resentment and lack of Quaker support from other quarters of Quakerdom. Against the preferred judgment of several members of the newly named Board of Advisors, which was clearly a national Friends group, Earlham was retained in the name.

Of almost equal importance was the debate over the inclusion of “religion” or “ministry” in the name of the school. The trend among seminaries nationally was to delete “religion” from their name in a period when “religion in general” had come under attack by Barthian and Neorthodox theologians. For example, Duke School of Religion
changed its name to Duke Divinity School, and Butler School of Religion in Indianapolis became Christian Theological Seminary. Elton Trueblood favored keeping “ministry” in the title, such as “Earlham School of the Ministry,” or “Friends School for the Ministry.” Even though “religion” was not a popular term among Christian denominations in the 1950’s and ‘60s, some felt that the Quaker emphasis on firsthand religious experience lent some credence to the inclusion of “religion” in the title. Even though the debate went on for some time, and even though feelings of concern prevailed for several years among those who would have preferred a “Friends” identification rather than “Earlham,” the time came when a decision had to be made. In the end, the prevailing opinion was that Earlham should forthrightly acknowledge ownership of the new school if it were to assume responsibility for it. Thus “Earlham School of Religion” became the official name.

**Administrative Relationship with Earlham**

Although the new Earlham President, Landrum Boiling, and the Board of Trustees took responsibility for launching the two-year experimental phase, and finally the full fledged seminary in 1962, the fact, as has already been indicated was that there was not unqualified support within the College. Some faculty members had not been impressed by earlier attempts Earlham had made to reach beyond its basic task in liberal arts education. There had been an experimental field- oriented (graduate and undergraduate) Community Dynamics Program under William Biddle, but it had been laid down. Earlham had offered for a time an M.A. in mathematics to accommodate area business people, but it had not taken root. Moreover, a growing plea for academic excellence produced a re-examination and elimination of a couple of established programs, which did not seem appropriate for a “pure” liberal arts education, in home economics and agriculture. The academic environment in the 1960’s at Earlham was not propitious for launching an ambitious new undertaking in religious studies. Yet, because the College already had strong programs in religion and philosophy, including the mechanism for granting M.A. degrees in religion, there was some precedent for expanding studies in religion and in ministry.
When I came into this situation, beginning April 1, 1959, I was not fully aware of the underlying feelings in the College about these matters. The independent grant of money from Lilly Endowment made it possible to do the feasibility study about establishing a school of religion, but there was no assurance of a College commitment to carry out the recommendations if they were favorable. If it had not been for the fact that Landrum Boiling had only recently assumed the Presidency with wide support for his new administration, and was personally committed to making the effort, the idea of a school of religion would not have been seriously put forward and probably would not have survived the preliminary discussions. Many among the Earlham faculty and a majority of the Board of Trustees, to be sure, were in favor of the idea. Those who were critical of the idea were reluctant to oppose it strongly, their attitude being: “We’ll have to let Landrum have his way. Anyway, it will probably fail in the end!” Thus, the School of Religion not only had to prove itself to the broad Quaker constituency but also to many of the Earlham faculty.

From an administrative point of view there was some ambiguity from the beginning about the relationship between the School of Religion and the College. Its development insofar as possible was to be separated from the College’s regular fundraising and was to seek its own independent financing. During the first two years I, as Administrative Secretary (without title of Dean), reported directly to President Boilling. Although this temporary free and open administrative relationship worked well because Landrum and I worked agreeably together, it did not provide the kind of institutional integration and accountability that later became necessary as the School of Religion developed and grew. Before long it became clear that ESR would have to relate to the Business Office of the College, which then was headed by Harold Cope, and the Dean’s Office of the College, which was headed by Joe Elmore. Relationships with these offices worked rather well for a number of years, although there was ambiguity about who was responsible for the M.A. degree in religion, and after 1962, for the Bachelor of Divinity degree (B.D.) which was added. The M.A. continued under the care and final authorization of the Graduate Committee of the Earlham faculty, whereas the B.D. program became the responsibility of the ESR faculty as it developed its own identity. This practice prevailed until ESR
became accredited in its own right and was able to assume full responsibility for both degree programs.

In terms of business affairs and financing the launching years were made relatively easy because of the funding received from Lilly Endowment. By 1965 it became clear that support for ESR would have to come increasingly from the Quaker constituency if there was to be further Lilly support. During these years, and even more so later when Lilly support was almost entirely withdrawn, stresses and strains developed between the College and ESR. As these increased the administrative relationship between the College and ESR was tested. Thus, ESR’s development and growing pains took on new forms and proportions even though the School continued to gain in enrollment and credibility.

During the 1970’s lines of administrative responsibility and accountability became more clearly defined. By the end of my deanship in 1978 a fairly explicit working agreement had been hammered out and put in writing. During Landrum Bolling’s administration he preferred to keep open the lines of communication by not defining more than necessary the lines of responsibility and authority and by allowing ESR a considerable measure of autonomy. During the interim year of Paul Lacey’s Acting Presidency, 1973-74, and through the administration of President Franklin Wallin, that began in 1974, that clarification and refinement of administrative relations between ESR and the College were spelled out. By 1978 a formal document of working relationships was adopted based in large measure on an administrative memorandum initiated by Landrum Bolling the year before he left the Presidency in 1973 (see Appendix III). This document had evolved with the help of Paul Lacey, Franklin Wallin and myself, along with Lorton Heusel and Paul Langdon, both successive chairmen of the ESR Board of Advisors. This expanded memorandum continues now to serve as the guidelines for the administrative relationships between ESR and the College. Under Franklin Wallin’s Presidency there was further clarification of the operating relationship of three Earlham inter-related but semi-autonomous institutions: Earlham College, Earlham School of Religion, and Conner Prairie Settlement. The Earlham Board of Trustees continues its responsibility for all three entities administered through the President of Earlham.
The ESR Board of Advisors, created in 1960 as the School opened, came to play a highly significant role. Appointed by the Earlham trustees (but on suggestions put forward by its own Nominating Committee including the Dean of ESR as ex-officio), this Board draws Friends from the entire spectrum of Quakers in America and may include up to three non-Friends. Three members of the Board are liaison appointees from the Earlham Board of Trustees, and three members are nominated by the ESR alumni/ae. The responsibilities of this Board and its Clerk (formerly Chairman) are spelled out in the above mentioned memorandum of agreement adopted in 1978. The importance of the ESR Board of Advisors cannot be stressed too strongly. It does not have final legal and financial responsibility for the Earlham School of Religion, which alone rests with the Earlham Board of Trustees, but it has served a very useful purpose as an essential link between the Quaker constituency and the Earlham administration and trustees. It has on it weighty Friends who have assumed major responsibilities for the School including the securing of financial support. (See Appendix IV-d for a listing of Board of Advisor members.)

**Financial Crisis and Budget Balancing**

The acid test for ESR’s survivability was not only whether it could draw students and get launched with the providential help of Lilly Endowment, but whether it could gain the kind of ongoing support from Friends which would enable it to become a viable institution on its own. This turned out to be the severest test that the School of Religion had to withstand. Lilly Endowment made clear from the beginning, through its executives Harold Duling and Charles Williams, that ESR would have to build its own financial base without indefinitely prolonged help of the Lilly Endowment. A review of the financial struggle which ESR underwent on its way to financial solvency and maturity is in order here. Much of the success of ESR had to be finally measured by whether Friends believed in it enough to invest substantial funds in the building and operation of the School.

The first grant by Lilly Endowment on April 1, 1959 was for $7,000 for the feasibility study which I was hired for six months to do. After the initial survey was made and the decision reached to launch an experimental two-year program beginning in September,
1960, Lilly Endowment made a grant of $60,000 which was budgeted to see us through the first two-year operating period. In June, 1963 an additional $25,000 Lilly grant for two years supplemented a commitment from Earlham to provide $200,000 support for ESR during the Ford Challenge Campaign (1961-65). In this and the later Pace Campaign (1971-72) Earlham agreed to underwrite ESR’s budgetary needs in lieu of a separate ESR campaign.

During the remainder of the 1960’s two major financial decisions were made. In December, 1961 Alexander Purdy and I were asked to visit Tom Jones at his home to try to convince him that he should lend his personal support to ESR by working with ESR’s new Director of Development, Leonard Hall, to seek Quaker financial support for the School. Although Tom Jones had always been committed to the establishment of a school of religion at Earlham he had been so heavily involved with nation-wide consultative work with college presidents, following his retirement as President of Earlham in 1958, that he did not have time to help with ESR’s fund-raising efforts. But in due course he agreed to join Leonard Hall in cultivating Quaker donors to replace the support Lilly Endowment had given.

The first trial run test of ESR’s ability to convince Quakers to take ownership of the School came in a challenge gift of $150,000 from Lilly Endowment, providing Friends would match the gift by the following formula: ESR would raise $30,000 to match $70,000 Lilly money the first year; a fifty-fifty matching agreement would pertain for the second year; and the third year ESR would raise $70,000 to be matched by $30,000 from Lilly Endowment. This would provide $300,000 operating funds for ESR over a three-year period. Tom Jones and Leonard Hall set out in 1965 to meet this challenge, and although they enabled the School to reach its goal each year and thus claim the Lilly money, Tom Jones said that it was the hardest money he had ever raised!

This trial run among Friends had no more than gotten under way when it was realized that ESR must plan ahead for long-term funding. This led to another major decision in 1966 when it was agreed that ESR would launch a capital development campaign with the help of Ward, Dreshman and Reinhart, a New York-based fund-raising firm. This is
the one and only such campaign ESR has ever run apart from joint involvement with Earlham College campaigns. Through the efforts of Tom Jones and Elton Trueblood we succeeded in obtaining a $300,000 challenge gift from Lilly Endowment contingent upon ESR’s raising $1 million from the Quakers. This drive was referred to as the 1967 Friends Leadership Development Campaign with a goal of $1,300,000.

A great deal of preparation went into this campaign as Cecil Cook from Ward, Dreshman and Reinhart joined the staff as Campaign Director. Following a personal visit which Cecil Cook and I made to Delbert Replogle at his home in Ridgewood, N.J., he consented to serve as chairman of the National Campaign Committee. Negotiations were carried on with Friends United Meeting to undertake a joint fund-raising endeavor. A film, it was agreed, should be produced to place the leadership training issue in historical perspective, depicting the roles of both FUM and ESR. David Stanfield and James Higgins of the FUM staff, joined us at ESR in the preliminary planning of a thirty-two-minute colored movie entitled, “A New People to be Gathered.” We contracted with Russell Benson, Indianapolis film-maker, to produce the film. The filming crew went to England to include seven minutes of early Quaker background in the movie and gathered other footage about Quaker activities in various Friends centers in America. The movie concluded with scenes at ESR on the Earlham campus and related the unfolding dream for leadership training through the Earlham School of Religion.
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Friends United Meeting was also invited to join with ESR in a capital fund campaign to benefit both institutions. A joint goal of $2 million was set, and extended discussions were held with staff and Board members of Friends United Meeting. Five pages of minutes in the 1966 FUM Triennial sessions are devoted to the proposal (pp. 37-42). In the end, however, a working agreement could not be reached on the joint campaign.
proposal, but FUM and ESR did continue to cooperate in the production of the film, “A New People to be Gathered,” which eventually was paid for out of campaign expenses.

During the ESR campaign, which began in late 1966 but focused on solicitations made during the first six months of 1967, concern developed at Earlham about the impact on the interests of the College from an independent ESR campaign. Some Earlham trustees raised questions which generated an extended written response from Landrum Bolling, dated December 15, 1966. He gave a full explanation for the background and reasons for the separate campaign, together with his regrets for not having spelled this out more fully in the October, 1966 Board meeting. He then concluded with this summary statement:

To be sure, some of Earlham’s traditional supporters will give to the School of Religion. But from what I have seen so far, I am convinced that Earlham will in the long run be helped—not hurt—by this campaign, and that the bulk of the funds raised for the School of Religion will come from givers who have not previously given nor are likely to give significantly to Earlham College.

Other concerns arose from a series of media interviews in the spring of 1967 that brought national publicity for the School of Religion in the midst of its campaign. Interviews with the religion editors of Newsweek magazine, the New York Times and AP wire service and other publications resulted in a series of news stories which were reasonably accurate but nevertheless aroused fears and criticisms among some Quakers, especially in the East. The Earlham School of Religion, thus, became again an issue of controversy within its own Friends constituencies. With a fund-raising campaign in process, this attention was a mixed blessing. Rather than gaining a breakthrough with some Friends, as we had hoped, the publicity tended to confirm their belief that Friends should not be involved in theological education for ministry. William Hubben wrote a critical editorial in Friends Journal (June 1, 1967), and there appeared a letter of “explanation” from Howard Brinton in the London Friend (June 16, 1967), apparently addressed to Friends abroad who would be coming to the 1967 Friends World Conference at Guilford College in August. There were also follow-up letters to the editor in Friends Journal, not all of which were unfavorable to ESR.
By the end of May, the 1967 ESR Leadership Development Campaign, despite the professional help of Ward, Dreshman and Reinhart, had failed to reach its projected goal, falling short almost a half-million dollars. The Lilly Endowment $300,000 challenge gift could not be claimed unless the goal of $1 million was reached by the end of December. The campaign in some gloom, was recessed for the summer.

Since we apparently had exhausted our resources in the campaign to raise the stated goal, it seemed evident that we must take a new look at what we were trying to accomplish. The Executive Committee of the Board of Advisors met on June 12 to review the situation with Cecil Cook, the Campaign Director, and to discontinue our contract with Ward, Dreshman and Reinhart. The gravity of the situation I spelled out in a memorandum to the Executive Committee, setting forth “Alternative Proposals for the Future Direction of the School of Religion.”

Three alternatives were suggested:

1. That ESR become increasingly independent of Earl-ham and more directly accountable to outside Friends groups, which would then have to become increasingly responsible for its funding. The name of the School would probably have to be changed to “Friends School of Religion.”
2. That ESR remain identified with Earlham but that it phase out the three-year B.D. degree program and concentrate on the M.A. degree in religion, thus avoiding improvements in library and staff necessary for accreditation of the B.D. degree.
3. That ESR seek a consortial relationship with a cluster of other seminaries, thus severing connections with Earlham and moving to a new location.

Although in the end, not any of these alternatives was pursued, the memorandum marked a low period in ESR’s development, and reflected our discouragement and uncertainty about the future.

A related problem was that enrollment for the new B.D. program, which we hoped to be the major degree of the school, was temporarily in decline. Meanwhile, we had made our first application for Associate Membership in the American Association of Theological Schools. That application, however, was not accepted until 1969. Provisional accreditation was granted only in 1973, and full accreditation in 1975. Part of the reason
for the delay in accreditation was our need for more faculty—and our inability both to afford and to recruit them.

Despite those weeks and months of uncertainty in the summer and fall of 1967, Tom Jones proved to be both a tower of strength and the kind of goad which many of us needed. He admonished me personally for even questioning the long-term viability of the School. Tom was determined that our lagging campaign was going to succeed even though our fund-raising counsel had left us.

On November 4-5, 1967 Delbert Replogle called an important meeting of the National Campaign Committee and our staff at a motel near the Cincinnati Airport. By that time we had received $771,636 toward the million dollars needed by the end of December in order to collect the $300,000 Lilly Endowment challenge gift. At that meeting the National Campaign Committee, and especially a handful of our most loyal supporters, determined that the money was going to be raised. They themselves pledged to provide the needed money if it should prove impossible to raise from other sources by December 31. With that stimulus, we went out on the road again. By the end of the year we had gone over the million dollar mark with Quaker support and were able to claim the Lilly challenge gift! Probably 1967 was the most crucial year financially that ESR ever faced. With the vision of people like Tom Jones, Delbert Replogle, Willard Ware, Oscar Marshburn, and with the hard work of Leonard Hall and myself and the unfailing support of Landrum Boiling, we were able to do what most Friends thought was impossible. This was not the last financial crisis to be encountered by ESR but it certainly was a major hurdle which by persistent efforts and by the grace of God we were able to overcome.

Despite the difficulties of the mid-sixties, there was a clear sense that ESR was becoming known and many were taking it seriously who had not given it much chance to survive. Moreover, it was becoming a place of gathering for Friends from east and west, north and south. That year ESR invited Maurice Creasey, Director of Studies at Woodbrooke College in England, to come as a Visiting Quaker Lecturer in conjunction with his trip to attend the Friends World Conference at Guilford College in the summer of 1967. Coupled with his presence at ESR we took the occasion to invite to campus fifty
leading Friends from all branches of the Society to consult on the subject, “Christ in Quaker Faith and Mission.” A main address on the subject was given by Maurice Creasey, followed by contributions from Arthur Roberts from the Evangelical Friends, and Francis Hall from Friends General Conference.¹ This was a significant gathering of Friends and became symbolic of ESR’s effort to bring together Friends of different persuasions for consultation at a deep theological level and for sharing our common spiritual heritage. It is for this reason that the late sixties was becoming a time of excitement at ESR as its potential for Quaker ecumenicity began to unfold.

Notes

¹ Further reference to the Friends Conference on “Christ in Quaker Faith and Mission” can be found in Errol Elliott’s *Quakers on the American Frontier*, including a picture and list of attenders, pp. 341-2ff.
CHAPTER V
The School in the Struggling Years
—Getting Established

Once we had successfully gotten over the hurdle of the 1966-67 ESR Leadership Development Campaign, it was time to reassess ESR’s general condition and take a longer look into the future. In the spring of 1968 a Long Range Planning Committee was formed to take a ten-year look ahead. This was also the time the Chairmanship of the Board of Advisors changed from Lorton Heusel to Glenn Reece. The first Chairman, Errol Elliott, had served from 1960 to 1963. He was succeeded by Lorton Heusel, then General Secretary of Friends United Meeting, who served from 1963 to 1967. Glenn Reece became Chairman from 1967 to 1970. Later succession of ESR Board of Advisors Chairmen were Delbert Replogle 1970-1975, Paul Langdon 1975-1979, and Harold Cope (Clerk) 1979-1984, to be succeeded by Earl Redding in 1985.

As part of the ten-year look ahead more attention was given to student recruitment and enrollment, educational policies, and accreditation. While this study was being carried on by several subcommittees I took my first sabbatical leave, spending the summer and fall of 1968 with my family in Europe, including the autumn term at Woodbrooke College in Birmingham, England. During my six-month absence Elton Trueblood served as Acting Dean of ESR. After my return the Long Range Planning report was completed and given at the Board of Advisors meeting in March, 1969. It recommended that ESR remain associated with Earlham College, that it pursue accreditation by the Association of Theological Schools, and that we revamp the curriculum. Reference was also made at the Annual Meeting to possible affiliation with the Dayton, Ohio Consortium for Higher Education Religion Studies (CHERS); the possibility of establishing an affiliated Institute of Quaker Studies; and plans for a Tenth Anniversary Celebration.

In October 1970 a two-day celebration was held to commemorate ESR’s ten-year accomplishments. A large dinner was held in Earlham Hall dining room to which everyone interested in ESR was invited. This was followed the next day by a colloquium
of speakers addressing the subject: “The Three M’s of Quakerism: Meeting, Message and Mission.” Several leading Quakers from home and abroad addressed the sessions, and a small book of the addresses was published by ESR. This occasion and the book were planned to mark the launching of the Institute of Quaker Studies, which was projected as a separate institute for research, study, dialogue, writing and publication in the field of Quaker studies. Because of lack of funds, and the fact that ESR’s own financial base was not yet secure, plans for the Institute of Quaker Studies had to be set aside.

The Tenth Anniversary Dinner held at the time of the celebration became the first of a series of twenty such dinners across the country to celebrate ESR’s beginning years. The objective was also to lay groundwork for another capital campaign, this time as part of the PACE Campaign which Earlham conducted from 1970 to 1973. Again ESR cooperated in actively soliciting contributions but did not promote its own needs apart from the College. Earlham guaranteed that $210,000 would be provided from the campaign for support of the School of Religion during these three years. This plan proved to be disadvantageous for ESR, since we were not allowed to seek independent financial help to meet ESR’s development needs. In 1971-72 the School began to draw on its last $100,000 reserve fund left over from the Leadership Development Campaign of 1966-67. Thus ESR, locked into rigid fund-raising restraints during the three-year PACE Campaign, began building up substantial indebtedness. Those in the administration who developed these plans realized the mistake too late to recoup the situation. Key members of the ESR Board and donors foresaw ESR’s slide into a debt which finally reached more than $281,000 before the kind of decisions were made which enabled ESR to turn the situation around.

One important oversight was that we did not formalize an Annual Fund drive until 1974, which in subsequent years has become one of the main sources for balancing the budget. Although annual giving was encouraged by ESR before 1974, we had been so deeply involved in a series of three capital campaigns (Ford Challenge, ESR’s Leadership Development Campaign and PACE Campaign) that annual giving was folded into these campaigns in such a way that we could not easily promote a regular annual giving program for ESR.
A very special financial asset came to ESR in 1973 when the so-called “17-73” Eli Lilly Gift came to Earlham, $2 million of which was initially earmarked for ESR. This came at the end of Landrum Bolling’s presidency and was negotiated by him just as he left office in June of 1973. There was some ambiguity about the conditions and wording of the grant but eventually ESR became the recipient of the income from this $2 million endowment. However, the value of the corpus of the Eli Lilly Gift got substantially reduced by the decline of the stock market in 1974 and following, which likewise reduced ESR’s share of income. Although the Earlham Board remains the trustee of the total Eli Lilly Gift, it is now assumed that income from 2/17th of the original $17 million gift will continue to come to ESR for the indefinite future. In effect this added substantially to ESR’s endowment and has helped, in addition to the Annual Fund, to enable ESR to avoid the deficit financing that prevailed in the mid-1970’s. More of the financial support later.

**Degrees and Accreditation**

Another part of ESR’s struggle toward maturity was over degrees to be offered and the issue of accreditation by the Association of Theological Schools. Reference has already been made to the question whether Earlham College or Earlham School of Religion would be responsible for and monitor the two degrees ESR offered, the M.A. in religion and the B.D. degree. Because Earlham had offered the M.A. before ESR came along, and because it was accredited by the North Central Association, it was natural for the Earlham faculty, through its Graduate Committee, to continue supervision of the degree. Although the ESR faculty did the teaching and preparation of students for the M.A. in religion, candidates had to be approved by the Graduate Committee and the faculty of the College. The Bachelor of Divinity Degree, however, was approved by the Earlham trustees for the ESR faculty to offer, and it has always remained the responsibility of ESR.

In subsequent years the name of the degree was changed to Master of Ministry (M.Min.) at the same time that the Association of Theological Schools changed its degree nomenclature from B.D. to M.Div. (Master of Divinity). ESR chose to substitute
“ministry” for “divinity,” which does not follow ATS practice but is acknowledged as appropriate for a Friends seminary. In fact, it is the only accreditation “notation” that ESR has carried for the past ten years.

No other degree offerings have been seriously considered by ESR. There has always been resistance to any degree that approached the doctorate, believing that we did not have resources sufficient to offer such a degree. With the upsurge of the Doctor of Ministry (D.Min.) programs offered by many seminaries in the 1970’s, and especially when ESR became part of the Dayton CHERS consortium, there was a push for ESR to be a part of a D.Min. program. Although ESR has cooperated in the offering of this degree through the consortium, we have never attempted to offer it on our own. Only one student, David Kingrey (ESR ‘67), has received the D.Min. degree from the CHERS consortium via ESR.

Another program of significance to ESR, but not a degree offering, has been the Theological Reflection Year (TRY) which was begun in the fall of 1972. It is a one-year program of graduate study for students who want to explore a seminary education at ESR, but are not ready to commit themselves to a degree program. Every year ESR has had from two or three to a dozen such students enrolled. Often, after a year they elect to change to one of the degree programs, although some regard their TRY year as a terminal period of study.

Accreditation was a major issue in the School from the beginning. It is one in which I was very much involved, believing that it was important for various reasons for ESR to seek full accreditation. Some held, as did Tom Jones for example, that what ESR was called to do was to provide a study program of excellence for Quaker pastors and leaders, and should not be overly concerned about accreditation. He often said, “If we become good enough to be accredited, let them (i.e. ATS) come seeking us and not us seek them.” My own contrary view was based on experience with students and the interplay of the seminary academic world. For example, one mature Quaker student who had come to ESR from an unaccredited undergraduate college said, “I have one Un-accredited degree; I don’t want two of them!” Still others needed an accredited degree to be
accepted for further graduate work elsewhere without having the work they did at ESR subject to question. Other reasons were that ESR needed to gain credibility among the theological seminaries of the country for the purpose of transfer of students, as well as to be eligible for grants of money available only to accredited schools. Also very important was the attitude of Earlham faculty toward ESR as an unaccredited school, a status that aroused suspicion that perhaps the work ESR was offering was not up to Earlham’s standards. The importance of accreditation was demonstrated by the relief and approval that came from the Earlham faculty once the School of Religion became fully accredited in 1975.

Requirements for Associate Membership in ATS was a minimum of 25 full-time students and four full-time teaching faculty. After more than one try to obtain this kind of membership it was found that we had to have 25 full-time B.D. students, because our M.A. was not a ministry degree and was accredited through the College. The first application for Associate Membership was made in 1965 but was not granted until the end of 1968 and announced at the beginning of 1969. To become fully accredited we had to increase the faculty to seven full-time persons. This became a stumbling block to accreditation in 1972. In the spring of 1973 we employed two additional full-time faculty for the fall term, (Miriam Burke and James Yerkes) and thus met the requirement for full accreditation. This was made possible through the generous support of Willard and Edith Ware.

Curricular Development

One of the arguments from the beginning was whether ESR, as a Quaker school, should have a curriculum patterned after the traditional theological school, or should develop a curriculum which emphasized the distinctives of Quakerism. The general practice at ESR has been to offer basic course work within the framework of the classical curriculum: Biblical Studies (Old and New Testament), Theological Studies, Historical Studies and Applied Studies. It has been the position of the faculty that courses in these areas provide a foundation for whatever we want to add on that is distinctly Quaker. Naturally the way courses are taught reflect something of the Quaker approach and
interpretation of Biblical, historical and theological studies. Alexander Purdy used to maintain that there is a style and methodology of Quaker teaching which is distinctive, but that the content for the most part would not differ from what is taught in other good theological schools. Proof that he practiced what he preached is indicated by the testimony of one of Purdy’s students at Hartford Theological Seminary, where Purdy taught for forty years: that “it seemed like a spiritual let-down to go from Professor Purdy’s New Testament class into Chapel, which always followed in the morning schedule.” Alexander Purdy’s scholarly methodology was impeccable, but he had the ability to teach New Testament so as to lift the souls of his students, as well as to challenge their minds.

The ESR faculty’s curricular goals and spirit are spelled out in the “Philosophy of the School” in Chapter III. But in the last half dozen years a concerted effort has been made to delineate those aspects of the curriculum which make ESR distinctive as a Quaker school as compared with other theological seminaries. Thus there has been added to the curriculum two areas of study which reflect the Quaker nature and emphasis of the School. One of these, Spiritual Preparation for Ministry, was started by Miriam Burke and taken over by Alan Kolp. The emphasis here is what some schools would call spiritual formation for ministry, or what many Quakers would speak of as nurturing the life of the Spirit and the life of prayer. Secondly, since my retirement as Dean in 1978 I have given leadership to the development of Peace and Justice Studies as integral to theological study and preparation for ministry at ESR. Together these two added requirements in the curriculum suggest something about the special way in which studies at ESR reflect the Quaker character. Of course, there are a number of Quaker courses in the curriculum which attempt to deal with the historical, theological and devotional dimensions of Quakerism. Finally, it is the School’s belief that the Quaker nature of this place has to be lived out in the community; that much of what we know about Quaker faith and practice has to be learned from living, worshipping and working together as a fellowship of committed persons.
Library Resources

One of the important resources for the development of a seminary is a book and periodical collection adequate for the teaching program, with less emphasis on a research collection. Although Earlham had a reasonably good Bible, religion and philosophy library, coupled with a working Quaker collection, it did not meet the standards required for ATS accreditation. Immediately attention was turned to building an adequate collection for the School of Religion. We called in a library consultant, Raymond Morris from Yale Divinity School, to give counsel and help us make some decisions. Each year money was budgeted to search for out-of-print as well as new books to build up the collection. Several libraries for sale were sought, and in a couple of cases ESR was able to acquire them. Yet, as we worked toward accreditation it was clear that we had to make special effort to improve our library capabilities in certain areas of the curriculum. A special Lilly Endowment grant of $50,000 received in the spring of 1974 gave us the major push toward upgrading the library collection to meet the full accreditation requirements. By 1975 the School was old enough to have obtained most of the new books and periodicals needed, but it had to keep working to acquire desirable and significant out-of-print materials. Although we have had some success in this endeavor, we must remain vigilant and enterprising if we are to continue to build the quality library collection ESR should have.

It was decided quite early that we should not try to excel as a research library, except in Quaker materials, and that we should not overload the library with foreign language materials which would not be used by the average student. Since ESR began, Earlham’s overall book collection has grown substantially, especially in the areas of Bible, religion and Quakerism, thanks to the presence and needs of the School of Religion. The total library book collection is now 300,000 volumes, some 1,300 periodicals and 15 foreign and domestic papers which are subscribed to regularly. The Kelson Religion Section of the library, which a special gift to ESR helped to build, now contains approximately 34,000 volumes. The library subscribes to approximately 120 religious periodicals. The Quaker collection alone numbers over 10,000 volumes. Steps are being taken currently to
upgrade the Quaker collection in terms of maintenance and cataloging, and to decide on what materials Earlham should specialize within the Quaker field.

The staff and services of the Lilly Library at Earlham are of high quality and the library building is one of the finest in the nation. Over the years it has received numerous national citations as a high quality library. The location of the library in relationship to ESR on the Earlham campus continues to be a problem, but a problem which ESR students and faculty will continue to live with. ESR keeps reminding itself that the School of Religion is no farther from the Lilly Library than many schools on a large university campus are from their main library.

Building a Stable Faculty

A most difficult and yet indispensable ingredient in a school of the kind ESR purports to be is to find and build a faculty who will share not only the Quaker vision for the school but who are competent scholars and teachers, as well as persons who are capable of working in a close knit community of students and faculty. As one looks at the record of ESR we can happily conclude that the School of Religion has done rather well with building and retaining an able and devoted faculty. But this has not been easy and continues to challenge the School as we seek replacements, or try to expand into areas not already covered.

When ESR was in the accrediting process one important observation was that it had succeeded in maintaining a stable faculty with very little turnover. But the big problem has been to find the right kind of Quaker faculty who are competent in their fields but also who either represent or can work easily with the wide variety of Friends in America. Where non-Friends have been invited special effort has been made to be sure they are persons who can support the mission of the School and work effectively with those who are dedicated to the fulfillment of the Quaker mission. ESR has been fortunate in having a number of such non-Quakers who have not only played a supportive role but who have brought distinction to the quality of teaching that goes on at ESR.
One runs a risk listing faculty who have played such a formative role in ESR’s history. Some who have been part time at Earlham College and part time at ESR, and others who have been adjunct teachers or who have come for short periods of time also deserve mention. Let me make reference to the main standbys who have helped to shape the School during its first twenty-five years.

We begin with Elton Trueblood, Hugh Barbour and Joe Elmore who were at Earlham when the School started in 1960. In addition to references already made to Elton Trueblood, special mention is due Hugh Barbour whose commitment to both Earlham and ESR, together with his high quality of scholarship and teaching, has made him a very valuable member of the ESR faculty. Starting in 1960 Alexander Purdy, who had just retired as Dean and New Testament Professor at Hartford Theological Seminary joined me, along with the three Earlham faculty mentioned above, to form the first teaching faculty of the School of Religion. I did both teaching and administrative work until 1978. Two years earlier, in 1976, I was taken seriously ill for a period of several months, during which time Tom Mullen served as Acting Dean for six months. After my satisfactory recovery it was mutually agreed, in 1978, that I should step aside as Dean and return to full-time teaching. After a sabbatical year away I took up full-time teaching until my retirement in 1985.

In 1962 Calvin Redekop and Richard Baer, Jr. joined us part time at ESR and part time at the College, as was also the case with James Spangenberg and William Rogers who came to the College the same year and taught part time at ESR. In 1963 Charles Thomas and Leonard Hall were two Quakers who were specifically recruited to become a part of the ESR faculty and development staff. They both remained at ESR until their respective retirements in 1975 and 1983.

Tom Mullen came to the Earlham faculty as Dean of Students in 1966, and gradually in the 1970’s he became more and more identified with ESR. In the early ‘70s he served as Associate Dean as well as instructor in Applied Theology. In 1967 Lynn Clapham received a joint appointment between the College and ESR. In 1968 Richard Davis and Clyde Black became Earlham faculty and staff persons respectively and have given part
time to ESR; Richard Davis has continued regularly to teach courses at ESR. From 1970 to 1977 Eugene Roop was a much valued member of the teaching staff and also assumed some academic administrative responsibilities. From 1969 to the present Keith Esch (ESR graduate in 1966) has served in various administrative roles, including Associate Dean for Business Affairs, and in 1984 was appointed Director of Development at ESR. In 1972 Miriam Burke and James Yerkes became teaching members of the faculty until their respective departures in 1983 and 1984. They both left an indelible mark upon the School.

Alan Kolp joined the Earlham and ESR faculties in 1974, and in 1978 became ESR’s second Dean until he returned to full-time teaching in 1984. Fred Tiffany replaced Eugene Roop 1978 and has continued teaching along with part-time responsibilities as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. Gayle Keller became a member of the development staff in 1981 and was named ESR’s Director of Development in 1983-84, after which time she joined the College Development staff. In 1982 Peet Pearson came to the teaching staff of ESR, working mostly in Applied Theology. In 1984 Tom Mullen succeeded Alan Kolp as ESR’s third Dean. At the date of writing new faculty are being sought to meet the staffing needs of the School.

It is not possible to tell fully the story of the supporting staff of ESR, which includes a long list of persons who worked on both the secretarial and maintenance/housekeeping staff. Some worked for short periods of time while others were with ESR for extended periods of service. At the very beginning Peg (Margaret) Higgins served as Secretary to Alexander Purdy and myself as we opened the first ESR offices in Carpenter Hall, which served as headquarters for the School of Religion 1960-62. When the School moved to its present location in Jenkins House on the corner of College Avenue and National Road West, Ella Brewer joined the housekeeping staff in the summer of 1962 and remained with ESR until her retirement in 1978. She made a lasting impression on the School, chiefly for her excellent cooking and her memorable relationship with students. Another tower of strength in the early years was Helen Starifield who served as Secretary to the Dean and ESR Registrar 1965-1974. Between these times and the present there has been a long list of loyal workers, sometimes student wives, and more recently students
themselves doing the maintenance and housekeeping work. All of these persons have performed valiant service for the School of Religion. Appendix 1V-c lists the main secretarial and maintenance persons who have served the school over the years, along with their respective periods of service. Among the present staff of longest tenure is Claudia Ettel, who came in 1977 and in 1984 assumed major responsibilities for business affairs and student loans. Sue Kern currently is Secretary to the Dean and the faculty, and Carol Nutter serves as Receptionist and Editor of *This Week*.

**Building a Student Body**

Obviously there would be no reason for a School of Religion without the students who, along with faculty, constitute the most important part of a school. In the beginning it became clear that these two factors, plus the necessary financial support to undergird the program, are indispensable in the development of any educational institution. It was the job of the Dean and his co-workers to bring these elements together and to put them into a working relationship so that the educational goals of the School could be realized. Just as it has been a struggle to secure funding for ESR, so it has been a struggle to obtain students.

The number of students in the beginning years was in the teens and low twenties, several of whom were enrolled in the Extension classes carried on by ESR. By the third year enrollment rose to over thirty, including Extension course students. The pattern of enrollment seemed to rise by plateaus, the first of which was in the thirties and low forties during the 1960’s. Then in 1971 there was a major jump to fifty-seven students, mostly men but with a noticeable increase of women students. It was always believed that the jump that year came as a result of Keith Miller, one of our illustrious graduates, who came back to serve as Visiting Professor for one year. But once we had reached the plateau of the fifties, ESR remained there for a number of years. It was not until 1976 that our enrollment went over sixty. By now, women students made up forty percent of the student body. During these years, especially with the appointment of Alan Kolp as Dean in 1978, a major effort was made to increase student enrollment. By 1979 it had gone over seventy and from that time to the present has remained in the seventies, except for a
short-lived surge into the eighties at the start of the 1980’s. Appendix IV-a gives enrollment statistics together with a graph showing growth in student enrollment.

The make-up of the student body is important. The pattern has been that each year 50-75 percent of the students have been Friends, leaving the remainder to be distributed among a dozen or more denominations. Denominationally Mennonites (in the early years) and Methodists have probably been the largest groups numerically next to the Friends. There have been occasional Roman Catholics, but only rarely a Jewish student or students of non-Christian affiliation. An increasing number of women have come so that now they make up approximately fifty percent of the student body. The School has never had the number of students representing minority groups and foreign students that would be desirable. In percentage terms, more African and foreign students came in the earlier years than recently. Another important trend is that in the first and second decades of the School’s existence a majority of the Friends came from programmed/pastoral Friends meetings, chiefly Friends United Meeting but with some from Evangelical Friends Alliance. Enrollments began to shift in the other direction at the end of the 1970’s, and now a slight majority of the Friends come from unprogrammed, chiefly Eastern yearly meetings. Meanwhile, the number of Evangelical Friends has declined. This shift is significant in determining future directions, because in the long run students tend to shape the development and character of a school.

**ESR’s Relationship with Friends**

One of the perennial questions and problems which confronts ESR is how to relate effectively and productively to the various branches of Friends. The division between evangelical and liberal Friends has tended to coincide with the division between programmed/pastoral Friends and the unprogrammed tradition. The fact is that ESR would not have come into existence had there not been the felt need for a Friends seminary to prepare leadership for the programmed/pastoral meetings. Many of these Friends have come to appreciate and trust ESR as a place where their future leadership can be trained, but the evangelical majority of these Friends still retain reservations about ESR. The fact that the trend of student enrollment has moved slowly toward more liberal
unprogrammed Friends mean that many evangelical Quakers have not yet been convinced that ESR is “their kind of school.” Not only that but it means that ESR is beginning to serve a slightly different purpose and clientele than was anticipated when it came into existence twenty-five years ago. This is one of the longterm trends which needs to be assessed carefully.

The places that ESR alumni/ae have now served is impressive. They have or are currently holding pastoral or meeting secretary positions in Quakerdom ranging from Oregon and California on the West Coast, to places in Kansas, Texas, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota in the Midwest, to meetings too numerous to mention in Indiana and Ohio, to most of the Eastern Seaboard states from Maine to the Carolinas. Graduates have or are currently serving in a variety of countries abroad, including Japan, Kenya and Uganda in East Africa, India, the Middle East, Western Europe, Belize and Canada. In addition to undertaking ministry in these places, a number of ESR graduates are teaching in secondary schools, colleges and universities both in the U.S. and abroad. Several hold responsible administrative positions with Friends’ yearly meetings, Quaker service and mission organizations, and conference and retreat centers. Some have found their way into a variety of business and community service organizations. The distribution of non-Quaker students has been equally varied and impressive, although the majority are serving in pastoral ministry or church work, some are involved in community service, or teaching in schools and colleges.

With respect to the Society of Friends there is little doubt that ESR has had a significant impact upon a large number of meetings and yearly meetings throughout Quakerdom. A majority of the graduates are making a marked difference in the places they are serving. Whether ESR can meet the leadership needs of as wide a spectrum of Friends as originally envisioned is still uncertain. Quakers although small in number are so pluralistic in faith and practice that it is probably too much to suggest that ESR-trained persons can meet the expectations of all Friends. Even so, it has played a significant part in helping Friends to communicate across the barriers of a century and a half of organizational division and ruptured communications. In this way ESR is helping Friends
and others to work together with a greater sense of Christian charity, unity and ecumenicity.

There is the possibility that the presence of ESR in recent years has encouraged some Friends to think more deeply about their meetings and the ministry, and to consider whether there are new and untried forms of ministry and worship which lend themselves to the needs of their members more fully than the traditional Quaker forms. There is experimentation going on which has led some pastoral meetings to become less structured, and less dependent on Protestant forms of ministry and worship. Sometimes this takes the shape of a team ministry which draws on the gifts and services of the entire meeting. Also, it may mean openness to more unprogrammed Spirit-led ministry and worship. In the unprogrammed tradition there is the recognized need for more instruction in Bible, theology and Quakerism, and that there is much in the area of pastoral care which is now neglected and therefore needs the careful attention of Friends.

Although there remain wide differences theologically among Friends, there is much they can learn from one another. There may also be common concerns and projects they can work on together. In the meantime, they both badly need to rediscover their Quaker roots and reclaim the vision of early Friends. By doing so they may be able to draw closer together theologically. The fact is that Friends do have a common heritage and history. They need to exploit this as a means of rediscovering one another in the community of faith. There surely must be a norm from which Friends have departed and need to recover. A common search for what this norm is for Friends and how it applies today could be a fruitful Quaker pursuit.

**ESR’s Relationship with Other Denominations and Seminaries**

Friends are not highly ecumenical as a religious body. The very fact we are small means that we tend to be preoccupied with our smallness and our need for identity. Because ESR is the only accredited Quaker seminary (although other attempts are currently being made) there is a tendency, if not a need, to seek out our uniqueness as a Quaker school and thus pay less attention to reaching out for cooperative relations with other theological schools.
In the early period of the School a variety of invitations came to ESR to join in a consortial relationship with other seminaries. ESR was born in a period when it seemed that the wave of the future was to link up with other schools. ESR was invited and sought out by several such developments. Just as ESR was getting under way in the early 1960’s representatives from the Independent Congregational Christian Churches contacted President Boiling about the possibility of a joint seminary venture between their group and the Friends. Rather than joining with us organizationally they were encouraged to invest their money in scholarship funds to support their students to come to ESR, or to other schools of their choice. As a result there have been a number of their students who have come to ESR over the years. One of their graduates, Karl Schimpf, has served on ESR’s Board of Advisers.

The first ongoing seminary consortium to seek out ESR’s affiliation was the Interdenominational Theological Center in Atlanta, Georgia. Then the new Christian Theological Seminary in Indianapolis (formerly Butler School of Religion) invited us to join them and others in an ecumenical theological center. A group of schools in Chicago, including Chicago Theological Seminary and Bethany Theological Seminary also talked with us. The Brethren, Mennonites, Church of God (Anderson, IN) and ESR consulted about a cooperative seminary.

As mentioned earlier, ESR in 1969 did become a member of a group of schools in southwestern Ohio, clustered around Dayton and Springfield, Ohio who formed the Consortium for Higher Education Religion Studies (CHERS). This effort began with high expectation on the part of six seminaries: one Methodist and one Lutheran, two Roman Catholic, one AME Black, and ESR. After the experiment had been going a few years it attempted to go all-Ohio and moved the CHERS office from Dayton to Worthington, Ohio (north of Columbus). This brought together six additional seminaries of equally diverse denominational orientations. This enlarged experiment after a couple of years failed to work and was finally dissolved. CHERS again resumed operations in Dayton but its demise finally came after efforts to become accredited failed, and when it became clear that there was too much “turf psychology” present on each campus to make a cooperative venture of this geographically far-flung nature work. However, as a result of
that common effort a limited amount of cross registration has continued between United Theological Seminary in Dayton, Ohio and ESR.

Alongside the CHERS development in the 1970’s was the formation of a parallel organization called the Accredited Theological Schools of Ohio and Indiana (ATSOI), which did joint fund raising with business, industry and foundations. This organization had a similar history to CHERS. It seemed to have considerable promise in the beginning but by the end of the ‘70s it had run its course. By the start of ‘80s both CHERS and ATSOT had plans to disband. The ecumenical benefits of both of these efforts were valuable to the schools, and particularly to the administrative staffs and faculties of the schools, but the payoff was recognized to be small and too expensive to warrant continuation. Moreover, consortial arrangements among well-established seminaries has worked only modestly well even where they have continued, so that many of the high hopes of the 1970’s toward seminary consorting had to be changed or given up entirely.

Another area of cooperation has been with the Historic Peace Church seminaries in the area of peace studies. This has included joint arrangements with the Associated Mennonite Seminaries in Elkhart, Indiana and Bethany Theological Seminary (Church of the Brethren) in Chicago. We have held a few joint conferences and course offerings, have encouraged exchange of students and faculty on a modest basis, and every two years we have run a joint four-day peace studies seminar in Washington, D.C. with the cooperation of our respective church representatives in Washington. In recent years a chartered bus has taken about forty students and faculty from our three seminaries on this trip, which has proven to be an excellent means of heightening student awareness of war, peace and social justice issues, and has provided a good ecumenical experience within the framework of the Peace Church seminaries.

A final word needs to be said about ESR’s ecumenical reservations among the neighboring schools over Earlham’s decision to launch a new theological school. The 1960’s were a period when many such schools were either merging with larger ones or were seeking to join a consortium. Accordingly, it did not make sense to many others to start up a new seminary; our neighbors hardly encouraged us to begin. As time went on
this attitude vanished so that in recent years our relations with the other seminaries and ATS have been cordial and supportive. They have often indicated amazement that ESR could succeed given the climate of the times and the degree of competition among the existing schools. ESR’s record of transferring students into other seminaries, including graduate schools, has been excellent. Moreover, it has become generally recognized that ESR was maintaining the high standards that have been associated with Earlham College.
CHAPTER VI
The School in Its Maturing Years

This title may be misleading. It should not be suggested that ESR went through a period of struggle and then moved beyond that into a period of maturation. The fact is that there has been a process of struggle and maturing, year by year, ever since the School began. But it is also true that the beginning years confronted us with special kinds of struggle which encouraged a sense of uncertainty about the future rather than a sense that ESR was moving toward maturity.

In Alan Kolp’s Annual Report for 1978-79 he states that the School had “a very good year” and suggests that it may even be a “turning point in the history of the School.” One can cite a number of things which got turned around or clarified in the middle or latter part of the 1970’s as indicators that ESR had outridden a number of storms that had threatened its survival in the earlier years.

In 1977-78 President Franklin Wallin, through the Board of Advisors, inaugurated an Evaluation and Progress Study which made its report in May, 1978. This “blue-ribbon” committee was chaired by Helen Hole and included representation from the Earlham trustees, the Earlham College faculty, as well as ESR Board members and faculty. Its concluding summary stated:

1. ESR is a valid, permanent, adult member of the Earlham complex.
2. It makes a substantial contribution to the educational and spiritual ethos of the Earlham Campus.
3. It has matured intellectually and religiously, and has made progress toward financial independence.
4. It is already making important contributions to the Society of Friends.

The attainment of ESR’s full accreditation from the Association of Theological Schools of the United States and Canada in June of 1975, was, of course, a significant validation milestone. It symbolized the end of a particular mode of struggle, involving many aspects of growth and development. It also marked the normalization of relationships with both the external educational world and with the faculty of Earlham College.
In the area of funding for the ongoing development of ESR probably the first real sign of maturity came with the success of the ESR. Leadership Development Campaign of 1966-67, already recounted in Chapter IV. This campaign together with the $150,000 Lilly gift in 1965, requiring matching money from Friends, provided the tests intended by Lilly Endowment to determine whether the Society of Friends would take ownership for the School of Religion and get behind it with their financial support. The evidence was now beginning to come in that the Quakers were serious about having such a school.

The major hurdle of the 1970’s was to turn ESR’s deficit financing around and begin to operate with a balanced budget without requiring subsidy from either Lilly Endowment or Earlham. When Franklin Wallin became Earlham’s President in 1974, and when Richard Wynn became Vice President for Business Affairs in 1976, together they closely scrutinized ESR’s financial operations and helped the School’s administration and Board of Advisors to face up to the requirements of financial accountability. The concerted Annual Fund drives originated in 1974, became an important means of funding the School, and establishing its viability. Secondly, the Earlham Board of Trustees in June, 1975 on the recommendation of President Franklin Wallin, decided that further approval of ESR’s budgets would be contingent upon intensified three-year fund-raising efforts directed at balancing the annual budget by the end of that time. This goal was accomplished on schedule; in the fiscal year 1977-78 the School operated in the black, for the first time in several years.

When Alan Kolp became Dean in 1978 he brought new determination and creative leadership to both fund raising and financial management of the School of Religion. He was able not only to keep up the momentum with the Annual Fund but he was able to inspire the confidence and vision of Board members, especially those like Barbara Perkins, who took the lead in eliminating ESR’s deficit, which had reached $281,417.48. A challenge to wipe out the debt to Earlham inspired a positive response from Earlham to match ESR’s gift money dollar for dollar to eliminate the debt. A schedule for removal of the deficit was set and by August, 1980, much ahead of schedule, the entire amount had been erased from the books. From that time on ESR has operated with a balanced budget, some years even building up a small reserve. The success of a strong Annual Fund drive
has been a chief reason for this important performance, though endowment has grown and income from student tuition has increased on a modest scale. In the funding of a program such as this it would not be possible to say that ESR “has arrived,” but it is possible to say that it has reached a level of financial stability and security which encourages hope for the future.

**Students, Faculty and Administration**

Another mark of the maturing years of ESR has been the steady increase in student enrollment. Current enrollments of seventy to eighty students is estimated to be about the School’s capacity, given our limited facilities and space, and given an understaffed faculty. To go beyond this would require expansion of both building facilities and the size of the faculty. In general the quality of the student body has improved with time, including some very able and gifted students. ESR still lacks for students from minority groups, and even though every year one to three students come from abroad, that number could be increased to the profit of everyone.

Special responsibilities for the success of a newly developing school like ESR naturally fall upon its administrative leadership and faculty. It was my privilege to be the chief administrative officer during those beginning years and to stay long enough, with good support from colleagues and outside advisors and backers, to provide the kind of stability and continuity that was needed at the start. At the same time, we were fortunate to be able to draw together an able teaching faculty which has remained reasonably stable over the years, although understaffing has continued to be a problem. The fact that we began with a few gifted people in the Earlham faculty, joined by Alexander Purdy and myself, and coupled with a series of capable faculty appointments, has meant that we were able to build a competent and stable administrative and instructional staff for the School. Many potential faculty have been attracted to ESR because it was a new Quaker venture in theological education; others were drawn partly by the Earlham connection and the fact that anything sponsored by Earlham was likely to have credibility. This was especially true of several able non-Quaker faculty who have helped us to put together a skilled and knowledgeable teaching staff. We need not belabor names further, since they
were enumerated earlier, but clearly a sign of the maturity of the School has been reflected in the quality and capability of the faculty and administration.

As a supplement to the full-time faculty and the part-time faculty shared with Earlham College, a very important resource group has been the non-Quaker Visiting Lecturers, Quakers-in-Residence, and the special Willson and Staley Lecturers who have come regularly to the campus each year. Because we knew that ESR would always have a small faculty an attempt was made from the beginning to bring in Visiting Lecturers and Quakers-in-Residence. Sometimes these turned out to be the same persons, though not always. Among the non-Quaker Visiting Lecturers who have been present for a term or more were Wayne Oates, Howard Thurman, Keith Miller and John Oliver Nelson. Among the Quakers-in-Residence, some of whom also served as Visiting Lecturers for a term or more, were Maurice Creasey, Douglas and Dorothy Steere, Roswith Gerloff, Francis and Pearl Hall, Frederic and Margaret Crownfield, Helen Hole, Tom and Nan Brown, Harold Smuck, David Holden, and John Punshon. This by no means exhausts the list; some Quakers-in-Residence came only for a few days, while others stayed a week or a month. Many distinguished names appear among the other special lecturers and visitors who have provided ESR with a steady flow of stimulation from outside the School, bringing new and fresh ideas and experiences. They have added immensely to the life and thought of ESR.

An additional word needs to be said about those who have served in administrative and fund-raising roles. It is not insignificant that ESR has been able to change Deans twice and to draw happily from its own faculty to fill this important role. The first transition came in 1978 when Alan Kolp, a relatively new member of the faculty, emerged as the right person for the next six years. Alan did a superb job with fundraising and development, projecting a favorable public image for ESR, and provided spiritual vision and leadership for the School. His administration was greatly strengthened by two capable administrative members of the faculty, Keith Esch as Associate Dean for Business Affairs, and Frederick Tiffany as part-time Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. Earlier under my deanship Eugene Roop had served in a similar role without carrying that title, and even before that Tom Mullen and Charles Thomas had taken
responsibility for a number of these administrative tasks. Keith Esch, a graduate of ESR ('66) had joined the administrative staff in 1969.

Alan Kolp decided in 1984 to step aside as Dean and return to full-time teaching. Again, ESR found his replacement in the faculty in the person of Tom Mullen, who was installed as Dean of the School of Religion on October 30, 1984. He has had many years experience at ESR and on the Earlham faculty and administrative staff. Twice he served as Acting Dean of ESR during my absence for two terms in 1976-77, and again when Alan Kolp was on leave in 1981.

ESR has been fortunate to have able persons in fund raising and development. Leonard Hall was on the staff for twenty years primarily as Director of Development, although in the beginning he assumed a number of public relations and administrative responsibilities. Toward the end of his tenure Gayle Keller, a graduate of ESR in 1980, joined the development staff in 1981 and took Leonard Hall’s place as Director of Development in 1983 when he retired. A further change in development officers came a year later when Gayle Keller took a position in the Earlham Development Office and Keith Esch was appointed to succeed her as ESR’s Director of Development. As is true of any such organization the head administrative officer, the Dean in the case of ESR, carries a heavy responsibility for fund raising. Tom Mullen as the new Dean in 1984 promises to be ably fitted for that role following the successful way Alan Kolp served in this capacity for six years. Certainly in the area of development and fiscal responsibility ESR has come to demonstrate maturity in its able leadership.

**ESR’s Acceptance by Earlham and the Quakers**

Perhaps the biggest achievement of ESR in its maturing years has been its acceptance and support within Earlham College and the Quaker constituency. Though still under some critical scrutiny, ESR has come a long distance since the early days when the very idea of a school of religion was greeted with considerable skepticism. Full academic accreditation and demonstrated ability to manage its financial affairs in such a way as not to constitute a drain on the College have certainly enhanced ESR’s standing. But there have been other factors which have helped to establish confidence and more enduring
relations between the College and ESR. This relationship has been strengthened by the lead which Alan Kolp took when he became Dean in 1978. Originally he had been a member of both the Earlham and ESR faculties and enjoyed the respect and confidence of colleagues in both places. Also, a new administrative arrangement that coincided with Alan Kolp’s deanship was the inclusion of the Dean of ESR in the Earlham President’s Cabinet. This made it possible for ESR’s Dean to be kept abreast with overall Earlham developments, as well as to be an immediate and direct participant in Earlham administrative decisions affecting ESR.

Other faculty have also helped to improve relationships between the College and ESR. James Yerkes, Professor of Theology, deserves special mention on this count. So does Fred Tiffany. A number of others could be named, such as Hugh Barbour and Dick Davis. Tom Mullen, appointed Dean in 1984 partly because of his many years of experience in the College has long been a positive link, and can help to build further on those relationships. In ways too numerous to mention ESR students have helped to improve and cement better relations.

The much longer and more complicated question of ESR’s acceptance by the Society of Friends is less clear than ESR’s acceptance on the Earlham campus. A great deal of progress has been made in the sense that in twenty-five years ESR has become reasonably well known among Friends, and even among the originally skeptical it is not regarded with the kind of suspicion which some expressed in the early years. The School of Religion has become known and generally favorably known through its graduates as well as through its faculty and administrative/development staff, who circulate widely among Friends. There is without question widespread goodwill for ESR. Still there are pockets of resistance and lack of confidence that ESR can serve the needs and interests of certain groups of Friends.

It was sometimes thought, unrealistically, that once ESR became known and understood by Friends across the Society, virtually all opposition and criticism of the School would disappear. Although ESR has not become fully accepted, it has grown in stature and matured in its relationship with Friends and its public image has generally
improved with the wider public. However, efforts put forward to gain the confidence of Evangelical Friends has had only modest results. ESR is seen as too liberal theologically and too bound to traditional Quaker practices to satisfy many of these Friends. Whether, with full respect for honestly held differences of belief, ESR can contribute acceptably to this group of Friends, as we would like to do, is still unknown.

The middle group of Friends usually associated with Friends United Meeting has an increasing attachment and loyalty to ESR. Whether their position as holders of the middle ground in American Quakerism means that their position and role will be expanded as reconcilers and builders among Quakers both east and west, and north and south, is unclear. In any case, the School’s service to this broad segment of the Society of Friends is positive and clear. The increasing interest in the School of Religion from eastern and more liberal Quakers has come as something of a surprise. It was precisely from this wing of the Society of Friends that the most outspoken criticism of the idea of a school of religion originally came. But the fact is that more and more, ESR is being accepted by these Friends on the basis that it has something to offer them in terms of religiously rooted, trained leadership. Currently main staff positions of several Friends General Conference affiliated yearly meetings are held by ESR trained persons, and increasingly ESR graduates are being sought after by Friends schools and service agencies.

It is only fair to say that ESR is not for everybody in the Society of Friends. However, it seems destined to be a strong force for unity, theological clarity and new spiritual life among Friends. Whether it is able to fully serve all the diverse purposes for which it came into being, it is clearly evident that it has a place in Quakerdom and that it is likely to serve a significant and positive role as Friends approach the Twenty-First Century.
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If one were to sum up what ESR has been engaged in for the past 25 years, I would suggest first, that functionally speaking it has been primarily concerned with preparation of persons for ministry, in the broad sense as spelled out earlier in this history of ESR. Second, it has served as a source of potential leaders among Friends. Everyone is crying for qualified persons to fill Quaker positions, and ESR is destined to be a source where Friends can look for such persons. Third, ESR has played and is playing an important role in spiritual renewal among Friends as well as in helping Friends to clarify their
purpose and goals. In these ways ESR has made and will continue to leave its mark on the Society of Friends.

**Looking to the Future**

As ESR completes the first twenty-five years and assesses its role for the next comparable period of time, it is clear that this will take the School into the Twenty-First Century. Planners say that it is not feasible to make projections and forecasts for longer than five years. But let us take a little longer look than that as Friends, and ESR in particular, approach the Twenty-First Century.

ESR has a number of current needs which are pressing for attention. One of these is the remodeling or rebuilding of its over-taxed facilities on the corner of College Avenue and National Road West where the School has been located since 1962. There continues to be a debate about the optimum size of the student body over the long term. Current planning is geared to the present size, 70-80 students. Yet from the beginning we have talked about expanding to an upper limit of 100 students, including part timers. There is at present no assurance that the School can recruit that many students and the question remains how to accommodate them should that number be available. If this upper limit should become the objective of ESR’s enrollment, then expanded building facilities are necessary. In the past two or three years studies have been made, architectural sketches drawn and cost projections made with the hope that another major capital funds campaign could be jointly launched by Earlham and ESR in order to meet a number of needs in both institutions. Progress toward such a capital fund campaign has moved very slowly, due in part to presidential changes at Earlham in 1983-85. When the campaign plans are completed and ready to go, it will be possible to propose more precise ideas and plans for ESR’s remodeling and expansion of facilities. Whether a major renovation of present facilities is appropriate or whether financial resources can be found virtually to rebuild the corner on which the School is located, these will be among the decisions to be made.

Another area that requires close attention is faculty development and expansion. More faculty are needed, one or two additional persons as well as replacements for persons who have left and persons expected to retire in the next couple of years. Obtaining
competent Quaker faculty to fill the teaching positions has been a difficult problem. A number of ESR’s own graduates eventually will be coming from graduate schools and seeking jobs, but that has been slow to happen so far. There is always the option to choose non-Quaker faculty where members of Friends are not available. ESR’s choices of satisfactory faculty in the past has been very fortunate. Whether we can continue to turn up satisfactory persons in the present and future is yet to be seen. There is always a temptation to choose the persons who are best qualified as scholars and potential teachers, but this often leaves out the need to have faculty who are personally involved in the Society of Friends and who can bring the kind of Christian commitment and balance to the faculty that is necessary if ESR is to continue to relate to and serve the diverse Quaker constituency. In the light of these difficulties the choice of faculty often becomes agonizing. One may hope that ESR will continue to take this matter seriously and, if necessary, continue to agonize until the right persons are found. The Earlham School of Religion may succeed over the long run, or it may bring about its own demise on the basis of the kind of teaching and administrative persons it appoints to its faculty. Faculty are not the only determining factors in the future of a school, but they are indeed very important and must not be taken lightly. May the leading of God’s Spirit continue to inform and guide those who are charged with the responsibility to recruit and recommend faculty for ESR.

Enough has already been said to indicate the importance of sound financial planning and development work to undergird the School with the necessary resources for the School’s growth in the future. This demands close attention, the expansion of sources of income, and the sound management of the funds once they are obtained.

The first ten-year review of ESR as an accredited seminary by the Association of Theological Schools is due in 1985. Although ESR must continually examine itself and revamp its curriculum to meet the changing needs of students and the changing character of the School, nevertheless it is important to go through periodic reviews in order to be sure that our standards are high and are adequately maintained to carry out the purpose and mission of the School. Standards of excellence are a part of Earlham’s tradition and should continue to be a part of the Earlham School of Religion. ESR has had several
rounds of review and long-term planning, and such planning is bound to be needed again and again in the future. When the School ceases to be self-critical and experimental, it will have ceased to be a living and vital community of teaching and learning.

Notes

1 A full report of the Evaluation and Progress Study is recorded with the minutes of the ESR Board of Advisors for May 4-5, 1978.
CHAPTER VII
A Glimpse into the Life of ESR

ESR is more than an institution with a history. It is also a living community of students and faculty with a common life and a common reason for coming together. There is a sense that something important is happening at ESR, and even after twenty-five years there continues to be excitement about that fact. Although ESR defies description or explanation in words, perhaps we can give a glimpse into what it is like by looking at what goes on in the daily life of the School.

The community of ESR is made up of seventy or more students, a half dozen teaching faculty, two administrative persons and a supporting staff of three and sometimes four secretaries. Most of the students live either in nearby college-owned apartments or housing available in the surrounding community. Approximately a third of the students commute from outside Richmond, while only a handful live on the premises.

ESR’s student body is very diverse. Normally two-thirds come from the Society of Friends. During the life of the School most yearly meetings have been represented in the student body, including several from abroad. This means that virtually all persuasions and branches of Friends have found their way to ESR. In the early years the majority came from the programmed/pastoral meetings of both Friends United Meeting and Evangelical Friends Alliance, whereas in the last dozen years a comparatively larger number have come from unprogrammed meetings, chiefly from the Eastern Seaboard. An increasing number of women students are enrolled. Few minority groups are represented in the student body, and there are fewer international students than we had hoped for earlier.

A substantial number of non-Friends have been enrolled in the School from the beginning. Any given year this is likely to represent a dozen or more denominations, including students from the Historic Peace Churches (Mennonites, Brethren), Protestants of many kinds, a few Roman Catholics, and occasionally a Jewish student. Because the School stands in the Quaker Christian tradition, most students are committed to or at least open to that point of view when they come. Geographically students come from all over
North America, with a scattering of students from European countries, Africa and the Far East.

The physical facilities of the School of Religion are modest. They consist of three houses located at the corner of College Avenue and National Road West, at the northeast edge of the Earlham campus. Although plans are in the making for renovating and expanding the present facilities, ESR has lived out of two of these houses for most of its twenty-five years: Jenkins House (ESR’s administrative building) on the corner, and Robert Barclay Center at 228 College Avenue. Recently a third house, which stands between the other two, has been added to the ESR building complex. Except for the use of Earlham’s central Lilly Library and the occasional use of other Earlham buildings, ESR carries on its work in these limited and overcrowded facilities.

The Daily Life of ESR

Academic study and skills training for ministry are the most time consuming aspects of ESR’s daily life, and in this sense they are central to the life of the School. The schedule of the week runs from Tuesday morning through Friday afternoon. No classes are held on Mondays, which are set aside for study and faculty meetings. The four-day week begins at 7:45 a.m. and runs for two consecutive one hour and fifty-minute periods until lunch time at 12:30 noon. There is a 9:45-10:30 a.m. mid-morning break for daily worship, coffee and fellowship. Some classes are held in the afternoons, and occasionally in the evenings. Classes are scheduled on a Tuesday-Thursday and Wednesday-Friday sequence, primarily to accommodate commuting students.

Because the student body is relatively small classes are small. Seminars and most classes go up to twenty or sometimes more. Emphasis is placed on a close relationship between faculty and students with a large amount of individual attention given to student needs and development. There is very little sense of hierarchy at ESR. Although faculty have experience, knowledge and expertise which they share with students, the fact that everyone at ESR follows the Quaker custom of addressing one another on a first name basis means that equality of persons is taken seriously. Faculty have a different function from students but in status they aim to be among equals in the community.
Although ESR has a separate existence from Earlham College with its own faculty, curriculum and building facilities, there is a close working relationship between the two schools. There is joint administrative responsibility for ESR maintained through the President’s office, the Development office, the Business and Accounting offices, and the Registrar’s office. Traditionally there has been some crossing over of teaching faculty, and there is cross registration of students for classes in addition to the fact that there are a few joint courses between the College Religion Department and ESR, such as church history, religions of Asia, philosophy of religion, and language courses. Students from ESR can enrich their course offerings by taking approved upper level courses in the College. This is especially true in the Peace Studies field. Because of considerable interaction between students in the College and ESR there is ample opportunity for students with quite different vocational goals to experience a cross-fertilization of ideas and to challenge each other’s point of view.

Both the College and ESR encourage advanced students to do independent study with professors of their choice. This is especially valuable at the graduate level where students are doing Master’s theses. Such required research and writing leads to extensive library work for all ESR students, regardless of which Master’s program they are in. Earlham has an exceptionally fine library with an adequate collection for undergraduate and Master’s research and study. One has only to walk through Earlham’s library any day of the week to realize how important it is as a learning tool for Earlham and ESR students.

Worship is central in the life of ESR even though in allocation of time academic studies take precedent. Daily worship, which is held during the four-day work week, is divided evenly between unprogrammed meetings based on silent waiting and programmed meetings led by students or faculty. Occasionally the worship period is made up entirely of hymn singing. Although not all students attend on a regular basis, the daily worship is important for a substantial segment of the School. Many of the commuter students are involved in regular worship with the meetings or churches they are serving. Some students have a worship relationship with other churches or groups in town. This is especially true for those who participate in the Ichthys House nightly worship at 9:30 p.m. Ichthys House is located across the street from ESR and is the
private home of Clyde Johnson, an ESR alumnus who has for years carried on a ministry with both ESR and College students. This is not officially a part of ESR but is partially supported financially by nearby Friends meetings.

Although not a great deal is said about it at ESR, the fact is that there is a very basic sense of community among students, faculty and staff. Although ESR does not provide a perfect pattern of human relations, it is a caring community of persons who have needs and provide an amazing amount of support for one another. The amount of community life ESR has been able to develop is doubly amazing in the light of the diversity of the student body and the fact that it is not a residential school. In spite of honest differences there is a strong sense of respect for one another and a willingness to be supportive of each other.

For students who have special needs for personal and spiritual help, ESR has developed what is called Active Listeners. This is an important legacy from the Miriam Burke days on the faculty in which she developed a team of students who demonstrated listening and counseling skills which could be shared. The Active Listeners’ group continues each year with the approval and guidance of the faculty. Anyone can seek out an Active Listener from the “approved group.” If personal or psychological needs require professional help, there is a means of referral for such assistance. Also, informal prayer and support groups form from time to time to meet particular needs. Clearness committees, so named out of the tradition of Friends, are also available to persons who are seeking counsel and guidance with respect to major life decisions, such as vocation or marriage. All of these help to form ESR’s caring community.

Perhaps the thing which is most symbolic of community at ESR is the longstanding Tuesday noon Common Meal held in the Tom Jones Community Room. This is a time when most students and faculty share a meal together and enjoy each other’s fellowship. It is followed by announcements, introduction of guests, and a brief time of thanksgiving for the time together, usually led by a student. It is customary for faculty members to preside at the Common Meal. Frequently someone is invited to speak either from the Earlham community or a visitor from the outside. Sometimes there may be a program of
music or entertainment. On other occasions there is a served meal in place of the regular buffet. This is followed by conversation and fellowship at the tables, which takes the place of a program for the day.

On other days of the week a simple luncheon is served in the Tom Jones Room at which time students and faculty are able to consult and visit together. Thursday noons are reserved for ESR Monthly Meeting and standing committee meetings. The Monthly Meeting is the student and faculty governing body conducted “after the manner of Friends.” The meeting is presided over by a student clerk who conducts business by the Quaker “sense of the meeting” procedure. This is not only an appropriate form of governance for a Friends school, it is also a learning experience for those who want to familiarize themselves with the Quaker business method. The administration of ESR has tried to share with the Monthly Meeting as much of the School’s decision making as possible. Thus the Monthly Meeting and its standing committees have an important role in the formation of community life at ESR.

Although not planned as part of the on-campus activities of ESR, there is significant involvement of students in the life of Richmond and the surrounding community. Much of this involvement comes about because of the need for students to have gainful employment. In addition, students welcome the opportunity to carry on practical ministry and service to others within Friends meetings, community churches and service organizations. From the beginning of ESR students have been employed or worked as volunteers in most of the community agencies of Richmond, including the state and city hospitals, county welfare services, girls and boys clubs, various schools in the community, Y.M. and Y.W.C.A., Townsend Community Center and special programs for the jails, battered women and child abuse.

Lest one conclude that ESR is all work and no play, this is not the case. Most students and faculty find leisure time for physical exercise, sports and fun. During the winter months there is a men’s basketball team of students and faculty, sometimes referred to as “Yahweh’s Warriors,” which has provided a lively sport for a number of students. Insofar as students have time, or take advantage of the opportunity, they can join in a variety of
physical activities at the College’s Trueblood Fieldhouse, including swimming. They can also take part in programs of art, music and drama on the Earlham campus. Every four years ESR joins in Earlham’s Big May Day festivities and stages one of the plays of the day, “The Deluge,” which is the story of Noah’s ark and the flood. During their free time ESR students do a lot of partying in small informal groups in other student apartments, or at the ESR recreation center on campus. When the weather is nice students are often found talking or studying in groups of two or three on the lawn, or they may be seen throwing frisbees during a break from class.

Other Happenings at ESR

It is not possible to do justice to everything that has or is going on at ESR. For example, one should refer to the Men’s Quartet of a few years ago, and now to the Women’s Chorus, both of which have been very active within the life of the School as well as in the School’s outreach to others. Coupled with these should also be reference to ESR’s “Valiant Sixty” visitation program which sent out students and faculty in small groups to minister to Friends meetings, and to visit colleges to recruit new students. These are some of the ways ESR has tried to reach out to the wider public, and especially the Quaker constituency, both to serve them and benefit the School.

There are several important annual events of the School which should be mentioned. Perhaps one of the longest standing is the Spring Banquet held a couple of weeks before Commencement. This is a dress-up occasion at a restaurant which is large enough to accommodate the nearly one hundred or more students and spouses who come. There is always a student and faculty prepared “fun and nonsense” program offered for the pleasure of the evening, which usually focuses on the fifteen to twenty graduates of the year. Another established tradition is the Mid-Winter Retreat, usually held during the cold and cloudy days of January or early February. This is held away from campus at a conference or holiday retreat center. Sometimes in the past this event has involved a bus trip to Chicago, Indianapolis or Cincinnati to take in cultural and entertainment events, along with meals at restaurants. A new event which started last year is the fall retreat at the time of the opening of school, held at a nearby camping facility. This promises to
become an annual occasion which will modify and shorten the orientation period held during the week of registration for Fall Term classes.

ESR has made use of field trips and travel away from campus for educational purposes. Some of the earlier midyear outings mentioned above were booked as a combination educational and recreational experience, especially ones which have been held in Chicago with a pre-established program lasting for two or three days. Another important field experience has been the biennial Washington Seminar trips in the spring run jointly with the Mennonite and Church of the Brethren seminaries and their respective Washington Peace Church staffs. This is a five-day chartered bus trip and has proven to be an invaluable part of the Peace and Justice Studies program.

Among other important happenings during the year are the endowed lectures and special visitors who come to campus. Although these have been described elsewhere, it is appropriate to emphasize that the Willson Lectures, for example, offer a significant learning experience away from the ordinary schedule of studies. Visitors and alumni/ae often join the School on these occasions. Very often during the year the routine is broken and the School’s life enriched by having Quakers—in-Residence and other special visitors come to campus for short or extended periods of time. These are occasions which allow fresh winds from the practical world of experience to blow through ESR and bring new challenges to the academic life of the School.

Amidst all that goes on at ESR there continues to be a spirit of adventure and a sense that those involved in the life of the School are part of a growing and developing educational experiment. ESR began in this experimental manner and will lose much of its vitality if it does not continue to exhibit a spirit of adventure and reaching out to new ideas and new ways of achieving its goals.

There is an amazing sense of commitment and loyalty to the School on the part of students and faculty. ESR has been able to develop an *esprit de corps* which endures long after members of the community go elsewhere. Just prior to ESR’s accreditation by the Association of Theological Schools in 1975 a survey was taken of all the alumni/ae group
of ESR. In the answers that came back there was a clear sense that those who had been a part of the School felt that they belonged to a continuing community and fellowship which had been formed while they were in school. Given ESR’s diversity in the student body there is a surprising spirit of acceptance and deep respect for one another which binds persons together into a common sense of *koinonia*. Although not all students have been equally appreciative of their experience, or have benefited equally from it, there is a loyalty to the School which is impressive and bodes well for ESR’s future. Clearly, something important is happening at ESR which has touched and changed the lives of a significant number of persons who have come through the School. This group now numbers nearly six hundred persons, 200 of whom have received degrees from ESR. These persons are making an important difference where they are serving, and for this we can be thankful that ESR came into being twenty-five years ago. ESR now looks to the future with an awareness of the importance of its role in the Society of Friends, in the wider church, and in the larger society of which it is a part.
CHAPTER VIII
What Can We Expect from ESR?

There is no reason for ESR unless it exists to serve the needs of the Religious Society of Friends. There are plenty of good seminaries, which means that ESR must constantly keep before it the particular role it has to play in providing ministerial leadership for Friends. This is not to say that we should not welcome students from other religious affiliations, but serving their needs is not the School’s first priority. Rather, our primary purpose is to provide the vision and fulfill the leadership and ministry requirements Friends have. The task before us will never be perfectly done because we are ourselves imperfect and are dealing with people who have similar limitations. But ESR clearly has a mission and purpose to fulfill in the Society of Friends.

Those of us who kindled the Earlham School of Religion were probably more ambitious in our dreams than we had any right to be. We had a dream that we could launch a process by which Friends in general would come to share a common religious vision and that we could prepare persons in the School who would have a sense of what that vision was so that they could go out and share it in their ministry and service to others. In my own case I was clear that this vision had to be rooted in the early Quaker sense of a “great people to be gathered in the power of the Lord,” and that through our empowerment by this vision and divine undergirding we could go forth and change the world! This would be authentic Quakerism in action. Obviously that large vision has to be translated into concrete and specific ministries and programs in our meetings and in the Quaker communities and fellowship groups of which we are a part. In the School of Religion it has to be translated into the teaching and skills training programs for ministry to which students will be exposed.

The Society of Friends is a very diverse and pluralistic fellowship of people. In short, the Society of Friends has many faces. Dare we hope that we can find a united ground of Quaker faith and practice that will form the basis for a united program of Quaker action? Whether this vision of Quakerdom in faith and action is too far off to hope to achieve may in itself be visionary, but it continues to be a dream of the future which captures m
imagination. ESR has not yet gone very far in helping to realize it, and maybe ESR will never be the vehicle that some of us hoped it would be to enable Friends to realize this dream, but at least some of us are committed to working for it as long as we live, believing that this is what God is calling us to do and be.

A great deal has been accomplished through ESR in twenty-five years, but there is a long way to go yet. None of us need worry that we will run out of work if we have our eyes set on this open-ended goal and hope for the future. May God’s grace and love sustain and empower us as we work at the task together. We are like pilgrims on the way, believing that God is leading us into the promised land.

While we work at this common task we must not isolate ourselves and our planning from a world which is in crisis and whose future seems uncertain. Ultimately our purpose and the purpose of the Society of Friends is to serve God’s will in the wider church and the world in which we live. Here we need to project a vision of hope for the future based not on our own efforts and ingenuity alone but based first of all on our response to what God can do and is doing through us in his creative and redemptive work. Thus the hope which we can and must project should finally not be in ourselves and in our own finite plans but must be in response to the vision of the Kingdom of God. We are called to be a Kingdom people and it is within that context that I believe Earlham School of Religion has come into being and has a promising future.
Visiting Professor Howard Thurman – 1966

Bishop Stephen Neill - 1973 Willson Lecturer visiting with ESR students
ESR's first graduating class - 1963: Wilmer Cooper, Dean, Anne Webster Weaver, Larry Barker, Paul Van Ness

Keith Miller, first B.D. graduate - 1964

Carol Marshburn receiving diploma from President Franklin Wallin at 1981 Commencement
ESR’s 1977 graduating class and faculty

ESR’s 1981 graduating class
Let me recap “The ESR Story, A Quaker Dream Come True” by describing a couple of powerful images which are taken from the life of ESR and which say something very important about it. In fact, they are more than images; they are parables about how the School got started in the first place, and about the message of hope which the School holds out for the Society of Friends and for the world.

Images and Parables of Hope

Elton Trueblood giving new students campus tour

Ella Brewer’s Common Meal in the early days
At the very beginning when we were still debating among ourselves whether we should have the “audacity” (to quote Howard Thurman again) to start the School, and secondly, whether it would in the long run produce the kind of Quaker leadership we all agreed was so badly needed, Elton Trueblood with a touch of humor said some very wise words. As I recall the conversation we were discussing how to generate new life, vision and vitality in our local meetings and churches. In answering this there is always a “chicken and egg problem” to determine whether alive and vital persons bring new life to a meeting, or whether the group generates the kind of persons who in turn inspire new life and vitality in the meeting. Referring to the role of the proposed School of Religion in this, Elton said: “We’ve got to quit arguing which comes first, the chicken or the egg, and simply get a setting hen and go to work!” Sure enough, that is exactly what we did.

The second image is clearly a parable of hope for the future. A number of years ago in the parking lot of ESR our housekeeper, Ella Brewer, one early morning found that a large toadstool had broken through the asphalt pavement and thrust its umbrella head above the surface. It was hard to believe that a toadstool would have that much power, but there it was so that we could take a picture of it, which made the local newspaper. Of course this event provided ESR people with some sermon topics and illustrations. But upon further reflection it was for me a parable of what I believe to be the power of the Quaker and Christian gospel of hope. No matter how hard and encrusted the situation may be in the world today, there is always the possibility that new life will break forth in surprising and unexpected ways. I believe that this toadstool parable is symbolic of what ESR is and what it can mean in the Society of Friends and the world.

What can we expect from ESR? Probably it is not so much what we can expect, but in what ways is ESR a channel for the grace of God to work through the lives of persons in powerful ways? That much we can expect because that is already happening in the lives of many students, faculty and graduates. In this fact there is genuine hope for the future, because it is God’s future working in and through us.
APPENDIX I

Personal Reflections and Testimonies

In preparation for writing the history of ESR a list of persons was made to whom a letter was sent requesting them to write about their memories and reflections on the beginnings and development of ESR. The majority of these were persons associated with the School at the start, or during its early years. A substantial number of replies were received. In the letter of request it was indicated that we might use the information they sent, and in some cases quote them directly. Many of the letters received provide a valuable record of ESR from their varying points of view and their appraisal of what was taking place. It therefore seems appropriate to quote freely from some of those letters to give the reader the impressions of others besides myself. No claim is made that the story of ESR developed so far, or as it will be interpreted by excerpts from these letters, will give a completely balanced and unbiased picture. Lacking are observations from persons associated with the School in the latter part of its twenty-five year history. Perhaps this story can be told more fully later by someone who will write about the second twenty-five year period yet to come.

Dwight Young

The first selection is from Dwight Young, who was chairman of the Earlham Board of Trustees when the proposal about a school of religion was first presented to the Board in the fall of 1959. There were two major times when the Board had to decide about proceeding with ESR. The first was in February, 1960, which is referred to by Dwight Young, and the second has already been told rather fully in Chapter II, which took place two years later in February, 1962. Dwight Young writes in a letter dated March 17, 1983:

The Earlham Board of Trustees had many sessions dealing with establishing a school of religion and how it would relate to Earlham College and what our responsibility would be for it. Tom Jones and Elton Trueblood were strong, convincing and probably biased advocates. I remember the even-handed report you gave about the survey of Friends across the country and the Yearly Meetings. The time of decision had come and our session had gone on for several hours. It was 11:00 p.m. and either I as Chairman of the Board, or someone else, suggested that we adjourn and meet again the next morning. It seemed like a good idea to everyone.
We met again at 8:00 a.m. the next morning. I was not aware, or at least do not recall, any special efforts to change minds between the two meetings. I do recall that we reached consensus within a very short time with Ed Wilson requesting to be recorded as “standing aside.”

I have always been and continue to be a strong advocate of Earlham’s ties to the Society of Friends in spite of the tendency for some colleges to either diminish or eliminate their denominational involvement. I believe the Earlham School of Religion will help to maintain that relationship.

Harold Cope

The second letter is from Harold Cope who was Earlham’s Business Manager at the time the School was started, and later became a member of the ESR Board of Advisors and eventually its Clerk in 1979.

I remember so well the day that Landrum told me he had asked you to come to Earlham to do the feasibility study...As a rather new Business Manager at the time of your appointment I must admit I had some uneasiness as to how we would finance such an undertaking as this. As things got started with Tom Jones being free of the presidency and Landrum Bolling’s ideas, vision and abilities, then I knew somehow this school would get off the ground and be successful. Fortunately everyone saw the wisdom of having you be the head of this new venture.

Willard Ware

One of the very early supporters of the School of Religion was Willard Ware from New England Yearly Meeting. In a letter dated January 19, 1983 he writes about his first exposure when I had reported at an area meeting at Poughkeepsie, N. Y in the autumn of 1959. This was in conjunction with a Board Meeting of the Five Years Meeting. He tells of a long discussion that he and Sumner Mills had on their way back to Holden, Massachusetts. He tells of the skepticism and lack of support from many New England Friends, just the idea of a Friends seminary! Willard Ware coupled this with another ESR meeting held a few years later in the Boston area to gain financial support for ESR. He reports:

Perhaps the best example of the opposition was spoken by the woman who was clerk of New England Yearly Meeting Ministry and Counsel. As I spoke to her on the way out from the meeting, she vented her disapproval by snapping, “What are you trying to do out there, raise a lot of little pastors?” With that she departed with a very straight back, exhibiting very definite disapproval of the whole matter...

It was very difficult to get across the idea that this was not being planned as a training school for “pastors” but for all varieties of leadership in the Society of Friends...
As committees and an Advisory Board were formed a little order began to come out of the beginning chaos. Those early meetings of the Advisory Board were a great experience for me, to see the gradual development of a committed guiding Board...

Oscar Marshburn

One of the early persons to catch the vision of the School of Religion was Oscar Marshburn of Whittier, California. As his letter indicates he seemed ready to respond to the proposal when he first heard it:

In about 1959 when Olive and I went to Meeting. . . I noticed a visitor sharing the pulpit. He looked like Wil Cooper who I knew slightly from Civilian Public Service days. . . . He brought us a good message and was able to weave into that message the importance of Friends providing a place for training our young people to serve us with adequate training to be our leaders. . . . I greeted you after Meeting. . . and told you I liked the idea and that you could count on us to support it.

Sometimes I have felt that Friends west of the Rockies were a little on the outside of Friends, but already I have witnessed that the Earlham School of Religion has scaled the heights of the mountains and is being felt on the shores of the Pacific because we are now feeling the help that is coming from some of the graduates.

What is ahead? People with a clearer vision than I have will have to set the stake farther out. . . . At this point I want to express my appreciation to the staff of ESR for the devotion they have shown to bring our school as far as they have in such a short time.

Delbert Replogle

Another devoted supporter and worker for the success of ESR was Delbert Replogle from Ridgewood, N.J. When the first major campaign was launched for $1,300,000 in 1967 he assumed the Chairmanship of the National Campaign Committee, and later became Chairman of the Board of Advisors. The story of the difficulties of the 1967 campaign are related in Chapter IV, but what follows is in part Delbert Replogle’s personal account of the crisis we encountered:

One very significant and memorable occasion was when the fund raising firm (Ward, Dreshman and Reinhart) . . . withdrew from the campaign, saying it was impossible to raise that kind of money from Friends. That took us somewhat by surprise and a meeting of our National Committee for fund raising was called and a very unanimous decision. . . was that we should go forward on our own, that Friends should carry the fund raising burden to Friends, and that we did with the results that history has recorded.

We held a final meeting . . . and that final meeting will remain in my memory as long as I live, and in the minds of many others although it didn’t make a deep impression on many members of the committee as it did on me.
I will never forget the dedication of that committee. Tom Jones said, “Oh, I’ll pledge $5,000,” and Tom didn’t have it; he had pledged everything he had including his home to ESR. . . . But we will never forget the dedication of Tom Jones to ESR.

After describing what a number of other National Committee members agreed to do at that meeting, Delbert goes on to tell of his own commitment:

I pledged another $10,000 and we ended up with enough money on signed pledges so that we met the goal of $1 million raised by Friends. . . . I will never forget the dedication of that National Committee in meeting this final challenge and for many it was a real hardship.

Since that successful campaign...the development of the School began and continued on a much vaster and higher plane than ever before. . . . History has recorded the number of wonderful graduates who have done tremendously important work among the Society of Friends. . . . At meetings subsequently where the Earlham School of Religion has been discussed. . . . I have often felt moved to say that this is one of the finest investments I have ever made; investments in religion and leadership, yes, but money couldn’t buy the results that have been obtained through the School of Religion, not only because of the money that was raised, but because of the dedication of its faculty, of its backers, of Earlham College and its wonderful Board of Trustees and all of the other people throughout the country who have seen the possibilities in this vision and have helped bring about its realization. . . . One of the main things I have seen grow out of it is the growing together of pastoral and non-pastoral Friends. Students have come from the West and East . . . and we have been justified in our dream that it would draw the Society of Friends closer.

As for the future of the School, I see more of the same and I see greater influence by its graduates in the Society of Friends. . . . I see that the stature of Earlham College has been raised because of the close relationship on a high religious plane of ESR, and I see that men and women of good will in the Society of Friends have had an opportunity to take part in a dream that was so badly needed in a Society that was becoming more and more fragmented and a Society which I believe has a divine purpose in this world, one to which we can give our full support and dedicated lives. . . . And so I can only wish the best for the School as it continues on its course training more and more leaders for religious work. And my prayers and what support I can give will go to this endeavor.

Tom Brown

Another eastern Friend, Tom Brown, Westtown, Pennsylvania served briefly on the Board of Advisors in the beginning, and more recently has come back on the Board. Also, he and his wife, Nan Brown, spent the winter term, 1978-79, as Quakers-in-Residence at ESR. In a letter dated April 8, 1983 he makes this observation:

It has taken Philadelphia Yearly Meeting a long time to appreciate the quality of the training given at ESR and the need Philadelphia Yearly Meeting has for men and women so trained.
He goes on to cite the important role that ESR graduates are having as workers in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. He also refers to “easing of rivalry” between ESR and Pendle Hill and the increasing exchanges between the two schools in terms of students and staff. He speaks highly of the term that he and Nan Brown spent at ESR and the quality of the life they found there. He concludes with these words: “... At ESR there is an open and easy acknowledgement of both the wings of Quakerism yet maintaining a firm middle ground. . . I am grateful for ESR’s service to all Friends.”

Errol Elliott

One of the early dreamers about a Friends seminary was Errol Elliott, General Secretary of Five Year Meeting of Friends and Editor of the American Friend. He was also first Chairman of the ESR Board of Advisors. He was awarded an honorary degree from Earlham College in 1965. Later he spent several years at ESR as Quaker Research Associate while he researched and wrote two books about Quakers on the American Frontier. His letter, dated December 29, 1982, warrants quoting, as the reflections of an eighty-eight year-old Quaker elder statesman:

To my mind this was not simply something occurring within the history of the Quaker movement; it is a vital part in the fulfillment of the Quaker way of life and thought. The establishment of an advanced school for Friends was, so to speak, “written into” the unfolding of our world life as Friends.

There are two major events in that unfolding history: 1) the formation of the Friends World Committee, and 2) the opening and continuing work of ESR. Of course I am quite aware of other developments of our life, but those two have been closest to me on the level of our World Society of Friends. Obviously the formation of the Five Years Meeting, the opening of Pendle Hill (a kind of parallel to ESR’s development), the agencies of Friends - the American Friends Service Committee, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, the Friends World Conferences and the evolving American Friends conferences on Faith and Life of all branches of Friends - these are vital developments within our total corporate life.

There was a special creative development in the Earlham School of Religion, blending mind and spirit without which there could be no certain future. The expansion and inclusiveness of ESR has been a most encouraging development. It now, in a real sense is becoming (or has become) a creative center and source within the ongoing history of Friends.

I dreamed of it long before it came, but for years it seemed an impossible dream; impossible for two reasons: (1) Friends appeared to be too deeply divided, and (2) the financial cost of it seemed prohibitive...

At that time my mind began playing with possibilities of a joint operation with an existing seminary such as that of the Disciples of Christ at Indianapolis [Christian
Theological Seminary]. Indeed I dared some thinking with them at that time...Would it not be better for Friends to operate their own school and open it to members of other Christian bodies? This could help us to be authentic in our own history and faith while also being ecumenical in spirit.

The nagging question continued in my mind — are Friends ready for it? Is it a financial possibility? *Enters the indomitable Tom Jones: “Yes it can be done.”* He was seconded by Landrum Boiling and Elton Trueblood — a formidable core for such a venture...

The liberating movement was on its way! It represented for me a “breakthrough” after my years with the Five Years Meeting problems and tensions within Friends, particularly the midwestern American experience. It was somewhat like waking from a long dream: “Is this real?” Indeed it was and continues to be even more than we had thought.

I shall not attempt to offer suggestions for the future of ESR. The deeper power within it is evident. It is an unfolding of Christian - Quaker history as experienced especially by Friends in America, and the goodwill and support of World Friends. What seemed to me as the impossible has happened. When the roots of the Quaker movement call the branches must respond.

*Seth Hinshaw*

Seth Hinshaw, longtime Executive Secretary of North Carolina Yearly Meeting and ESR Board member in its beginning years, writes on March 8, 1983 about two important Quaker developments in his lifetime that he felt privileged to help initiate. The first of these was the Friends Committee on National Legislation in 1943, and “the second great event was the founding of the Earlham School of Religion in 1960.” He continues:

The founding of ESR was one of the greatest ventures of faith I have ever known. At a time when other seminaries were declining, Friends decided to start a new one! And this was after Friends had gone for three hundred years without a school of this kind!

To say that such a school was long overdue would be a great understatement. For three long centuries Friends leaned too much (in my opinion) toward the concept that God alone is responsible for raising up leadership. The concept of working together with God in discovering and nurturing leadership was thought to be “creaturely activity,” which could only be a hindrance.

Finally . . . you dared to start planning for a school of religion! Fortunately, Earlham College was willing to cooperate in making this possible.

At this point, I am not able to formulate any adequate estimate of the constructive influence which the ESR has been and will continue to be. I do know it is TREMENDOUS!

*Charles Thomas*

One of the tall persons, though short in stature, who had vision as well as teaching skills to help ESR through its struggling years was Charles Thomas. We will let him tell
his own story, which reflects something of the struggles which individuals and families went through to become a part of the ESR team:

I would like to leave a testimony of my faith in this adventure from its beginning. My first serious introduction to the proposal to establish ESR came when Wilmer Cooper visited me at Winchester, Indiana where I was serving as pastor. He reviewed with me the results of the Survey of need and the prospect that Earlham would start the project by initiating a Master’s in Religion. Then came the question “Would I consider joining the faculty if the way opened and if the school actually got started.” My enthusiasm for a school needed little fanning. However, for me to become a faculty member would require leaving a good pastorate where I had been only two years and returning to school for advanced training. I had no money for securing more education and had a son in college and a daughter in Junior High school. Wilmer helped to find the money, but our family spent the next three years barely getting by, and that at considerable sacrifice. I did not know, and Wilmer did not know, if ESR would become a reality, or if it did, that I would get appointed to the faculty. The prospect of such a school was important enough to me to justify the risk. Even though those three years were strenuous, so many things fit together during the time, that I felt an inner assurance and support all the way. In the end the School did begin and I was appointed to the faculty. It was all a very rewarding experience. I am glad that I had the faith to go through with my part.

From the earliest days of my ministry as a young man just out of college (1933) I encountered and shared a deep concern among Friends for a training center for Quaker leaders, especially pastoral. These who sought additional training for ministry beyond what we got in a Friend’s college, had to turn to other denominational schools. I did not, and I suspect others did not, lament the quality of these schools. However, in matters of doctrine, worship and ecclesiology the experience in these denominational schools was not very practical. There was little, or no exposure to Quaker distinctives.

The Quaker “miracle” of this century is that ESR could come into existence and achieved a good degree of permanence as a graduate school in ministry. I attribute this achievement to (1) a sound survey of the need and the readiness to support such a venture, (2) the willingness of Earlham College to foster a graduate school and share its faculty and provide administrative services and allow degrees to be conferred in its name, (3) the appointment of a Dean and small separate faculty so as to give the school an identity, (4) the wise move of appointing a Board of Advisors with a broad representation of Friends, (5) the role of Lilly Endowment, and (6) the work of such persons as Elton Trueblood, Landrum Boiling, Thomas Jones, Wilmer Cooper, Delbert Replogle, Willard Ware, and a host of others who were determined to establish ESR.

As for the students, I am still amazed and grateful for the contribution of the first students. They came without assurance that the school would continue to exist another year. Would their degree be recognized in academic circles? The idea of being the only one in a class, or at most, one of three or four, surely was not attractive. Yet students came and they joined in the venture, quite willing to share the limitations and be part of this new undertaking. Bless them, we would never have survived without them. They caught the spirit and stayed with us.

Another thing which amazed me was what a few devoted faculty could accomplish. ESR has never had enough faculty, but we were limited to two or three full-time
persons at the beginning, supplemented by part-time Earlham faculty. All carried heavy work loads, yet remained inspired and expectant about the success of ESR. A small school requires as many kinds of services and as much faculty preparation as a large one. This meant that faculty had to share a heavy load of administrative duties...

As I look back on this first decade I marvel at the patience and wisdom which prevailed and brought the School to where it is now. Surely the Lord was with us.

_Dorothy Craven_

Dorothy Craven, from Kansas and faculty member at Friends University, served on the Board of Advisors. Her letter of April 5, 1983 tells what this association with ESR meant to her:

My nine years on the Board of Advisors were a real privilege for me. My own concept of ministry was both deepened and broadened by the emphasis at ESR on the “equipping ministry,” and it was very satisfying to meet students who were preparing to minister in a variety of ways. I was eager, as I still am, to support the School because of its concern for the broad range of ministries to which Christ calls His disciples, including but not concentrating solely on, the pastoral ministry. The genuine effort at the School, issuing in a large measure of success, as I saw it, to create a Christian community of faculty members and students in which students could grow personally as well as prepare for Christian vocations especially pleased me, because I saw in it the concern for recovery of the wholeness of life, the union of personal faith and daily discipleship, which has always characterized Friends at their best. My own life was enriched by sharing on the Board with concerned Friends from various areas and emphases of Quakerism, and I know that this same enrichment comes to students who have more time than I did for interaction with Friends and others from varying backgrounds. I might add that here at University Friends we have been especially blessed by having ministers who were privileged to attend ESR. Thus I have appreciated the results of students’ training there as well as the sharing in the process. I certainly hope and expect a continuing vital ministry at the School.

_Richard Baer, Jr._

Let me turn now to some responses from teachers (in addition to Charles Thomas quoted above) who helped shape the School in the early years. First we will quote from Richard Baer, Jr. who came to the faculty in New Testament in 1962 out of a conservative Christian background:

One of my earliest concerns about ESR was whether there would be genuine respect for the value of theology and the life of scholarship, on the one hand, and for the central importance of the Christian Gospel on the other hand. Or would a kind of vague spirituality and warm inner feeling pervade the school and the religious life? My years at ESR answered these questions for me. I became convinced that the school was genuinely committed to a wholesome balance between the life of the mind and the role of the Bible and of theology, on the one hand, and on the other hand to the dynamic inner working of the Holy Spirit—not just to a vague spirituality...
that had no ties to the Bible, the theological heritage of Christianity, and to Quaker history. Overall, I believe ESR has done an excellent job in keeping a lively balance in these areas — not always just the balance I personally would choose, but a very healthy and lively balance, one that is faithful to the best in Quakerism.

What is perhaps most interesting to me as I think back on my years at ESR is that I forget most of the particulars but clearly remember the quality of people’s lives and their concern, consideration, love, thoughtfulness, helpfulness, and so on. Not that I remember specific instances so much as I remember people and the overall orientation of their lives. It’s as if there was something of a family spirit, a family orientation, for this is very much the way I remember my own family during my early years. There is a remembrance of warmth, of love, of goodness...

Of course, I will always remember the encouragement of D. Elton Trueblood. I owe much to him, and I frequently think of him with genuine admiration and gratitude. Even during some very difficult times, he was a friend, an elder statesman, a senior mentor in the very best sense.

My years at ESR were also enriched by the continuing strong support that Landrum Bolling gave to us, and I many times experienced his encouragement and help in different situations.

Leonard Hall was always a joy to me as a colleague, and I sometimes wonder if he received all the credit due him for his steady and faithful support of ESR. Charles Thomas also remains in my memory as a warm spot. He and Lucille personified in their daily lives much of what is best in Quakerism. They were a great encouragement and joy to me during my days in Richmond.

I remain indebted to you, Wil, and to many others. Right now, for instance, I think of the deep dedication of Jim Yerkes to quality scholarship; of Dick Davis’ warm concern for people, especially for a whole generation of students; of Tom Mullen’s constant touch of humor, a humor that was always healing in intent and in result; of Keith Esch’s quiet, effective, unobtrusive way of getting things done — well done; of Gene Roop’s steady concern for his students and his desire to impart sound scholarly techniques to them; of Lynn Clapham’s commitment to thorough, honest scholarship; of Miriam Burke’s unflagging commitment to students and her willingness to enter deeply into their joys and sorrows through her counseling and teaching. I think also of twelve years’ worth of students, each of them different: some questioning, eager, puzzled, open to new ideas, some unclear about where they were going.

At any rate, ESR remains for me a dozen years of very good memories and the continuing sense that God is doing something very good through this new experiment in education, something that will continue to bring life and renewal not only to Friends but also to many non-Friends throughout the entire world.

Calvin Redekop

Another faculty person who joined ESR in 1962 was Calvin Redekop, who came from a Mennonite background and was instrumental in drawing a number of Mennonite students to ESR. He and other Mennonites, including Keith Esch when he joined the faculty, have helped ESR to cultivate a deep concern for community, as reflected in Calvin Redekop’s letter:
If the community life is still anywhere near what it was when I was there, then you have done the miraculous. It is amazing how institutional pressures and roles can fragment a community...

I remember with great pleasure the full community life we had together. The Friday faculty lunches (very adequate with Ella’s jealous care) where we could discuss faculty and academic issues were unique. The common meal on Tuesday noon with the ensuing lectures will always stand out in my mind as the nearest thing to traditional living and learning as anything conceivable.

The book for the term, the retreats, the numerous visiting lecturers and speakers simply enriched an already rich community life. ESR community trips to Chicago for example, indicated that we were not too large to do such things...

The variety among students, yet with an eagerness to adapt and become a part of the community was great; the same goes for the faculty, which though a collection of rugged individualists, nevertheless allowed for wholesome and accepting relationships.

The freedom I had to experiment with the CSI, (Community Service Internships) and with courses which really did not directly contribute to the students’ immediate needs but which you supported nevertheless was deeply affirming. The ecumenical flavor of the community allowed me to test my “sectarian” Mennonite upbringing and yet not be driven out of court. I certainly grew in my intellectual and spiritual life because of my tenure at ESR.

**Wayne Oates**

Another person who did some teaching and played an important role in ESR both as an adjunct faculty member and as a non-Quaker member of the Board of Advisors was Wayne Oates, of Southern Baptist Seminary, and more recently of the Department of Psychiatry at the School of Medicine of the University of Louisville. In his letter of January 10, 1983 he says:

As I recall Earlham School of Religion’s history, I remember the sense of the importance of developing the spiritual being of the student that really gave the School its uniqueness. Your concern was not in developing a “product” of role-conscious ecclesiastical bureaucrats, but that of developing a sense of mission, personal integrity, and a vision of a specific task to perform in the vineyard of the Lord. This all came to me, as Keith Miller put it, as the new wine of the Spirit.

As a consultant, as an adjunct professor, and as a member of your Board of Advisors, I found these intentions being put into action at every level. Your quiet confrontation of students at the point of their inner integrity before the Lord and your nurturance of them in a community of shared concern was evident to me. Some of my particular counseling skills were used to facilitate their spiritual growth in the 1962-70 time frame.
Another important category of persons canvassed for their remembrances of ESR were student alumni/ae. Among the first three graduates of ESR in 1963, was Lawrence Barker, an Earlham College graduate who came from Indiana Yearly Meeting and enrolled in ESR to prepare for ministry. In his reflection letter of February 3, 1983 he says:

Coming from the evangelical side of Indiana Yearly Meeting where the pastors were concerned more with “calling” than with “education” my choice to attend Earlham was questioned by several. I remember attending a gathering at Quaker Hill in 1954 for those considering the ministry, I was in high school while most were in college. An undergraduate discussion with Alexander Purdy helped to bring things in focus. Later when I heard that Alexander Purdy was going to retire from Hartford and come to ESR, I wanted to go to ESR. Also I wanted to be loyal to Friends. ESR means much to me. The direction of my ministry has been affected by my experience there.

Keith Miller

In the early days of the School some remarkable persons turned up to study, some of whom had been influenced in their decision to come by Elton Trueblood. Keith Miller was one of these and writes as follows:

As you may remember I was “brought in” to the Earlham School of Religion by Elton. He was the keynote speaker and I was a lay witness at the first week of conferences at Laity Lodge (Texas). I was visiting with him between sessions and said, “I would sure like to study with you,” (one of those off hand complimentary remarks one makes to a speaker).

He pulled out his little black book and said, “School starts the 26th of September. Can you be in Richmond by then?” That was on June 7th. I didn’t know what to say. But Elton turned to me and said, “You were serious weren’t you?” I had been but had no idea of quitting my work. Besides I had no money to move and go to school while supporting a wife and three children. I told him I would pray about it and see about the funding possibilities.

Within ten minutes a man walked up to me (who knew nothing of my conversation with Elton). This man was president of a company. He said that he and his wife were tired of putting money in buildings and would like to support conferences like the one we were attending. He said if I ever wanted to go into this sort of work they would like to help financially. And that was how we got to Earlham. They helped with our move and expenses.

I was impressed at once with the candor of one Wil Cooper and the atmosphere of honest seeking not only at ESR but among Friends. I was also impressed that all of the faculty members wanted to have intellectual integrity and not let people get by with uneducated “spirituality”...It was an exciting and very stimulating time for me. I got the walls of my mind pushed back considerably; and the time I spent at ESR gave
me an excellent base from which to try to do the ministry I feel called to — that of writing...

After Keith Miller had been at ESR a couple of years he wrote a letter of thanks to Harold Duling of Lilly Endowment in Indianapolis thanking them for their support of ESR and expressing his own gratitude for his experience there:

After two years in the program at Earlham School of Religion, I can only say that I believe this to be one of the most exciting experiments in theological education that I have heard of. Having attended a denomination seminary several years ago, I have found the openness here and the real desire to create a Christian fellowship, as well as maintaining high academic standards, very refreshing.

Robert Foster

Another student of similar interest was Robert Foster from Massachusetts who took leave from a well-established family real estate and insurance business to come to ESR. Through the counsel of Bruce Larson at Faith at Work in New York Bob on the spur of the moment called ESR a month before school opened in 1961 and wanted to bring his family, buy a house, and enroll in ESR. I remember this well because I happened to answer the phone when the call came, but now let him tell his own story:

We had less than a month to wrap up business and things in Massachusetts and get to Richmond, Indiana. This we did...The transition to classes, studying, term papers, exams and reports was not easy. Every topic was new. It was like learning a new language. That first term I had Hugh Barbour for two courses. He talked fast, had an accent, talked softly, used unfamiliar words and assumed that we knew a lot more than we did. He was a great professor in the end...

The other course I had that first term was “Philosophy of Religion”. I arrived at ESR with no background in religion, Bible, Philosophy, Theology, etc. I was a rank novice, an amateur. Well, Elton Trueblood was the professor. The class met Tuesday and Thursday evenings in Teague Library. The class was relatively large. One night Connie went to class with me. Elton got onto the Apostles’ Creed and was making points about it and getting responses from the students. He made a statement and turned to me and said, “Isn’t that right, Bob?” To which I replied, “Yes” but in actuality, I had no idea as to what he was referring to. When Connie and I got to the car, we turned towards each other and asked simultaneously, “What is the Apostles Creed?” We came out of a noncreedal church. When we got home, I went to my Bible, but could not find the Creed. I knew that Jesus had Apostles, so I figured that they must have written it. No luck! I looked in my one commentary but again no luck. I was about ready to call either Don McClanen or Keith Miller but hesitated for I didn’t want to reveal my ignorance. I did not want to be thwarted. The Holy Spirit finally took over and said, “Go to Webster’s Dictionary.” Sure enough, there was just enough of an explanation to answer the question.

I managed to survive that first term. The second term was no easier. I remember one of the ESR student body weekly gatherings. You asked us to relate something of our
experience at ESR. When my turn came, I said both seriously and jokingly that I was
glad to learn that Luther had nothing to do with the Exodus and that Moses likewise
had nothing to do with the Reformation. Dr. Purdy and Elton Trueblood enjoyed the
humor and laughed but you did not know how to take it then. It was difficult for you
to believe that there could be such an uninformed Christian.

I enjoyed ESR because it was a small, struggling school. I had an opportunity to get
to know both classmates and professors. Charles Thomas and I had a very good
friendship and to the point where we tried to relax on the golf course. Charles could
always beat me. He was a steady player. I was always unpredictable.

There was a certain esprit de corps amongst the ESR family as the experience
unfolded into reality. We were fortunate to have Elton Trueblood and Alexander
Purdy there during those early years to give prestige, balance, continuity, depth, etc.
The fledgling school was conceived, born, nurtured and finally matured, all thanks to
God’s providential hand and the dedicated and unselfish workers...

The three years at ESR had a great impact on my life. How I grew. How I hurt. How
I wished that I could have quit. Those three years were a great growing experience.
They helped prepare me to be a minister out in the world and to appreciate life in all
its aspects. These were rich years... I was challenged and was allowed to be myself.
They are years that no one can deprive me of. I frequently talk about them with my
peers.

Soon after graduation Bob Foster did go back into the world of business with a sense
that he had a ministry to carry out in the secular world.

David Haney

Another extremely thoughtful letter came from David Haney, a Southern Baptist
graduate of ESR, and recently appointed an alumni/ae representative on the Board of
Advisors. His testimony not only evaluates his experience at ESR, but he reflects on
some of the challenges facing ESR. Apart from wanting to continue his theological
education which had begun in a Southern Baptist seminary, he says:

The most influential reason for coming to ESR was Elton Trueblood. I wanted to
study under him. But I was to discover that he was but one plus among many!

Given this reason for coming David Haney then sets forth what impressed him most
about his ESR experience:

1. The embodiment of balance. ESR provided a unique balance between the practical
   and the academic, the spiritual and the theological, in religious graduate training...
2. The freedom to grow. There was no penalty for being other than Quaker, and none for
   being other than “liberal” (I was just to the right of fundamentalism at the time.) I
   was not challenged to change; only to grow and to be able to defend any position
   chosen. I never felt threatened or second-class.
3. *The quality of education.* The quality of professors was most impressive. The list of Trueblood, Purdy, Barbour, Cooper and others, plus the visiting professors like Ferra, Oates, Canby Jones, Stendahl and others is impressive still! Along with this must be the small classes as a mark of quality. . . . I couldn’t help but get individual attention and be able to ask questions.

4. *The ecumenicity of faculty and students.* Coming from a provincial group and educational milieu, ESR was so open, so broad — all denominations! What new breadth it provided me!

5. *The model for ministry.* Most of all, the most important contribution ESR made to me, the “model” for my ministry and the churches I served was invaluable. While the content of courses was important and needed and good, the more important lessons I learned (and could use) came from the model ESR provided:
   a. *The equipping ministry emphasis.* A radical departure from Southern Baptist practice . . . I saw what I was to be — and saw it modeled in the professors who saw themselves as equippers, not just teachers.
   b. *The relationship of faculty and students.* There was a definite “carry-over” from professor-student to pastor-people for me. I had never seen it so. That professors were “on the journey,” too! I saw them in the absence of titles (Dr., Rev., etc.), the faculty student retreats (we could mix), the Common Meal (we were all learning and growing) etc., I saw and experienced *koinonia,* not just between peers (students) but between what I had seen as ranks, professionals (professors, pastors) and students (the common lot, the amateurs). Wow!

Given this list of things which impressed David Haney the most, he then turns to a list of challenges which he lays down for the School. These are given here only in outline and summary form. He challenged us:

1. To correct a drift toward being a traditional seminary, which he sees as a danger at ESR.
2. To be unique — no justification for being just another seminary. He calls for a “Quaker-plus” seminary offering some unique features, such as the equipping emphasis, spirituality, peace and justice studies, etc.
3. To be Quaker, yet more. The idea that Quakerism is a movement, which people of other denominations can relate to.
4. To be practical. Priority be given to training pastors, which means giving more emphasis to this in the curriculum. He proposes the following radical experiment: “Hire successful local meeting leaders as professors. While this strikes terror among the Ph.D’s and plays havoc with ATS standards, it is a must.” Couple this with “visiting professors from among the ranks and successful local meeting pastors. My guess is that they would be thrilled to do it almost without pay! Then there should be ‘name’ people too. . . .” Also, build local church functions into the field education programs.

*Other Colleagues*

There are many others who have played an important role in ESR who have made statements worthy of quoting. Let me conclude with three contributions.
Richard Newby, a Friends pastor with wide Quaker experience, has both served on the Earlham Board of Trustees and ERS Board of Advisors and has worked valiantly to gain Quaker support for ESR. He writes:

I have felt for many years that the Earlham School of Religion is the last best chance we have to recover a viable Quaker faith suitable for our day. More of our best leadership in the Society of Friends must accept the challenge of the local Friends Meeting, prepare themselves for this ministry at ESR and return to local meetings and churches where a more effective channel for Christ’s mission to the world can be realized.

Leonard Hall, who has already been referred to as a key person for twenty years on the ESR staff, gave a faculty lecture near the close of his tenure which told the story of the benefactors of ESR whom he cultivated over the years and who influenced both his life and that of the School. He concludes his lecture with these words:

...I am very proud to have known and been a friend of persons such as Esther Stranahan, Dr. Zoe Bulpitt, Abigail Clutterback, and Dr. Willis Coale. I know they have helped me in my perspective, in maintaining my enthusiasm, and in setting the foundations for the Earlham School of Religion. These are foundations along with the lives of many other persons, upon which will be built future generations of leaders for the Society of Friends.

...I don’t know whether George Fox would feel at home in our present day Earlham School of Religion. But I do believe very deeply that we have here not only the expertise and the knowledge, but we know through experience that here is a community of faith. We have at ESR an experience of openness through our uncertainties and anxieties, but also a vision of light and the love of God which can overcome the darkness within ourselves and in our world.

My own vision of ESR is that we must continue to reach out to the young George Foxes, or the Elizabeth Frys or the Mary Dyers of our day. We must endeavor to wrap them into a loving community and provide them with the living water.

Our task is to hold up the vision! To experiment with a living community of faith! To learn anew the Presence of Christ — who is always present among us, endeavoring to “teach us himself.”

Lorton Heusel, will be the last testimonial to be included. As friend and colleague of ESR he is the only Advisory Board member who served two nine-year cycles (with one year out to meet Board policy). He was Chairman of the Board 1963-67, and in 1980 he was awarded an honorary Doctor of Divinity degree by Earlham in recognition not only for his service to ESR’s development but in recognition of his years of pastoral work and as General Secretary of Friends United Meeting. One of Lorton’s continuing concerns
was the practical and applied side of the curriculum. Apropos to this he writes on February 2, 1983:

Frequently in my ministry the deficiency in education is at the point of translating the academic fields to the practical needs and circumstances of people in the parish.

He spoke highly of the few in-service programs which ESR sponsored during the summer sessions of the early 1960’s. He also pointed out the dilemma ESR sometimes found itself in between training for pastoral ministry and the need also to train persons for the universal ministry. ESR has tried to do both but sometimes has not been altogether clear about its priorities in this respect.

Conclusion

In quoting the previous respondents I have understandably avoided or deleted most of their affirmative and complimentary references to my personal role in the development of ESR. Let me, however, conclude with Lorton Heusel’s testimonial, which sums up the expression of many others:

I’m glad you are undertaking this venture [of writing the history of ESR] and hope it will be both enjoyable and satisfying. You were the architect, engineer and pilot and for years you almost singlehandedly forged the school. You not only identified and articulated the dream, you were instrumental in persuading others that it was viable. Consequently, you bore the burden of enlisting support and implementing the dream step by step and stage by stage. Your authorship should not inhibit you from recognizing the pivotal role you played in putting the immense puzzle together. The Society [of Friends] owes you an enormous debt.

For those words, of course, I am enormously grateful. I am even more grateful for the comradeship, encouragement, and cooperative labors they gave to me along the way. They shared the vision and the hard work — and the hope that kept us going.
APPENDIX II

Summary of Proposed School of the Ministry
at Earlham College 1959
by Wilmer A. Cooper

Shall Friends Train Their Own Leaders?

The following is a condensed report of a survey undertaken to study the need and possibility of establishing a School of the Ministry for Friends. The survey was sponsored by Earlham College and financed by a grant of money from Lilly Endowment, Inc., in Indianapolis. Although it attempted to study the general leadership training needs of Friends, it was primarily focused upon the need for trained pastoral leadership in the local Friends meetings. The purpose of Earlham College in sponsoring the survey was to determine what responsibility it should assume as a Quaker college in the training of such leadership.

The study was projected for a six months period, running from April through September, 1959. The method was primarily that of extensive travel and interviewing persons concerned with the question of Quaker leadership. Approximately 15,000 miles were covered from coast to coast talking with leadership in Friends Yearly Meetings and Friends colleges, especially those affiliated with the Five Years Meeting of Friends. In addition some special statistical studies were undertaken, two of which are reported in the accompanying boxes.

As background information for reporting the results of the survey, a quick look at the membership of American Friends maybe useful. At the present time three major bodies exist: Friends General Conference with a membership of 25,554, mostly located on the East coast; Five Years Meeting of Friends with a U.S. membership of 67,665, spread from coast to coast but with a heavy concentration in the Midwest; and the newly formed Evangelical Association of Friends, which is constituted by individual rather than meeting membership, but whose main support comes from three Yearly Meetings (Ohio-Damascus, Kansas, and Oregon) with a combined membership of 21,191. In addition to
these major bodies there are 4,848 Friends affiliated with independent groups who do not officially belong to one of the larger bodies. For the most part they feel drawn toward the Friends General Conference, with the possible exception of the Conservative Friends who have a combined membership of 1,944. The membership of the Five Years Meeting of Friends, although largest in numbers, is divided in its loyalties. Many Friends affiliated with the Five Years Meeting in California, Iowa, and Indiana identify themselves with the newly formed Evangelical Association of Friends. On the other hand, Eastern Five Years Yearly Meetings, such as New York and New England, are also affiliated with the Friends General Conference. At the present time it is difficult to forecast the future alignment of Friends in terms of official affiliation.

In terms of membership growth Friends have made their greatest showing in recent years outside the United States, especially through the influence of Friends missions and service work. Between 1941 and 1957 world membership increased from 164,209 to 192,887, or 17.5 percent. In the United States, however, the increase for the same period from 115,201 to 119,469, or 3.7 percent, itself was very small as compared with the rapid population growth. Between 1925 and 1950 out of twenty-four Yearly Meetings in the United States, fourteen had a decrease in membership and ten showed an increase. Among the same Yearly Meetings eighty-five meetings were discontinued and ninety-one new meetings established, showing an increase of six new meetings. At the last count in 1957-1958 the total membership of Friends in the United States was 120,771, and the total number of meetings 1,005. Of this total about 73 percent of the membership belong to programmed meetings with pastoral leadership, while approximately 66 percent of the meetings are served by part or full-time pastors.

The Problem and the Need

With such a large percentage of meetings relying upon part or full-time pastoral leadership, it is obvious that Friends must be concerned about the quality of this leadership and the kind of preparation which it receives. Although Friends continue to believe that persons should be “called” into the ministry, it is also increasingly
recognized that to adequately fulfill any vocational calling one must become prepared for service through training.

There is a high degree of certainty that pastoral leadership in the Society of Friends is here to stay, in spite of the feeling of some Friends that such reliance upon professional leadership and a “paid ministry” constitutes a mistake which American Friends have made during the past seventy-five or more years. But, given this fact, the problem which Friends face is that a majority of the leaders upon whom they now rely are trained either in non-Quaker institutions or in schools which place very little emphasis upon the Friends approach to Christian faith and practice. Furthermore, a majority are trained in sub-standard academic institutions, or receive no training at all. Consequently, the leadership which many meetings have been getting not only falls below the high standards which Friends usually set for themselves, but it is leadership which is frequently closed to new religious insights and knowledge about life. This is indeed a paradox in view of Friends historic insistence upon “continuing revelation.” Such leadership is often “spirit filled” and “spirit motivated” but devoid of understanding and enlightened judgment.

Better Training Sought

It must not be forgotten, however, that ever since Friends began having pastoral leadership there has been a growing interest on the part of a substantial number of Friends to obtain better trained leadership.

Those now serving in leadership capacities in Friends meetings have received their training from a wide variety of colleges, seminaries, and Bible schools. In a study made in 1957 by the Committee on Ministerial Training of the Five Years Meeting of Friends, it was discovered that out of 185 Friends’ pastors who replied to the questionnaire, 71 different colleges and 43 seminaries were represented in their training. The breakdown for the ten most frequently mentioned institutions was as follows:

*It should be noted that this list ranges from unaccredited institutions to accredited colleges and seminaries. The figures should be taken as symptomatic of a situation rather than an accurate analysis. For example, Butler School of Religion in Indianapolis may actually have more Friends graduates than some other schools mentioned.*
Cleveland Bible College .................................. 29 graduates
Earlham College ........................................... 23 graduates
William Penn College .................................... 18 graduates
Marion College .............................................. 16 graduates
University of So. California ............................. 12 graduates
Pacific Bible College ..................................... 12 graduates
Berkeley Baptist Divinity School ....................... 11 graduates
Friends University ......................................... 10 graduates
Guilford College ........................................... 9 graduates
Hartford Theological Seminary ........................... 8 graduates

Quaker College Statistics

The following Quaker liberal arts colleges (or colleges affiliated with Friends) were studied:

Earlham College
Friends University
George Fox College
Guilford College
Haverford College
Malone College (formerly Cleveland Bible College)
Swarthmore College
Whittier College
William Penn College
Wilmington College

According to 1958-1959 figures these colleges reported a total student enrollment of 6,149, of whom 899 were Friends. The percentage of Friends in relationship to total enrollment was as follows:

Earlham ...................... 28.7 percent out of 829 students
Friends ..................... 12.9 percent out of 724 students
George Fox ................. 66.6 percent out of 150 students
Guilford .................... 18.5 percent out of 665 students
Haverford ................. 10.7 percent out of 450 students
Malone ..................... 20 percent out of 325 students
Swarthmore ............... 10 percent out of 920 students
Whittier ................. 5 percent out of 1200 students
William Penn ............ 21.4 percent out of 191 students
Wilmington ............. 7.3 percent out of 685 students

Of the total student body it is estimated that 250 to 285 are going into the ministry or some other full time religious work, and of this number between 75 and 90 are Friends.
Out of the 185 pastors surveyed 39 percent had attended a Friends Liberal Arts college; 52 percent had taken some seminary graduate work, though frequently not from an accredited seminary; 27 held the E.D. degree; 12 held the Master of Arts degree; 1 the Ph.D.; 1 the Th.D. degree. About half of those replying indicated an interest in further training, though most of it would have to be in-service-training.

In the light of these facts and the situation which exists there is general consensus that the time is at hand, if not overdue, to do something to correct the leadership plight in which more than seventy percent of American Quakers find themselves. Although there is a lack of clear vision as to how to confront the problem, it is quite clear that Friends are sufficiently disturbed that they are becoming awakened to their responsibility in the matter.

At the local meeting level the survey has shown that although Friends indicate a “need” for better leadership, this need is not well understood or defined. There are actually fewer openings in Friends meetings for well-trained leaders than has been supposed, at least the kind of openings which will draw well-qualified persons. The reason for this is both inadequate financial support and a lack of preparation psychologically, educationally, and spiritually on the part of the meeting membership to receive and make the best use of such leadership. Friends from the beginning have been suspicious of theological training and the “paid ministry.” In its place they have championed a “free Gospel ministry.” The result is that where Friends have had pastoral leadership it has been so poorly paid that most meetings have failed to draw the best qualified persons. Moreover, the ministry has not been “free” in the best sense of the word because it often has been encumbered by religious emotionalism and doctrinal biases which have kept it from being either “spirit-led” or theologically informed.

_Raising Our Sights_

But in spite of the reasons for this situation, change and improvement are beginning to take place. The general education level of the membership is steadily increasing, so that old patterns of cultural ingrownness and indifference to learning are on the decline. This means that slowly but surely better trained and better paid leadership will be sought.
These changes seem imperceptible in some places, but they are coming and will inevitably lend their support to the growing concern for the kind of leadership which can help Friends broaden their spiritual and intellectual horizons.

If Friends could begin to raise their sights in such a way as to open up more and better supported pastoral and other leadership opportunities in local meetings, this would go a long way toward answering two other basic problems which were clearly evidenced in the survey. These are the problems of availability of potential candidates for ministerial training, and secondly, the problem of holding onto those trained and well-qualified.

At the present time the number of potential students available to come into a graduate training program is not large. One reason is a question about the kind of school which might be established and the theological emphasis which would be given. Some would be inclined to go elsewhere for geographical or financial reasons, or because they have the opportunity of serving a meeting while attending a seminary nearby. Another and more basic reason is that Friends have never developed an image for the pastoral ministry as a vocational possibility to which young Friends can aspire. Pastoral leadership in a Friends meeting is often looked upon as a second or third class vocational opportunity, or is only meant for those who feel a particular call to the ministry and whose dedication makes up for the lack of salary and family security.

Leaving Because...

As for those who have been well trained and have left Friends for other denominational or vocational pursuits, the reasons are much the same. Poor salaries have a great deal to do with it, but there is also a feeling on the part of many Friends ministers that they are not part of a vigorous and larger church program which knows where it is going. A local pastor often feels isolated and lonely, and does not feel undergirded by a denominational loyalty, philosophy, and program which has a central focus and purpose. Some are bothered by the lack of, or wrong kind of, organization in the Society of Friends, which they believe handicaps Friends in carrying on their work effectively. A few have left the Friends ministry because they came to the conclusion that the pastoral ministry is not compatible with the historic practices of Quaker worship and ministry.
Of these three major problems which have appeared in the course of the survey (i.e., insufficient number of placement opportunities, lack of available persons to be trained, and the question of holding onto trained leadership) none are problems which will be easily and quickly solved. They are problems with which local meetings and Yearly Meetings will have to wrestle. Yet, the experience of other church groups, such as the Church of the Brethren, indicates that well-qualified leadership can be of great help in finding solutions to these problems.

*Efforts to Meet the Need*

A brief look may now be taken at what Friends have done in recent years to try to meet the need for better trained leadership. At one time or another in the past fifty years most of the Friends colleges have considered the possibility of a special ministerial training program, including Earlham College, Friends University, Guilford College, Pacific College (now George Fox College), William Penn College, and Wilmington College. At the present time Friends University and George Fox College each offer a fifth year in Bible and religion following the A.B. degree leading to a Bachelor of Theology degree. In Wilmington Yearly Meeting a joint program has been established between the Yearly Meeting and Wilmington College offering undergraduates evening courses either for credit or audit.

On the graduate level there has been the advanced study program at Pendle Hill, the Master’s degree in philosophy at Haverford College and the Master’s degree in Quaker history at Swarthmore College. Perhaps the most significant recent accomplishment has been the new Guilford College Program of Training for Religious Leadership. Beyond the undergraduate major in religion, Guilford offers the Master of Arts degree with a wide selection of courses designed to prepare persons for leadership in the local meeting. Earlham College has also offered similar training on both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Since 1943 it has granted seven Master of Arts degrees in religion.

In addition to these more formal types of programs several Yearly Meetings have undertaken special training programs as prerequisite for the recording of ministers, as
well as short courses in refresher work for those in service. None of this work has been offered on an accredited basis.

As early as 1944 the Five Years Meeting of Friends appointed a Committee on Ministerial Training which was commissioned to work in four areas:

1. Contact with ministerial students
2. Program of recruiting for the ministry
3. Educational programs for in-service ministers
4. Information service and placement of personnel

Some of the early activities and conferences of this program were held at Quaker Hill in Richmond, Indiana. These efforts finally culminated in a National Conference of Friends on Ministerial Training held at Germantown, Ohio, Nov. 22-24, 1957. Several specific recommendations grew out of the conference, such as a special summer school program in connection with Butler School of Religion in Indianapolis; the possibility of endowing a teaching chair at an accredited seminary to be filled by a Friend who would also direct a Quaker student center; and the appointment of a full-time secretary in the Five Years Meeting to carry out the proposed functions of the Committee on Ministerial Training.

The first of these recommendations was carried out in the summer of 1958. The second was considered by the Executive Council of the Five Years Meeting of Friends during 1958 but was believed unattainable within the framework of the Five Years Meeting at the present time. The third recommendation, which was officially initiated and approved at the Five Years Meeting of Friends in 1955, has resulted in the establishment of a new Five Years Meeting Board on Training for Church Vocations with a Secretary under appointment.

He will help recruit students for ministerial training, handle scholarship funds for the purpose of assisting students, keep in contact with them while in training, help them get placed upon graduation, and assume related tasks in connection with such a program.

Another recent development under consideration is that of the Evangelical Association of Friends which was discussed at their conference in July, 1959, at
Newberg, Oregon. Their proposal is to explore the possibility of a summer seminary to strengthen the ministerial training programs of several of the Friends Yearly Meetings and colleges.

Alternative Proposals

Although there is general agreement that a much more far-reaching training program should be instituted for Quaker leadership, some feel that the proposal to establish a fully accredited Graduate School of the Ministry is either too ambitious, or that some other ideas ought to be tried first. In considering the various alternatives, one point of view is that the basic problem of Friends is to encourage more pastors to complete an A.B. degree before an extensive graduate program is undertaken. Some hold that a good grounding in Quakerism and religion in a Friends undergraduate college would then provide a solid background for seminary study under non-Friends auspices. Some believe that the broadening experience of an interdenominational seminary would be quite preferable to a Friends graduate school. They feel that the ecumenical spirit and challenge of both students and teachers in such a setting cannot be matched by anything Friends could offer. A number of educators also hold that the small denominational seminary not only cannot provide the stimulating and competitive learning experience of a larger seminary, but such schools run the risk of being dominated by one great teacher or a particular theological position.

Another point of view is that Friends should link up with a good existing seminary with a Friend on the faculty to teach Quakerism and direct a Quaker student center. This idea has backing both among pastoral and non-pastoral Friends and was referred to above as one of the Germantown Conference recommendations considered by the Executive Council of the Five Years Meeting.

Still another proposal is that Friends should support the new Five Years Meeting Board on Training for Church Vocations in its efforts to help recruit, train, and find placement for ministerial leadership. The main concern here is that Friends put their financial support into scholarship funds and encourage their students to take their training
in existing seminaries, which it is believed would provide educational advantages beyond anything Friends could provide.

Finally, there are those who represent the point of view that when the Society of Friends has to resort to the establishment of a school for the ministry it is admitting that the early pattern of developing leadership has failed. This view holds that local Monthly Meetings, Quarterly Meetings, and Yearly Meetings should take care of their own training needs through special workshops and seminars which could be conducted locally.

It should be pointed out that many of these alternative proposals do not conflict with one another but could be implemented in their various forms in such a way as to complement each other.

Proposal: A School of the Ministry at Earlham

In addition to these alternative suggestions much interest and support was also shown in the survey for a Graduate School of the Ministry at Earlham as well as a supplementary program to meet the needs of those not prepared to enter a full graduate program. Both propositions will be outlined here.

A. A Graduate School of the Ministry

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of a School of the Ministry at Earlham would be to train and prepare men and women for the Christian ministry within the framework and tradition of Friends. It would be available first of all to members of the Society of Friends who wish to prepare themselves for pastoral and other types of religious leadership. Secondly, it would be open to non-Friends who feel that the particular religious emphasis and teaching program of the school would meet their needs. The school should be fully accredited with a three year program leading either to the Bachelor of Divinity or Master of Theology degree.
From the standpoint of various Christian vocations the following leadership objectives may be enumerated, though the chief need at the present time is for better trained pastoral leadership for the local meeting.

1. Pastoral ministry  
2. Teaching ministry  
3. Writing ministry  
4. Lay ministry  
5. Ministry of Quaker outreach

**Distinctive Emphases**

There is general agreement that Friends should not establish a Graduate School of the Ministry unless such a school possesses features which are distinctive in theological education and which are in keeping with the character of Quakerism; and secondly, a school which serves a particular need among Friends which non-Friends seminaries cannot serve. In view of this an attempt was made in the survey to find out what these distinctive emphases should be. In reporting them it is important to stress that whatever program might be undertaken should be a program of academic excellence.

1. It should be a school with a distinctively Quaker orientation.

2. Most seminaries stress either a neo-orthodox or a narrowly fundamentalist theological orientation. Neither is completely compatible with Quakerism, therefore emphasis should be placed upon a Friends approach to Christian faith.

3. Because Friends stress firsthand religious experience, it is important to give high priority to this aspect of training and to the idea of commitment and growth in the spiritual life.

4. The program should not only expect students to grow spiritually and intellectually but to become mature persons emotionally and psychologically.

5. Training in Christian Education should be centrally emphasized in the curriculum.

6. Emphasis should be placed on the development of an intimate Christian fellowship on the part of the teachers and students involved in the educational life of the school.

7. It should stress lay responsibility in training for the pastoral ministry.
8. It should relate Christianity in a positive and constructive way to the rapidly changing non-Christian world religions.

9. Students should be helped to become aware of the world in which they live and to develop a sense of social and political responsibility.

10. The school should offer an opportunity where Friends could study and worship in a scholarly atmosphere and think through the nature and purpose of Quakerism as well as wrestle with basic problems of religious truth.

11. Emphasis should be given to the education of women for various phases of the ministry and Christian service.

12. Every student should be given basic training in organization, finance, and administration for work in the meeting.

13. Leaders should be trained who know how to build new meetings.

14. In teaching methods, seminars and tutorial work could be stressed with a minimum of large classes and lecture courses.

15. There should be a revolving professorial chair endowed for an outstanding visiting professor each year.

Curriculum and Teaching Staff

In order to work toward accreditation the following four areas of Biblical and theological study would have to be included:

1. Biblical
2. Historical
3. Theological
4. Practical

A minimum of four full-time teaching faculty would be required, one in each of the four major areas of the curriculum. In addition, other part-time teachers would be needed to offer specific courses, particularly in the practical field. The school should have a Dean who could teach part time. Before full accreditation could be expected a minimum of six full-time faculty would be required, of which the Dean could be one. The success or failure of the school would depend largely upon the faculty selected. In the end they would shape the character of the school and the emphasis given.
Yearly Meeting Statistics

A questionnaire was sent to all Yearly Meeting superintendents and secretaries to ascertain the current situation with respect to leadership and what the need is believed to be. Completed questionnaires were received and studied from the following Yearly Meetings:

- Baltimore (FYM)
- California
- Indiana (FYM)
- Iowa (FYM)
- North Carolina (FYM)
- New England
- New York
- Philadelphia
- Western (FYM)
- Wilmington

These Yearly Meetings report a total of 574 active local meetings. They employ 200 full time pastors or meeting secretaries and 165 part time persons. In addition 40 other full time workers in the Yearly Meetings are reported and probably well over 200 persons are engaged full time in Quaker outreach work, such as missions and service. Of the full time pastors and meeting secretaries, 58 now receive $4,000 or more a year. Another 85 meetings either now or later would be interested in a half time person who would be paid a salary of $2,000 a year. The overall full time salary range is from $1,200 to $8,000 a year, with an average of around $3,500. These figures are in addition to housing and travel allowances.

It is estimated that between 110 and 140 meetings prefer seminary trained pastors or meeting secretaries. Among the full time workers approximately 174 hold an A.B. degree from a Liberal Arts college while approximately 65 have had two or more years of seminary training beyond the A.B. degree. Those now attending graduate seminary are reported to number around 25, while it is estimated that 30 to 50 others would take seminary training if financial and other circumstances permitted.

These figures represent careful but by no means exact estimates given by persons familiar with the situation in each Yearly Meeting.

Library

One of the more difficult problems is the development of an adequate library for Biblical and theological studies. To meet the need and the accrediting standards it would be necessary to build a basic working library of approximately 20,000 volumes in Bible, religion, and philosophy. A five-year collection program should be outlined with an adequate amount of money budgeted each year to make the necessary purchases. Accreditation could be sought before the collection was completed, provided it could be shown that a serious program of budgeting and purchasing was under way.

Accreditation

The plan for accreditation would be as follows: A survey of the type just completed should show a general need and support for the proposed program and indicate the
resources available to make it possible. It would be necessary to begin with a minimum of twenty-five students and four full-time faculty.

After the opening of the school an appeal could be made to the American Association of Theological Schools for Associate Membership. If it could be shown that the school was moving toward the requirements of A.A.T.S. standards, it is likely an Associate Member relationship would be recognized for a five-year period. Upon the completion of five years of operation, and if the accrediting standards continued to be met, the school would then be a candidate for full accreditation.

**Financing**

There are two approaches to the problem of financing. One would be to seek large gifts and enough endowment to guarantee the operation of the school. The other is to develop an annual operating budget and attempt to raise the money each year on a living endowment basis. At the same time special gifts could be sought for particular projects, scholarships, and permanent endowment. The latter of these two approaches would seem the only wise and possible course to follow. However, some large gifts and foundation support would have to be sought to finance a library acquisition program, the endowment of one or more faculty chairs, and the need eventually for building facilities.

On the question of tuition, most seminaries either charge a very low fee and subsidize the rest of the expense, or grant tuition free. If a nominal tuition fee were charged, which is the practice of most seminaries, an effort should be made to obtain enough scholarship money so that no student would be kept away who is qualified to come. Friends Meetings and Quarterly Meetings, as well as Yearly Meetings, might be asked to finance their own students and also give scholarship assistance to others seeking training.

**B. Supplementary Training Program**

The survey also showed a definite demand for a program in addition to, and perhaps prior to, the proposed School of the Ministry. This would be to meet the needs of several groups of persons. There are those now in service who could not qualify or for other reasons would not care to enter a graduate seminary program. Secondly, the program
would serve a need for persons not yet sure of their life vocation but who might be drawn into the ministry or other Christian service if afforded the opportunity for special study. Thirdly, there are meeting members who would like some advanced study to deepen their own religious understanding and to help them become better prepared for leadership in their local meetings.

To meet these needs, existing programs of undergraduate and graduate study in Friends’ colleges could be expanded. Students on the undergraduate level could be enrolled for work toward the A.B. degree, or registered as special students. Anyone with a high school certificate and the ability to do college work would qualify to apply. Beyond the regular work offered during the academic year special programs of study could be offered in three forms:

1. Summer school sessions, perhaps running for two three-week terms.
2. Extension courses offered at various Quaker centers. These could be conducted on a seminar basis one evening each week and be taken for credit.
3. Cooperate with the Board on Church Vocations of the Five Years Meeting in the development of a workshop training program which would be conducted in local meetings or Quarterly Meetings. The purpose would be to help officers, Sunday School teachers, and meeting members become better workers and assume a larger share of responsibility in the life of the meeting.

On the graduate level existing Quaker college Master of Arts in religion programs could be expanded similar to those now offered at Guilford and Earlham. Efforts might also be made to develop an M.A. program in Christian Education.

In Conclusion

The motive which lies behind the concern of Friends about their internal life and the proper role of qualified leadership is not merely a concern to survive. Friends believe deeply that historically they have had a message and mission in the world, and they continue to believe that they must be bearers of it. But if this is to take place, Friends
need to rediscover that which gives character, identity, and purpose to Quakerism. In the light of this, there are several questions which Friends need to ask themselves.

1. Do Friends have any distinctive witness to make regarding Christian faith and practice? Is their role essentially that of another Protestant denomination, or do Friends have a peculiar role to play within the Christian Church?

2. What is the relationship of Friends to the other churches; to the ecumenical movement; to the non-Christian world religions?

3. What is the mission and message of Friends in the world today?

4. Assuming that Friends desire the development of new Christian life in their meetings, for what purpose and to what end should this new life be directed?

5. Can Friends rise above the programmed-unprogrammed (pastoral-nonpastoral) controversy and begin to meet their needs for worship and ministry on a new and higher level?

6. How much and what kind of professional leadership do Friends need, and how much and what kind do they desire? Should Friends stress a lay movement in the ministry? Could this become a major Quaker contribution to the Christian Church in the Twentieth Century?

7. In their local meetings do Friends wish to serve primarily a “spiritual community” or a “geographical community?” What is their attitude toward evangelism? Can they develop community churches and still maintain the distinctive features of their Quaker witness?

In considering a School of the Ministry for Friends it is essential that Friends give serious consideration to such questions as these. No school for the training of Quaker leadership should be founded which does not have a clear understanding of the nature and purpose of the church from a perspective of Friends. Such a definition is necessary in order to know for what ends and objectives Quaker leadership should be trained; and secondly, what kind of a curriculum and teaching program will most likely produce the desired results.
What is being asked for is not the delineation of a Quaker creed or an overall master plan for Quakerism. Part of the genius of Friends is their belief in the freedom of the spirit and the belief that they must always remain open to new truth and new leadings of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, Friends need to understand the faith that is in them, to discover that which gives continuity to Quakerism, and begin to articulate that which makes Quakers what they are.

Because of the wide divergences among Friends, it is not likely that they will in the foreseeable future reunite into one body. But new avenues of communication are opening up; a renewed concern for vital Christianity is evident among virtually all Friends groups; and a new search to rediscover the roots of the Quaker heritage is taking place, all of which are indicative of a desire to seek after those things which are important in a community’s religious life and history.

There is also a widespread conviction that if a School of the Ministry is established it would not only meet some of the more immediate and specific needs of Friends for better trained leadership, but it could help to focus Friends attention and energies in such a way as to achieve greater unity internally and prepare Friends for a wider service in the Christian movement as a whole.
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APPENDIX III

The Policy of Relationship Between the Earlham Board of Trustees and the Earlham School of Religion Board of Advisors

Today Earlham is an institution which consists of three significant divisions or units—the College, Earlham School of Religion and Connor Prairie Pioneer Settlement. Each division is committed to its distinctive educational mission and serves a special constituency. Each unit is accountable to the Earlham Board of Trustees through the President. In this way, the Earlham Board of Trustees retains its ultimate authority and responsibility. The distinctive mission of each of these institutions has led to their development of organizational structure which relates these units of Earlham to their particular constituency and the mission they serve.

The ESR Board of Advisors was established by the Earlham Board of Trustees to facilitate the development of ESR’s mission and relate to its national constituency. The Board of Advisors represents the various segments of Quakerism, the non-Quakers and the alumni of ESR. The Board of Advisors was drawn together around a common concern for development of Quaker leadership. The ESR Board of Advisors has reached out to the full spectrum of Quakerism which the School serves. This gives a much needed relation between ESR and the Quaker constituency upon whom it depends by involving the Board of Advisors in all important aspects of ESR’s operation.

Relating specifically to ESR, the Dean of ESR has reported regularly to the Board of Advisors on all matters that would come to the Earlham Board of Trustees. In this way the Dean and President would receive the recommendations and counsel of the Board of Advisors before action was taken by the Earlham Board of Trustees. Over the years the Dean and the President have taken the recommendations and counsel of the ESR Board of Advisors to the Earlham Board of Trustees who have, in turn, approved these recommendations and counsel. The ESR Board of Advisors has been regularly and fully informed on all ESR affairs. The importance of the advisory and supportive roles of the
ESR Board of Advisors has been recognized as essential in the success of Earlham School of Religion.

While not all of the ESR students are Friends, it is obvious that the constituency upon which the existence of ESR depends is Quaker. It is apparent from the comparative statistics and projections that the importance of this dependency will increase. ESR should have sufficient freedom to allow its own identity for purposes of accreditation by the Association of Theological Schools and to maintain accountability to the Society of Friends for which it was established and seeks to serve as its primary constituency. To this end, the effective operation of the ESR Board of Advisors is essential. Therefore, it is the policy of the Earlham Board of Trustees that, in the administration of Earlham, adequate communications be maintained. Recommendations will be secured from the ESR Board of Advisors before important actions are taken. Such actions include:

1. Major changes in
   a. educational goals, programs and curriculum of ESR
   b. policy covering faculty recruitment and student recruitment and admissions
   c. policy covering promotion and public relations
   d. changes in physical facilities
   e. changes in administrative personnel, such as President and Dean of ESR
2. Budgets
3. Arrangements for fund raising

It is also the Earlham Board of Trustees’ policy for the Dean of ESR to be invited to be present at Board of Trustees meetings. The Clerk of the ESR Board of Advisors shall also be invited to attend the meeting of the Board of Trustees at the time of ESR reports.

In carrying out its responsibility for Earlham, the Board of Trustees has prescribed that the President, who is ex-officio a member of the Board of Trustees, be chief executive officer of Earlham. The President shall have freedom from interference by the Board of Trustees within the lines of general policy laid down by the Board of Trustees. Hence, the Board of Trustees does not prescribe detailed organization or administrative procedures for the operation of Earlham College or Earlham School of Religion. This, of course, applies to the EC-ESR operational relationship. The present operational relationship between the College and ESR is recorded in the Appendix. Changes in this present working relationship will be made with adequate consultation of all College and
ESR persons concerned and the Dean of ESR will report such changes to the ESR Board of Advisors.

Appendix

It is assumed that for the foreseeable future Earlham School of Religion will continue as an integral part of Earlham, but with sufficient freedom to warrant its own identity and accreditation by the Association of Theological Schools.

Of paramount importance in the continuing relationship between ESR and the College will be a concerted effort to improve communications between the two institutions. In order to strengthen working relationships and build trust, goodwill and understanding, all persons concerned must work at this task with diligence. The following attempts to spell out in detail the nature of this working relationship.

Board Relations

1. In order to assure adequate communication and consultation between the ESR Board of Advisors and the Earlham Board of Trustees the Board of Trustees shall appoint up to three of its members to the Board of Advisors as liaison persons. These appointments should be staggered and run for three years.

2. A report should be made by the Dean of ESR to the Earlham Board of Trustees at least once a year. This shall be worked out in consultation with the President and the Chair of the Board of Trustees. On some occasions this may include a report from the Clerk of the Board of Advisors.

General Academic and Administrative Relations

1. It is important that Earlham School of Religion be accredited by the Association of Theological Schools of the United States and Canada in addition to its accreditation by North Central Association through Earlham College.

2. With the Association of Theological Schools’ accreditation the ESR faculty now has final authority to recommend degree candidates to its Board of Advisors which, in turn, makes a recommendation to the Earlham Board of Trustees.
3. Items of business which call for joint action of the two faculties of the College and ESR will be considered and acted on in specially called meetings of the combined faculties. The faculty retreat which opens each school year, graduation and all community convocations and faculty social events shall be planned as occasions to which all members of the combined faculties are invited and in which they are free to participate.

4. Whenever the need arises for a joint Administrative-Faculty committee between ESR and the College, this can be designated by the Earlham Board of Trustees or requested by the ESR Board of Advisors.

5. No joint contracts shall ordinarily be written between ESR and the College for faculty or administrative personnel. ESR shall contract with its own faculty, but agreements can be made for exchange of teaching services between the two institutions through the respective Deans. Where this is done, a mutually satisfactory rate of compensation shall be derived.

6. In the interest of mutual trust and effective cooperation between Earlham College and ESR, there shall be consultation in both places when faculty appointments are made in ESR. Specifically, the President, the Academic Dean of the College and the Religion Department of the College shall be consulted. Likewise, ESR should be consulted about the central administrative appointments at the College. Specifically, the appointment of the President, Vice-Presidents, the Provost and Academic Dean, Librarian and members of the Religion Department of the College will call for consultation with ESR. Beyond this, it is assumed that ESR will be consulted when any prospective College appointee might at some time teach a course at ESR.

7. Joint course offerings shall be kept to a minimum, but it is recognized that provision does exist for cross-registration between ESR and the College. The following guidelines will be used to govern cross-registration:
   a. ESR students may take any course for ESR credit which is double-listed in the Earlham and ESR catalogs.
   b. ESR students may take up to three College courses for credit:
      i. In order to remove a deficiency required for admission to ESR;
ii. in order to fulfill a language requirement or need;

iii. In order to meet a special academic or vocational interest or need.

c. Occasional Independent Studies can be done with College faculty (for ESR credit) providing the instructor can give time to it, approves the proposal, and it does not run over the three allowed courses in the College.

d. In exceptional cases an ESR student may petition the ESR faculty to take more than the allowed three courses at the College.

e. All ESR registrations in the College must be approved by the ESR Dean, the College instructor involved, and the College Academic Dean.

f. Regular ESR tuition fees will be charged for up to three courses taken in the College. ESR, in turn, will pay the College for instruction at the regular rate of exchange. Students who want to take more than the allowed three courses (with the exception of (d) above) shall be charged College tuition fees.

g. Earlham College students who wish to take courses at ESR may do so for undergraduate credit. This can be accomplished by obtaining the approval of the respective Deans of the College and ESR.

8. ESR graduates and faculty shall participate in the commencement exercises of Earlham College each June at which time the ESR degree shall be conferred by the President of Earlham with the assistance of the Dean of ESR. During the same weekend ESR will hold its own baccalaureate service on the evening prior to the Earlham commencement to be preceded by a dinner for the graduates and their families. Participation in the Earlham baccalaureate on commencement day shall be voluntary on the part of ESR students and faculty.

9. In budget-making and projecting of needs and resources there will continue to be close coordination of efforts between Earlham College and ESR. Budget preparation and control for ESR will continue to be the duty of the Dean of ESR and the associates he/she deems appropriate. The Dean of ESR or his/her associate will be responsible for consulting with the Vice-President for Business Affairs in preparation of budgets; likewise, preparation of official reports on budget and audits will be made in consultation with the Dean of ESR. Final responsibility for the ESR budget will rest with the President. Final ESR budgets
will be recommended to the ESR Board of Advisors. They, in turn, or the Board of Advisors’ Executive Committee, will recommend the budgets to the Earlham Board of Trustees.

10. In annual or special programs of fund-raising there will be close cooperation and coordination of efforts between Earlham College and ESR. With the freedom necessary for accreditation it is recognized that ESR may require certain liberties within this framework of development to raise funds on its own. Overall responsibility for administration of these efforts will be vested in the Earlham President. Supervision of joint efforts in fund-raising will be delegated to the Vice-President for Development who will work closely with the Dean of ESR, the ESR Director of Development and other persons from the Development Office of Earlham.
APPENDIX IV

Earlham School of Religion
Student Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall Term Enrollment</th>
<th>Total Enrollment For the Year*</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-63</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: These are total credit enrollment figures for the year, including credit received from extension courses. Extension courses, especially in the early years, admitted many auditors not included in these figures. For further information on extension courses see Appendix IV (e), pp. 159
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1963 | Lawrence Barker, MA  
Paul Van Ness, MA  
Ann Weaver, MA |
| 1964 | Louraine Holsinger, MA  
Keith Miller, BD |
| 1965 | Robert Foster, BD  
Kenneth Shirk, BD  
Michael Thornburg, MA |
| 1966 | Mervin Curran, BD  
Keith Esch, MA  
Raymond Evans, BD  
David Haney, MA  
William Taber, MA |
| 1967 | Ralph Ewbank, BD  
Solomon Kenaz, BD  
David Kingrey, MMin  
Karl Schimpf, BD |
| 1968 | Jan Emmert, MA  
Mervin Kilmer, MMin  
Anne Smith, MA  
Carl Zigler, MA |
| 1969 | Charles Adams, BD  
Michael French, MMin  
Andrew Grannell, BD |
| 1970 | Nicholas Block, MMin  
Howard Macy, MA  
John Van Tine, II, MA  
Erma Wilson, MMin |
| 1971 | Dennis Ginoza, MA  
William Guthrie, MMin  
James Helmuth, MA |
| 1972 | Randall Hinshaw, MA  
John C. Smith, MA  
David Wetherell, MA  
Eugene Fisher, MA  
William Geary, MA  
Justin Lapoint, MMin  
Lloyd McDonald, MMin  
Isamu Nagami, MA  
Edwin Robinson, MA  
Paul Wood, MA |
| 1973 | Ronald Allen, MMin  
Donald Andrews, MMin  
P.V. Chandy, MMin  
Maria Crosman, MMin  
James Flakes, MMin  
David Kingrey, D.Min.  
Richard Pritchard, III, MMin  
Robert Rieke, MMin  
Stephen Sebert, MMin  
Leslie Whitbeck, MA |
| 1974 | Larry Carlson, MA  
Mary Chandy, MA  
Donald Coffin, MMin  
Angelo Giannitelli, MMin  
Gordon Harris, MMin  
Herritt Huist, Jr., MMin  
John Kennerley, MMin  
Marvin Page, MMin  
Stanley Rodabaugh, MMin  
Richard Sartwell, MA  
Gary Stratmen, MDiv  
William Wagoner, MMin |
| 1975 | Dorlan Bales, MMin  
Barbara Brindle, MMin  
Max Carter, MMin  
Daniel Cheatham, MMin  
Michael Clemmer, MMin  
William Cronk, MMin  
Dennis DeMond, MMin  
Marshall Gibson, III, MMin  
James Hightower, Jr., MMin |
Clinton Hockenberry, MMin
Keith Phillips, MMin
Jim Pitts, MMin
Tadashi Yuasa, MA
1976
Stanley Banker, MDiv
David Garman, MMin
Duane Hansen, MMin
David Hickman, MA
Gregory Keller, MDiv
James Kridler, MDiv
Chom Boon Kwak, MA
Shannan Phelan, MDiv
Roger Rankin, MA
Charles F. Thomas, MMin
Sadie Vernon, MMin
1977
Fred Bernhard, MDiv
Linda Brindle, MMin
Wanda Coffin, MMin
Dale Dorrell, MMin
Mary Garman, MMin
Kenneth Henke, MA
John King, MA
Keith Mardock, MMin
James Newby, MMin
Ross Putnam, MDiv
Frederick Shaw, MA
Kenneth Story, MMin
1978
James Amundsen, MMin
Malio Barasa, MA
Kenneth Hall, MDiv
Thomas Jeavons, MA
Patricia Jones, MMin
Linda Kusse, MMin
Donald Lynn, MDiv
Pamela Mark-Whitley, MDiv
Jonathan Neff, MMin
David Wolfe, MMin
1979
Michael Birkel, MA
Samuel Caldwell, MMin
John DeHORITY, MDiv
John Fitzgerald, MMin
Lawrence Habschmidt, MMin
Nancy Jackson, MMin
1980
David Kahn, MDiv
Brian Marshall, MDiv
Deborah McGrady, MA
Rebecca New, MMin
Lynn Peery, MMin
Bonnie Ridener, MDiv
Robert Van Antwerp, MMin
Howard Alexander, MA
John Baker, MMin
Brent Bill, MA
David Brindle, MDiv
Michael Brown, MDiv
Frank Edwards, Jr., MDiv
Michael Hall, MA
Paul Kelcourse, II, MMin
Gayle Keller, MDiv
Anne Lester, MMin
Ronald McGuire, MA
Ronald Selleck, MMin
Curtis Shaw, MMin
Janice Strain, MDiv
Richard Todd, MDiv
Rebecca Van Waes, MMin
Scott Watts, MDiv
1981
Paul Anderson, MDiv
Robert Bennett, MDiv
John Carter, MDiv
Stephanie CrumleyEffinger, MDiv
Shirley Dodson, MDiv
Lawrence Garvey, MDiv
Robert Gosney, MMin
Felicity Kelcourse Brock, MDiv
Phillip King, MMin
Charles Lidala, MA
Carol Marshburn, MDiv
Larry Phillips, MDiv
Michael Snow, MDiv
Paula Teague, MDiv
Gary Wagner, MDiv
John Zehring, MDiv
1982
Howard Alexander, MMin
Stephen Angell, MA
Douglas Baker, MMin
Patricia Brown, MMin
Loretta Gula, MMin
Scott Hinkley, MMin
Kent Holmes, MMin
Phyllis Hutson, MMin
Judith Middleton, MMin
Jay Morrison, MMin
Daniel Snyder, MA
Martha Stuessy, MMin
Sara Elizabeth Terrell, MMin
Karen Thomas, MMin
Terry Anderson, MDiv
Robert Blake, MDiv
Pieter Byhouwer, MMin
Marty Chappell, MA
Bill Code, MMin
John Coffey, MMin
Thea Cowley, MMin
Erin Cox, MDiv
Don Crist, MDiv
Gary Cummings, MDiv
Ann Davidson, MMin
Holly Inglis, MMin
Mark Inglis, MMin
Margaret Kennedy, MMin
Alice McCormick, MDiv
Patrice McDaniel, MDiv
Ben Richmond, MA

Daniel Rouse, MA
Terry Shumaker, MMin
Peter Sippel, MDiv
Duane Smith, MDiv
Greg Swope, MDiv
Lonnie Valentine, MA
Clare Walter, MDiv
Donna Zehring, MDiv

1984
Joshua Brown, MMin
Anne Buttenheim, MMin
William Hook, MMin
John Weaver-Hudson, MDiv
Deborah Kaiser-Cross, MDiv
Daniel Paul Kriese, MA
Mary Elizabeth Long, MMin
Frank Massey, MMin
Erik Miller, MMin
Mark Minear, MA
Candida Palmer, MA
Ed Slaughter, MMin
Ann Smoot, MDiv
Cathy Vaughan, MMin
Marvin Wingfield, MA
### Faculty and Administrative Personnel

#### Faculty and Administrative Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elton Trueblood</td>
<td>1946-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Barbour</td>
<td>1953-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Elmore</td>
<td>1957-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmer Cooper</td>
<td>1959-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Purdy</td>
<td>1960-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Baer, Jr.</td>
<td>1962-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Redekop</td>
<td>1962-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Rogers, Jr.</td>
<td>1962-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Spangenberg</td>
<td>1962-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Hall</td>
<td>1963-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>1963-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Mullen</td>
<td>1966-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Clapham</td>
<td>1967-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Grover</td>
<td>1967-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Davis</td>
<td>1968-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Black</td>
<td>1968-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Esch</td>
<td>1969-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Roop</td>
<td>1970-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam Burke</td>
<td>1972-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Yerkes</td>
<td>1972-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Kolp</td>
<td>1974-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Tiffany</td>
<td>1978-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Keller</td>
<td>1981-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peet Pearson</td>
<td>1982-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Adjunct Professors and Visiting Lecturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Castle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Coffin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Creasey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederic Crownfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby Cunningham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Denton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Doherty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Emerick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Garman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roswith Gerloff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Hole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer Humrighausen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Horn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Horton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Canby Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Kuehn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Lacey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Littell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liston Mills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Oliver Nelson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Newman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Oates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Punshon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Randall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Roberts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Shelton Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Steere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Thurman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Wentz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Campbell Wycoff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secretarial Staff
(one year or more)

Margaret (Peg) Higgins 1960-65
Mae Harper 1960-68
Mary Benson 1962-63
Helen Stanfield 1965-74
Virginia Stebing 1969-77
Jay Martin 1969-76
Dorthea Toney 1970-76
Marjorie Rupe 1970-76
Frances Engle 1971-72

Mary Lynn 1974-77
Mary Beth Mapstone 1974-76
Claudia Ettel 1977-
Martha Wischert 1977-78
Peggy Moore 1977-78
Dee Ball 1978-81
Carol Nutter 1981-
Lynn Peery 1981-82
Sue Kern 1982-

Maintenance Staff

Ella Brewer, 1962-78
Carl Cook
Earl Baldwin
### Earham School Of Religion Board of Advisors Members

(With Term of Service)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Baker</td>
<td>1973-82(A)</td>
<td>Robert Garris</td>
<td>1975-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewitt Baldwin</td>
<td>Ex-officio</td>
<td>Robert Greenleaf</td>
<td>1960-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxine Beane</td>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>Donald Green</td>
<td>1979-82(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Russell Branson</td>
<td>1960-65</td>
<td>Anna Lydia Hadley</td>
<td>1966-75(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman Brantingham</td>
<td>1977-1979</td>
<td>Clifford Hadley</td>
<td>1975-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Brewster</td>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Bronner</td>
<td>1969-81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas S. Brown</td>
<td>1960-63;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Cadwallader</td>
<td>1969-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Caldwell</td>
<td>1982- (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendel Carey</td>
<td>1985-1986-71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Cattell</td>
<td>Ex-officio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Coffin</td>
<td>1966-69;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara Cole</td>
<td>1975-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Collett</td>
<td>1980-1983-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Cope</td>
<td>1983-1985-77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Cope</td>
<td>Ex-officio</td>
<td>Clyde Hissong</td>
<td>1966-72(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Cope</td>
<td>1960-62(D)</td>
<td>Helen Hole</td>
<td>1976-83(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmer Cooper</td>
<td>Ex-officio</td>
<td>Lewis Hoskins</td>
<td>1969-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Cowgill</td>
<td>1965-70(D)</td>
<td>John Jennens</td>
<td>1974-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Craven</td>
<td>1966-75</td>
<td>Charles Johnson</td>
<td>1976-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Downing</td>
<td>1968-71</td>
<td>Thomas Jones</td>
<td>1960-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errol Elliott</td>
<td>1960- (H)</td>
<td>Marcus Kendall</td>
<td>1967-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Flynn</td>
<td>1971-77(A)</td>
<td>Mervin Kilmer</td>
<td>1969-78(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Langdon</td>
<td>1970-79;</td>
<td>Karl Schimpf</td>
<td>1976-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David LeShana</td>
<td>1981-83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex-officio</td>
<td>Keith Smiley</td>
<td>1977-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P); 1975-78</td>
<td>Douglas Steere</td>
<td>1966-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975-78</td>
<td>James Stein, Jr.</td>
<td>1960-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Levering</td>
<td>1968-71</td>
<td>Elton Trueblood</td>
<td>Ex-officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Littell</td>
<td>1966-69(N)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Macy</td>
<td>1974-83(A)</td>
<td>Arnold Vaught</td>
<td>1960-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Marshburn</td>
<td>1967- (H)</td>
<td>Sadie Vernon</td>
<td>1978-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Marshburn</td>
<td>1982-1984-74</td>
<td>Harold Walker</td>
<td>1966-66(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarabel Marsteller</td>
<td>1960-66</td>
<td>Helen Walker</td>
<td>1960-66(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Milner</td>
<td>1960-66</td>
<td>Franklin Wallin</td>
<td>Ex-officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Miller</td>
<td>1966-76</td>
<td></td>
<td>1974-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A)(N)</td>
<td>Willard Ware</td>
<td>1960-69;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex-officio</td>
<td></td>
<td>1970-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P); 1975-78</td>
<td>S. Arthur Watson</td>
<td>1960-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Norval Webb</td>
<td>1960-66(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Mullin</td>
<td>1982-1983-75</td>
<td>Bernard White</td>
<td>1967-70;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Oliver Nelson</td>
<td>1966-70-79</td>
<td></td>
<td>1972- (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Perkins</td>
<td>1975-84</td>
<td>Louise Wilson</td>
<td>1977-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Pickering</td>
<td>1961-63(D)</td>
<td>Ellis Williams</td>
<td>1976-82(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Purdy</td>
<td>Ex-officio</td>
<td>Clifford Winslow</td>
<td>1981-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1960-65;</td>
<td>Richard Wood</td>
<td>1985-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1967-76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola Purvis</td>
<td>1978-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Quigg</td>
<td>1982-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Raines</td>
<td>1960-63(N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Ray</td>
<td>Ex-officio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Read</td>
<td>Ex-officio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P)(D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Record</td>
<td>1977-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Redding</td>
<td>1971-80;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1982-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Reece</td>
<td>1960-73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H)(D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Rees</td>
<td>1960-66(D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Regen</td>
<td>1960-66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delbert Replogle</td>
<td>1966- (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Roberts</td>
<td>1971-79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klane Robison</td>
<td>1977-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milo Ross</td>
<td>Ex-officio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P)(D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Rumsey</td>
<td>1960-62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Wilson</td>
<td>1977-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis Williams</td>
<td>1976-82(D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Winslow</td>
<td>1981-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Wood</td>
<td>1985-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Board Chairmen/Clerks**
- Errol Elliott 1960-63
- Lorton Heusel 1963-67
- Glenn Reece 1967-70
- Delbert Replogle 1970-75
- Paul Langdon 1975-79
- Harold Cope 1979-84
- Earl Redding 1985-

**Symbols**
- A-AlumniJae
- D-Deceased
- H-Honorary Life Member
- N-Non-Friend
- P-Quaker College President serving Ex-officio
Extension Courses Offered

These were ten week, two hours per week courses offered by ESR faculty in Quaker communities in Indiana and Ohio from 1960 to 1974. The courses were offered for both credit and audit and went under the program name of Adult Education in Religion Studies.

After a period of five years in which no extension courses were offered, a new format was launched in 1978-79 in the form of extension courses related to Quaker college and yearly meeting centers. These included Friends University of Wichita, Kansas, High Point and Guilford College, North Carolina, and Iowa Yearly Meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF EXTENSION COURSE</th>
<th>PROFESSOR</th>
<th>WHERE</th>
<th>TERM-YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian Ethics</td>
<td>Wilmer Cooper</td>
<td>Fairmount, IN</td>
<td>I, 60-61</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quakerism</td>
<td>Alex. Purdy</td>
<td>Indpls. IN</td>
<td>II, 60-61</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel of John</td>
<td>Alex. Purdy</td>
<td>Xenia, OH</td>
<td>I, 61-62</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quakerism Sem.</td>
<td>Wilmer Cooper</td>
<td>Muncie, IN</td>
<td>I, 61-62</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of NT in Preaching</td>
<td>Alex. Purdy</td>
<td>Richmond, IN</td>
<td>II, 61-62</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT Prophets</td>
<td>Alex. Purdy</td>
<td>Richmond, IN</td>
<td>III, 61-62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Ethics</td>
<td>Wilmer Cooper</td>
<td>Indpls., IN</td>
<td>I, 62-63</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Letters of Paul</td>
<td>Alex. Purdy</td>
<td>Marion, IN</td>
<td>I, 62-63</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult &amp; His Church</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Kokomo, IN</td>
<td>I, 63-64</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rise &amp; Meaning of the Church</td>
<td>Alex. Purdy</td>
<td>Richmond, IN</td>
<td>II, 63-64</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult &amp; His Church</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Muncie, IN</td>
<td>II, 63-64</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quakerism</td>
<td>Wilmer Cooper</td>
<td>Indpls., IN</td>
<td>II, 63-64</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult &amp; His Church</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Marion, IN</td>
<td>III, 63-64</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul, Man &amp; his Message</td>
<td>Alex. Purdy</td>
<td>Winchester, IN</td>
<td>I, 64-65</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistle to the Hebrews</td>
<td>Alex. Purdy</td>
<td>Richmond, IN</td>
<td>II, 64-65</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Leadership</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Carmel, IN</td>
<td>II, 64-65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature &amp; Mission of the Church</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Wilmington, OH</td>
<td>III, 64-65</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF EXTENSION COURSE</th>
<th>PROFESSOR</th>
<th>WHERE</th>
<th>TERM-YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Ministry of the Church</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Fairmount, IN</td>
<td>I, 65-66</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature &amp; Mission of the Church</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Knightstown, IN</td>
<td>II, 65-66</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devotional Life</td>
<td>Howard Thurman</td>
<td>Richmond, IN</td>
<td>II, 65-66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministries to Families</td>
<td>Spangenberg, J.</td>
<td>Richmond, IN</td>
<td>III, 65-66</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. Skills for Local Leadership</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Winchester, IN</td>
<td>I, 66-67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the Gospel through Quaker Faith &amp; Practice</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Fairmount, IN</td>
<td>II, 66-67</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Reformation</td>
<td>Maurice Creasey</td>
<td>Richmond, IN</td>
<td>I, 67-68</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelism and Church Renewal</td>
<td>Eugene Coffin</td>
<td>Anderson, IN</td>
<td>I, 67-68</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. Skills for Local Church Leadership</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>W. Newton, IN</td>
<td>II, 67-68</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Quakerism</td>
<td>Leonard Hall</td>
<td>Danville, IN</td>
<td>I, 68-69</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Issues for Church People</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Dublin, IN</td>
<td>I, 69-70</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. Skills for Local Church Leadership</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Wilmington, OH</td>
<td>I, 69-70</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Ministry for the Local Church</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Spiceland, IN</td>
<td>III, 69-70</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization and the Church</td>
<td>Tom Mullen</td>
<td>Indpls., IN</td>
<td>III, 70-71</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The People Who Ran from God</td>
<td>Keith Miller</td>
<td>Richmond, IN</td>
<td>I, 71-72</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing Together for Mission</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Winchester, IN</td>
<td>I, 71-72</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Identity</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Russiaville, IN</td>
<td>I, 72-73</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF EXTENSION COURSE</td>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>WHERE</td>
<td>TERM-YEAR</td>
<td>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the Gospel of our Time</td>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Plainfield, IN</td>
<td>III, 73-74</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Counseling</td>
<td>Kingrey/Louthan</td>
<td>Friends Univ.</td>
<td>III, 79-80</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>Verlin Hinshaw</td>
<td>Friends Univ.</td>
<td>I, 80-81</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beg. NT Greek</td>
<td>Verlin Hinshaw</td>
<td>Friends Univ.</td>
<td>I, 80-81</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor as Preacher</td>
<td>Bill Guthrie</td>
<td>NCYM</td>
<td>I, 80-81</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor as Counselor</td>
<td>Bill Guthrie</td>
<td>NCYM</td>
<td>I, 80-81</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Admins.</td>
<td>Bill Guthrie</td>
<td>NCYM</td>
<td>II, 80-81</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Counseling</td>
<td>Claude Ragan</td>
<td>NCYM</td>
<td>II, 80-81</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripture Stories Telling God's Truth</td>
<td>Bales/Macy</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>I, 81-82</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beg. NT Greek</td>
<td>Hinshaw</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>I, 81-82</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies in Pastoral Care</td>
<td>David Wolfe</td>
<td>NCYM</td>
<td>II, 81-82</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Cnsling.</td>
<td>Claude Ragan</td>
<td>NCYM</td>
<td>II, 81-82</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beg. NT Greek</td>
<td>Hinshaw</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>III, 81-82</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's Letter to the Romans</td>
<td>Groves</td>
<td>NCYM</td>
<td>III, 82-83</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Commitment and Discipleship</td>
<td>Kolp/Burke</td>
<td>NCYM</td>
<td>IV, 82-83</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in Ministry</td>
<td>Hicks</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>I, 83-84</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. as Pastoral Ministry</td>
<td>Westerhoff</td>
<td>NCYM</td>
<td>I, 83-84</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quakerism-Yesterday-Today</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>NCYM</td>
<td>II, 83-84</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church and Family</td>
<td>Mullen</td>
<td>NCYM</td>
<td>IV, 83-84</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. Theol. Reflection</td>
<td>Stoneburner</td>
<td>NCYM</td>
<td>I, 84-85</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Twenty-Five Year Operating Statement
### Income and Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 1969-</td>
<td>34,975.00</td>
<td>8,521.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 1960-</td>
<td>67,989.97</td>
<td>39,308.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 30, 1961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Records for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1 - June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30, 1962 not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-63</td>
<td>64,947.00</td>
<td>48,554.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>80,929.00</td>
<td>79,048.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>128,269.00</td>
<td>98,847.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>119,512.00</td>
<td>111,565.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>120,047.00</td>
<td>128,751.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>293,685.00</td>
<td>167,035.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>245,363.00</td>
<td>163,847.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>225,152.00</td>
<td>173,577.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>125,178.00</td>
<td>209,487.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>119,052.00</td>
<td>234,558.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>190,058.00</td>
<td>261,977.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>143,932.00</td>
<td>266,630.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>153,684.00</td>
<td>295,227.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>202,370.00</td>
<td>277,690.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>265,481.00</td>
<td>300,799.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>271,927.00</td>
<td>271,927.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>326,506.00</td>
<td>310,398.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>385,667.00</td>
<td>314,511.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>387,361.00</td>
<td>343,889.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>440,844.00</td>
<td>393,893.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>454,282.00</td>
<td>429,414.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>483,104.00</td>
<td>469,939.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>*495,000.00</td>
<td>*464,150.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated figures March, 1985