

# **The Secularization of Religious Colleges and Universities**

A Paper Prepared for the Governance Study by the Rev. Brian W. Keith

January 1, 2000

The purpose of this paper is to provide background information on the process of secularization<sup>1</sup> that has occurred at most of the religiously founded colleges and universities in this country.<sup>2</sup> My goal is not to suggest any specific governance structure nor criticize any potential evolutions of our governance that may be considered. However, there is a growing body of information on the secularization process that is vital to consider when looking at governance structures of the Academy and its relationship to the General Church.

Unfortunately, this paper has grown so long that it may discourage some people from reading it. To make access to the information easier I have divided it into the following sections:

**I. Churches and Their Religious Colleges: Points of Connection or Disconnection.**

**II. Discussion of the Points of Connection or Disconnection.**

**III. History of the Protestant Institutions.**

**IV. History of the Catholic Institutions.**

**V. Theological Seminaries.**

**VI. Why Did it Happen?**

The material in sections I, II, and VI present the key elements in the secularization process.

## **Introduction**

Prior to the establishing of land-grant and or state universities, most institutions of higher education in the United States were founded by churches for furthering their denomination's goals. These usually involved training clergy, providing a "safe" environment for their children's intellectual development, and allowing a few non-denominational students to benefit from their education. Over the course of time virtually all of these institutions, especially the more prestigious ones - Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Duke, University of Chicago, Boston College, etc.- have become secular in nature with perhaps a department of religion for those few interested. The vast majority of other, less prestigious, institutions may retain more or less vestiges of their religious roots; however, religion is often removed from their core values and decision making processes. And a very few, such as Brigham Young, have retained their religious emphasis.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Secularization" here means that which is not religious. A secular institution, as all public institutions are in the United States, must maintain a strict separation from anything religious. An instructor may not discuss his or her religious beliefs and subject matter may not reflect any belief system. The result of this has been the virtual elimination of anything having to do with religion from curriculum, decision-making, and all other aspects of educational institutions.

<sup>2</sup>The history and the present status of religiously connected high schools is neither so well documented or understood. From what little evidence I have been able to find, it appears there are two distinct paths. The first is for those religious schools which are very closely yoked to their sponsoring organization. These have maintained their principles and character over time. The others appear to have followed a very similar secularization route to religiously founded institutions of higher education. For example, the Quaker schools in eastern Pennsylvania retain certain customs and affinities for their Quaker roots. But with most all of the students, faculty and administration from a non-Quaker background, these schools are Quaker more in name than reality.

This process of secularization, except in the case of Catholic institutions, did not happen suddenly, nor with a conscious intent to abandon the religious principles upon which these colleges were founded. Nor was it the act of a single individual or cause. As George Marsden, a leading scholar in the field, observes, "So rather than finding many culprits, what we typically find are unintended consequences of decisions that in their day seemed largely laudable, or at least unavoidable." (Marsden, p. 8) However, the accumulated decisions, the tolerated or encouraged drift to secularization, very quickly took on a life of their own which then could not be slowed nor stopped. And as James Burtchaell concludes in his massive study on the subject, "The failures of the past, so clearly patterned, so foolishly ignored, and so lethally repeated," provide warning markers that any religious educational organization should heed.<sup>3</sup> (p. 851)

## **Section I - Churches and Their Religious Colleges: Points of Connection and Disconnection<sup>4</sup>**

### **Mission and Philosophy**

- What is the purpose of the institution?
- Is the religious emphasis on the uniqueness of the religion, or what is shared in common with other religions, philosophies, social movements, theologies, etc.?
- Is the religious orientation focused on the church faith or more on a moral life?
- Is the institution primarily driven to serve the church or another community such as a geographic area, the public as a whole, or a social class?

### **Curriculum or Theology**

- Is "religion" primarily a separate discipline or is it integrated into all subject matter?
- Are faculty, especially lay faculty, actively pursuing religious concepts in their courses?
- How many courses in religion are required per year and for graduation?

### **Church Connections**

- Does the church organization have influence/control over the institution?
- Selecting board members?
- Selecting the president?
- Selecting the faculty?
- Determining basic policies and programs?

---

<sup>3</sup> This and Marsden's work are the primary sources for this paper. They are fundamentally critical of the secularization process. Most other previous historians of higher education have observed this shift from religious to secular, but with high praise. See the definitive work, *The Emergence of the American University* by Laurence R. Veysey as a prime example of this. The thesis is that religion inhibited and restricted the development of higher education, thus as it was supplanted by science and the scientific method of study true universities were at last free to develop. Historically, this interpretation is supported, because if the Harvards and others had remained in the grip of their founding denomination, and their intellectual development based on and limited to the falsities of the first Christian Church, it is extremely doubtful that they could have achieved the stature they enjoy today.

<sup>4</sup> These points have been culled from a variety of sources which can be found in the Bibliography.

## **Board**

- Are members of the board members of the church?
- Are they restricted to laity or clergy?
- How are board members selected?
  - By the current board?
  - By the church or church body?
  - As representatives of various alumni or other interest groups?
    - Within the church?
    - Outside of the church?

## **Money**

- Is the source of income primarily from within the church or outside of it?
- Is the institution primarily tuition or endowment driven? (If it is tuition driven, then having more students to produce revenue tends to take precedence, diminishing religious emphasis.)

## **President and Administration**

- Is the president a member of the clergy or laity?
- Is the president a member of the church?
- Are administrative personnel members of the church?
- Is the president primarily concerned about the religious mission of the institution?

## **Faculty**

- What percentage of the faculty are clergy?
- What percentage of the faculty are active, participating, members of the church?
- Is their orientation more to the "professorate" and its standards or the church values and its standards? (These are not necessarily antithetical, but have traditionally come into conflict.)
- Is their membership and participation in the church a primary or ancillary factor in their hiring?

## **Accreditation**

- To what extent do external accreditation agencies affect internal policies and attitudes, leading to a diminution of the religious focus of the institution?

## **Students**

- What percentage of students are members of, or raised in, the church?
- Is a goal to attract and retain students from the church, or are other standards used? (i.e. To become a more selective institution, trying to attract higher academic ability students, etc.?)
- When non-denominational students attend, is the primary goal to make them comfortable or to proselytize them?

## **Religious Life of Students and Faculty**

- Is chapel required? (For both students and faculty.)
- Is church attendance required?
- Is there an active program leading to conversion/joining the church a key and well integrated feature of the institution?
- What determines acceptable standards of student conduct? (I.e. Relations between the sexes, standards of honesty, consequences when disorders occur, etc.?)
- What role does the religion play in making administrative decisions?

## Other Indicators

- Is the emphasis on an “academic” study of religion or communicating the truths of faith to all students?
- To what extent is the denomination’s religious symbolism on campus?
- Are state holidays followed, or religious holidays, if they are not the same?
- Does the institution present itself as denominational, or does it use vague descriptions such as “Christian,” “Religious,” or “Moral”?  
In its advertising? Admission forms? Public relations?

## Section II - Discussion of the Points of Connection or Disconnection

**Mission and Philosophy.** The purpose of the institution, as originally conceived and currently understood by administration, faculty, and students, is a key driver in the religious nature of the institution. Where the primary focus is the religion, then secularization is minimized. But where other objectives take precedence, such as “excellence,” “attracting the best students,” or drawing students from a specific population other than church members, religious elements tend to be minimized, departmentalized, and eventually lost.

Also, if the religious philosophy is not primarily concerned with a development of denominational faith among the student body, which at the Academy would be the three-fold Word, then mediate or secondary goals take precedence.

Where “religion” becomes identified with good works or a good moral character (which can be accomplished by any religion or secular philosophy) instead of a set of beliefs, denominational values fade into the mists.<sup>5</sup>

**Curriculum.** When the faith of the church is clearly present and discussed from a position of belief by the faculty, the religious nature of the institution is strong. But where religion is seen as ancillary to “secular” subject matter, it plays a decreasing role in the intellectual life of the institution and eventually can only be found in religion departments and the few people who inhabit them. This is usually reflected in a diminishing number of religion courses required for graduation.

**Church Connections.** There is a strong tendency for any organization to strive for independence and freedom from any outside control. This is especially the case in institutions which are comprised of very independent minded faculty and administration. To the extent the connection with the church is close - seen in administration and faculty participation in the church, direct church influence on policy and personnel, board participation, etc., - the ties are strong. But with each weakening link of the connections, their inherent striving for autonomy eventually leads to complete separation.

**The Board.** Boards set general policy for the institution and are thus significant in maintaining ties with the church. However, the Board can also be a strong secularizing influence. This happens when alumni are elected to the Board who are not primarily interested in it as a religious institution but allow some secondary goal, such as having excellent athletic teams or top-notch academics, become primary. When alumni use financial contributions to gain representation on boards, and if they are not primarily committed to its religious goals, it has the effect of undercutting the denominational trustees on the board.

---

<sup>5</sup>See Appendix I for examples of mission statements of colleges and universities which are gradually sanitized of denominational and religious emphasis over time.

However, having a board which is all from the denomination, or even with clergy representation is not a secure guard against secularization.<sup>6</sup> Many boards of trustees of religious colleges desire their institutions to have a religious tone. But the board itself is usually, and appropriately, not involved in such day to day activity where this is seen, and thus by default may preside over a secularization process.

**Money.** This has been a leading factor in encouraging institutions to seek connections with non-denominational organizations. When little financial support comes from denominations, tuition from non-church students, governmental aid, foundation grants, etc., become necessary means for an institution to continue and enhance its educational mission. But with financial links come influence and control. Because educational institutions are very adept at spending every cent available, there is always pressure to seek non-church sources of funding.

**President and Administration.** Presidents have often been key factors in promoting secularization or, at the very least, acquiescing as the process moves along. Their role is described by Burtchaell:

“With very few exceptions, the presidents who have been the strategists of religious alienation have been large souled, attractive, and trusted. They typically felt that their institutions were somehow confined, stifled, or trivialized by their church or denomination or order and at a critical moment they greatly enhanced the professionalism, resources, and clientele of their colleges. As they enacted a new age on their campuses, they tended to point out the deficiencies of the past, though only as a foil for what they proposed as a future. They rarely criticized the religious sponsorship openly. There was usually no rhetoric of rejection, no breakaway surge, no praise of secularization, except perhaps among the Catholics. Even when there was a secession from formal oversight by church authorities, such as at Lafayette, Wake Forest, and at Boston College, the claim and the belief were that the institution would of course remain as Presbyterian, Baptist, or Catholic as ever. Indeed, all change was supposed to be gain, without a sense of loss.” (p. 827)

As Protestant institutions began placing more emphasis on the “practical” - sciences, engineering, etc.- clergy presidents were seen as less significant and capable of leading in the changing educational goals. When there was a shift to a lay president, the institution rarely returned to a clergy president.

However, having clergy as presidents is not always protection against secularization. Jesuit priests and Ursuline nuns were leaders in reorganizing their institutions apart from Catholic Church control.

It is also of note that some institutions have attempted to establish a dual governance system - a clergy person in charge of the “religious” and “overall” aspects of the institution and a lay person in charge of general educational program. The results have been to diminish and eventually remove religion from the core of the institution. A Catholic example illustrates this:

“At Fr. Ledochowski’s instructions in 1934, some campuses had experimented with dual leadership: a rector for the Jesuit community and a president for the college or university. The intent was that the rector answer for the overall welfare of the combined enterprise, but when it was first tried at Fordham the president treated the rector as his third-level assistant. By the 1950s a pattern emerged: the rectorship and presidency remained united in one man, but a ‘superior’ would, under his authority, handle the day-to-day affairs of the resident Jesuits and leave all matters of state to the chief. Freed of his daily responsibility for the religious, personal, and professional lives of the local Jesuit community, the presidency thus took a step further toward a more narrowly profiled professional identity.” (Burtchaell p. 586)

This “more narrowly profiled professional identity” was secular.

---

<sup>6</sup>The Academy has not traditionally had “clergy representation” on the board. I believe this is due to our sense that the laity have a critical role to perform here and that if there is to be a truly free response in a clergy led institution, the board should be comprised of laity alone.

**Faculty.** Because the faculty are the pivotal junction between the educational mission and the students, and have grown to have a dominant say in selecting other faculty, they are either the staunchest defenders of a connection with the church or a major force in the institution's movement to secularization. There are two aspects to this: the religious commitment of the faculty and the extent to which they have embraced academic standards which are hostile to religion.

Where faculty are selected who are not of the denomination, whether due to a paucity of good candidates from within the denomination or the desire to have the best instructors or researchers in a field regardless of their religious affiliation, the effect has been to lead to secularization. This is not seen at first because a small minority on the faculty does not set the tone. However, since the faculty are the primary determinant in selecting future faculty, and non-denominational faculty have little stake in finding denominational faculty, eventually the religious orientation is less and less a factor in employment decisions. As Burtchaell notes, the questions asked of prospective new faculty shows this gradual progression: "from Methodist to Evangelical, to Christian, to religious, to wholesome, to 'the goals of the college,' which by then were stated in intangible terms." (p. 830)

Faculty's participation in the life of the church is also critical, since they are usually the first to lose interest in a religious orientation. If indifference, seen in silence or absence from religious observances, grows, it has a deadening effect upon the presence of religion on campus.

Faculty can also promote a drift to secularization if they embrace academic standards of the "professorate." While most of these standards fit well with General Church attitudes, there are also some which have had a negative effect on religious faith. For example, academic freedom, as it is generally accepted in higher education, accepts only "neutrality and competence" as legitimate criteria for boundaries. The American Association of University Professors definitive statement on the subject in 1940, which still stands without modification, is revealing. After extolling the virtues of academic freedom, a religious mission for a college is then defined as a "limitation of academic freedom." Thus Divine revelation is not considered in any academic subject as a valid criterion for determining what is true and what should be taught.<sup>7</sup>

**Accreditation.** Accreditation was not a significant factor in most Protestant institutions because they were founded and were moving headlong to secularization well before accrediting agencies came into existence. However, they have been a definite factor in more recently founded institutions such as some established by evangelical churches. Azusa Pacific University sought accreditation to gain legitimacy in the eyes of other academic institutions, to have its credits transfer, and to have the ability to have international students attend. While its student body is still comprised primarily of born-again Christians, the accrediting process has resulted in a split between its religious inspiration and its academic standards. Moreover its growth in evening professional programs and branch campuses seem to be lacking in any religious element.

---

<sup>7</sup>Certainly the religion of the first Christian Church has stifled free inquiry. In the New Church, and at the Academy, this should not be a major point of conflict. The Academy College's self evaluation in 1982 for re-accreditation addressed this issue and used the concept of the two foundations of truth (from one Source) as our means to provide for genuine free inquiry "within the circumference of a common faith." (p. 8)

Also, these agencies can challenge church connections. Dordt College, a Christian Reform college in the midwest, has had its system of selecting faculty with input from the church, rather than exclusively using peer review, seriously questioned by its accrediting agency.<sup>8</sup>

**Students.** Virtually all institutions have accepted students not of their denomination. Some have done this from principle, and some from the necessity of garnering their tuition dollars. Usually this is done with the theory that having non-denominational students present will be an enhancement for the denominational students, and in vague hopes that these students will somehow be affected by the religious atmosphere of the institution. Where there is no active effort to proselytize these students, the emphasis shifts to making them feel comfortable. The result of this is a toning down of the religious elements of the institution and a minimizing of doctrinal differences which newcomers either do not care about or disagree with. And as Burtchaell notes, "As the students change, the college must change." (p. 155)

**Religious Life.** Less of a critical factor, but certainly a force in secularization, is the external observance of a religious life. Required chapels and Sunday church attendance tend to be reduced, made voluntary, and eventually eliminated in the secularization process.

Also significant here is to what extent the denominational values and beliefs are actively present in determining the parameters of student behavior.

## Section III - History of the Protestant Institutions

### The Origin of Higher Education

The earliest universities were founded in Europe in the twelfth century. They were elite guilds focusing on religious knowledge. But there was also a strong fascination with "pagan" knowledge - Greek and Roman erudition. This presented a challenge because while their fundamental assumption was that all knowledge reflected God, the philosophy and insights of the Greeks were clearly not Christian. The solution was to wrap the pagan learning within Christianity, but Christianity remained a separate entity.

During the Reformation, Martin Luther severely criticized the universities for their Greek learning. He perceived a strong antipathy between the philosophies embraced there with the religious life he was trying to promote. However, Luther and the Protestants would not abandon higher education. They realized that by emphasizing an individual reading of the Scriptures, a potential Pandora's box was being opened of complete anarchy of belief. So, with some misgivings, Protestantism embraced universities as the means to unify beliefs and train those who would become the leaders in the Protestant Church.

### Protestant Colonial Colleges

The first colleges were founded by individual denominations with a clear sense of promoting their religious beliefs. Their primary purpose was to provide pastors for their churches. These colonial colleges had anywhere from 25% to 75% of their student body looking to ordination. Law and medicine were the two other professions for which there was instruction.

The presidents of these colleges were invariably clergy, as were most of the instructors - these being virtually the only formally educated people of the times. The students tended to be either poor males seeking to become ministers, doctors, or lawyers, or sons of the wealthy class who were marking time before entering their fathers' businesses. The curriculum was "classical," that is, the subject matter consisted of ancient languages, religion, philosophy, and a few practical subjects.

---

<sup>8</sup>The Middle States Association is the Academy's accrediting agency. It is comprised of educational institutions, including the Academy. Its primary goal in granting accreditation is to measure an institution's own stated goals with what they are actually doing. In this they have performed a very useful function as an objective evaluation of whether we are achieving what we claim to be achieving.

During the 1800's a fundamental transformation occurred. Technology and the practical sciences grew to become a driving force in the development of the United States. This was reflected in the colleges and universities with a greater emphasis placed on these subjects. Colleges, after some large-scale battles, embraced the sciences. It gave a new purpose to the colleges, and it was a way to attract students and increase the revenues of the institution. Borrowed from the Germans, this newer concept of a university placed its primary emphasis upon research and science, and insured free inquiry by the principle of academic freedom - the non-interference from any outside agency, such as wealthy donors, presidents, or religious affiliations.

As this occurred, religion as a subject and as a factor within these institutions was compartmentalized and gradually marginalized. Theological seminaries were separated as departments within universities or set up as independent entities. "Sectarianism" came to be associated with all that was opposed to the advance of the sciences and democracy. It was associated with narrow mindedness and allegiance to a constricting faith as opposed to the free inquiry for "truth".

How did the churches respond? Usually not at all. This was for two reasons. The first is that they agreed with and embraced this concept. The early Protestants had so identified Protestant ideals with the country's values that as it moved towards a scientific ideal they attempted to claim it was the same as their religious philosophy. Unfortunately for these churches, as the universities realized that morality and democracy in the liberal spirit did not require any denominational nor even religious support, church connections then became superfluous to their educational mission.

The extreme of this complete identification of being Christian with democracy and liberal society is exemplified in the 1902 presidential report of William Rainey Harper at the University of Chicago - an institution founded and funded as Baptist by John D. Rockefeller and with Harper as its first president. Defending the existence of many Jews on the faculty and in the student body, he justified it by saying: "As the country of which we are citizens is a Christian country, so the University of Chicago is a Christian institution."<sup>9</sup>

The second reason is that the early Protestant churches emphasized pietism - a focus upon an external style of life, rather than statements of faith. Adherents of this view tended to define Christianity in terms of moral behavior and social justice. Thus when the issue of whether to accept students who were not of the denomination, and later faculty who were not, it was perceived that as long as these were "good Christians" they would not detract and would even add to the educational enterprise.

The emphasis on science and the professionalization of the faculty, led to a change in governance. The clergymen who had been presidents of most all colleges and universities began to be replaced by laymen.

"Into discard went the clergyman, not so much because his godliness was an administrative encumbrance - indeed, a religious posture, whatever its sincerity, continued to be a desirable quality in a college president. The clergyman president went into discard because he lacked skill in the ways of the world, because his commitment to the classical curriculum stood in the way of the more practical and popular emphasis which commended itself to the trustees, and because the world in which the colleges and universities now moved was more secular, less subject to religious influences. One by one the colleges broke with traditions and elected their first non-clergyman to the presidency: Dennison in 1889, Illinois College in 1892, Yale in 1899, Princeton in 1902...." (Rudolph, p. 419)

Nor would these or other colleges return to clergy as presidents.

---

<sup>9</sup>While it is probably not fair to suggest that Harper was intentionally dissembling, his primary goal was to create a great university on the model of Johns Hopkins. Harper, a baptist minister himself, sought to achieve greatness by attracting the most prestigious faculty to the institution, with their religious affiliation of secondary importance.

## Higher Education in the 1900's

The ascendancy of science and the scientific method was a force that would soon dominate virtually all of higher education and would quickly render religion less and less significant to the educational enterprise. As great universities were being defined by the caliber of the faculty, their religious affiliation became less and less significant to presidents, boards of trustees, faculty, and students.

In the early 1900's there was a fundamental shift in power from presidents to the faculty itself. Based on the developing expertise and professionalization of the faculty, they gained the predominate voice in determining who could be fellow faculty members. Coupled with the granting of tenure to ensure academic freedom, the faculty had encapsulated itself in its guild, and religion became an outside encumbrance, like wealthy donors and presidents.

Further entrenching the alienation of religion from the campuses was an attack launched by fundamentalist Christians in the 1920s. Recognizing that the leading educational institutions were promoting science as opposed to religion (as seen in teaching evolution and scorning creationism), virulent attacks were made on the "godless" universities. Since no liberal or moderate theologian or layperson wanted to be painted into the fundamentalist corner, there was a greater acceptance of the norms of dispassionate science and suspicion of religion as having any place in the curriculum or search for "truth".

By the mid 1900's the professionalization of religious instruction itself was well under way. The scientific method was turned on the text of the Bible - with disastrous results. The Old and New Testaments became regarded in academic circles as merely an ancient fallible collection of stories. Those who taught theology sought credibility among their peers through rigorously applying the scientific method to the Scriptures. Claiming neutrality was essential for scholarly instruction, they thereby removed any proselytizing or encouragement for the students to believe in the Bible. Religion courses shifted from seeking to convey the truth of the Bible to encouraging students to think for themselves and have respect for all faith groups, with a scholarly recognition that absolute answers are narrow and incompatible with scientific objectivity. In fact today, it is often the departments of religion who are the least accepting of any form of Christianity on campus.<sup>10</sup> Also, the demands of curricular growth to provide more room for the sciences led to religion course requirements being reduced and eventually eliminated altogether. The result was that fewer students took any religion courses, and those courses they took did not promote faith in any set of beliefs.

Money was also a significant factor in drawing institutions away from their religious roots. Most denominations provided a paltry amount of financial support which was woefully inadequate to provide for their current operations let alone hope for any growth. It became evident to most college presidents that the only way to survive or grow was to seek alternative funding from wealthy donors, foundations, and state and federal governments. However, to be acceptable to these potential donors, the colleges had to present themselves as working for the common good of all within the United States - i.e. they could not be controlled nor unduly influenced by any particular denomination.

---

<sup>10</sup>See Appendix II for examples of how religion departments have changed their emphasis, and turned away from any denominational allegiance, over time.

The weakening link between churches and educational institutions became evident when the Carnegie pension fund was established in 1906. At that time, faculty had almost no provision for retirement and their salaries were barely livable. The Carnegie Fund used the offer of a generous pension for faculty to attempt to eliminate denominational affiliations. Only those colleges and universities that could demonstrate that they were not under the control of religious institutions would qualify. Fifty-one previously identified religious institutions immediately requested and were accepted into the program. Within four years twenty more institutions had joined. And it was observed by the administrator of the program that even those institutions who applied and were denied “almost without exception [declared] that such [religious] connection played little, if any, part in the religious or intellectual life of the student body.”<sup>11</sup> (Marsden, p. 283)

Other factors also came into play. After the Second World War, there was an explosive growth in student population. Denominational institutions were often swamped with members of other faiths and their own faith group became a minority. And students from denominations that had previously attended their own church’s institutions found public universities more attractive. As the student body became more diverse, there was a corresponding loss of interest in religion.

All of these factors were mutually supportive in exiling religion from any meaningful place in reputable institutions of higher education.

## **Section IV - History of the Catholic Institutions**

Catholic educational institutions followed a slightly different pattern, but with many of the same factors present and with the same results.

Catholic colleges and universities have two key features which distinguish them from Protestant institutions. They have more of a philosophic and theological emphasis and less of a pietistic one, and the independence of their governance structure.

The importance of the study of philosophy in the Catholic tradition, and their theology that is strongly based in it and less so in the pietistic tradition, has kept Catholic colleges and universities less open to identifying “Catholicism” with simply a moral life or American democratic ideals, that is, until recently.

In governance, and contrary to what one might expect, Catholic colleges are structured much more independently than Protestants. This is due to the fact that they were founded not by the Catholic Church itself but by various semi-autonomous orders within the Catholic Church, such as the Jesuits and the Ursulines. They were founded, funded, staffed and controlled by the orders. Thus any Board of Trustees or influence by local Catholic churches or bishops was minimal if it existed at all.

Throughout the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century, Catholic colleges and universities existed apart from “main-stream” higher education in the United States. This was partly due to them retaining an emphasis upon “sectarian” education as Protestant institutions were shedding that garb, but it was also due to a prejudice against Catholics. High-sounding declarations by Protestant institutions that they were “non-sectarian” were in large part coded language to mean they were not Catholic. So while they were eagerly accepting government funds, they did not want Catholics to receive them. Catholic institutions were viewed with suspicion, if not derision, by the rapidly expanding secular universities and the Protestant related colleges and universities.

But in the decade of 1965-1975 a seismic shift occurred in Catholic institutions. Rather than a decades long incremental slide into secularization, there was a headlong rejection of Catholic roots in favor of the norms of higher education.

---

<sup>11</sup>To this day most large private foundations, state governments, and the federal government are major sources of funding, provided a college can show it is not “pervasively sectarian,” and that any religious influence is superficial and does not play any real part in the programs, curriculum requirements, staffing, student admissions, etc.

Four primary factors fueled this rapid change.

The first was a precipitous drop in Catholic clergy. Not only were fewer and fewer young men selecting clerical garb, but those who did often sought social activism rather than education as their primary occupation. This resulted in too few Jesuits and others to teach or administer the existing Catholic institutions. Lay instructors, often non-practicing Catholics and even non-Catholics, had to be hired.

The second factor was the traditionally low endowments of Catholic institutions. As massive federal and state dollars were pouring into all facets of higher education, Catholic colleges and universities were seeing their academic credibility eroded even further without new funding. When they began seeking state and federal funds for financial aid for students, erection of new buildings, and research grant money, they came under legal attack for receiving funds because of their sectarian nature. They were at risk of being excluded from the dramatic developments of higher education.

The third factor was the growing competition for Catholic students. The explosive growth of higher education was absorbing a great many of the Catholic students who had previously chosen Catholic institutions. If Catholic colleges and universities could not show an equivalent program, they were in danger not only of losing their best and brightest students, but such significant numbers of students that many Catholic institutions would either shrink significantly or cease operations entirely. As survival and growth is usually a primary goal of most organizations, inviting non-Catholics to their colleges and making them feel accepted on their own terms became necessary.

The fourth factor was the turmoil within the Catholic Church itself. The Catholic Church at this time was roiled by numerous disagreements. Theological rebellion against traditionally held Catholic ideas and practices were fomenting - especially in the universities. A rejection of authority led American Catholics to take less seriously their doctrine and calls for a Catholic life style. Within this turmoil, the colleges and universities had a growing sense of restlessness under any obedience expected, even within Catholic orders. This was especially seen whenever the Catholic Church or superiors within the order attempted to exert influence on the institutions.

As this was taking place, a new type of president was leading the Catholic colleges and universities. These were men and women whose education was not limited to Catholicism but who often had terminal degrees from the Ivy Leagues or other secular institutions. Their affinity was much closer to the professorate, or the norms of higher education, than the apparent confines of the Catholic church.

The response of these presidents to these forces was swift and decisive. The first was to seek government funding. In support of this they developed many new educational programs which attracted a new and much more religiously diverse clientele to traditional Catholic colleges and universities. To ensure ongoing government funding, they proposed reorganizing these institutions as civil entities with lay boards, lay administration, the right to appoint Jesuits by the rest of the faculty and not by their own religious order, and selection of a president by the Board and not by the superior general of the order. These proposals were not strenuously opposed by the Catholic Church and numerous Catholic institutions quickly reorganized under the leadership of a dynamic priest or nun - but independently from the Catholic church and their founding orders.

The extent of this movement away from any Catholic church control was seen in 1967. The leaders of the more prominent Catholic institutions declared in their "Idea of a Catholic University" that a Catholic university must embrace academic freedom without any church authority standing in the way. Many Jesuits even claimed that there was little distinctive contribution they could make in higher education, and they redefined Catholicism to include all people of goodwill.

The effect of these steps was immediate and pronounced. The institutions quickly embraced new and non-Catholic faculty. The student bodies which had previously been overwhelmingly Catholic now had non-Catholics in significant numbers, sometimes even in the majority. And formal ties were weakened, if not severed, with most Catholic orders that had established and previously controlled these institutions.

Recognizing that these institutions were making independent decisions with little apparent regard for Catholic practices, the Vatican made numerous attempts to regain influence over these institutions in the 1970's. Presidents were called to Rome to explain the situation and were strongly chided for their lack of connection to Catholicism. While numerous decrees were then made, the reality was that these institutions had such a significantly declining Catholic base in faculty and students and as they were now structured apart from any Catholic Church control, that the Vatican could not regain any of its lost influence.

Attempts last year (1999) by the Vatican to reformulate its relationship with these universities shows how extreme the situation has become. Rather than try to make them "more Catholic" in nature, the Vatican is seeking to require that local bishops approve the doctrinal purity of the professors of theology. In other words, they are limiting their efforts to the religion departments, and have little actual power to effect any changes even there.

## Section V - Theological Seminaries

One might think that theological schools whose goal is to provide pastors for congregations would be immune from secularization tendencies. And in many cases, especially where a theological school is strongly denominational (i.e. that is, controlled by one denomination and focused on producing pastors for their congregations), these institutions have retained their original orientation. But many others, particularly those associated with secularizing institutions and seminaries which encourage several denominations to send students, are also experiencing strong moves away from their religious roots.

This is perhaps not surprising because there has always been a love-hate relationship in Protestantism with formalized theological training. The evangelical tradition of Protestantism held deep suspicions about higher education. As one fundamentalist in 1895 put it, the typical seminary product is

"One of these namby-pamby, limber-back, cotton-mouth, soften-handed, apologetic baptists, spelled with a little 'b'... These pulpit dudes with kidded hands and velveteen mouths, preaching that 'unless you repent to some extent and be converted in a measure you will be damned in all probability.'" (George, p. 39)

While there was a desire to have informed sermons, there was a strong perception that formal theological education sapped the energy of "spirit filled" young men.

John H. Leith, in his *Crisis in the Church: The Plight of Theological Education*, 1997, delivers a devastating critique of why mainline Protestant theological schools are not producing pastors who can lead the churches. Leith, a retired professor from Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, one of the big five Presbyterian seminaries, believes that there is a disconnection between the academic training students receive and the needs of congregations.

Leith identifies several key factors which have led to this situation. Primary among these is the acceptance of the academic norms and standards of higher education. Their dispassionate and critical analysis of the Bible, an emphasis upon Ph.D.s (a research, not pastoral, degree), professors tied more to an academic discipline than to the cause of promoting a denomination, and the expansion of curriculum into ancillary subjects such as social justice, counseling, abortion politics, and a host of other "causes," has produced a lack of interest in traditional parish ministry. These, and other, forces have exerted tremendous pressure in leading seminaries away from their traditional task of preparing pastors for the churches.

However, two factors have allowed these forces to gain ascendancy in many institutions. These are severing the ties of a theological seminary from its denomination, and the selection of faculty who are more concerned with scholarship than with the pastorate.

Severing ties between a seminary and its church causes a loss of focus and accountability of the school to produce pastors for the church. And as that focus dims, convenient secular academic norms are

accepted - hiring the most prestigious scholars for positions at the institution rather than those of that faith group who will communicate those values and inspire the students to become effective pastors. This fascination with PhD's, as opposed to having pastoral practitioners as instructors, has led many institutions to increasingly distance themselves from the realities of church life.

Hiring faculty who are not of the denomination also cements the shift away from producing pastors. Because non-denominational faculty are usually allied to their discipline more than any church, and because faculty choose additional faculty, a disconnection with the churches occurs. As Leith observes,

“professors from outside the constituency of the seminary seldom support a choice from the constituency...professors who are not alumni...seldom support appointment of professors who are alumni...professors with little or no pastoral experience seldom support the choice of a professor who has had any effective pastorate.” (p. 72.)<sup>12</sup>

The result is that academic aspirations have overtaken pastoral ones, and those seeking pastorates are not being trained by those who have the values and experience in the field.

## **Section VI - Why Did It Happen?**

### **Why Did the Churches Let This Happen?**

Since it usually took a long time for the secularization process to gain a critical mass, why did the sponsoring churches not do something to prevent it? A large part of the answer lies in the fact that the pietistic movement emphasized external behaviors over any creed or belief. With such an emphasis upon the kind of life a person led, to the exclusion of any belief system, it was relatively easy for institutions to pay less and less attention to the philosophy or beliefs that distinguished them from other denominations, religions, and even non-belief. So the gradual shift from the denomination's faith, to being called “Christian”, to being “religious”, to finally being “socially responsible” did not arouse any worries in the denominations. By reducing religion to morality and sentiment, the churches overlooked fundamental changes in their colleges and universities.

The church leadership was also oblivious to the secularization process because the controls or influence exerted by the church were gentle. Each step away from the church was not seen as a rejection or major departure from the institution's original purpose. In fact, they assumed good will between the two, and were usually surprised when they discovered the relationship was no longer reciprocal.

When churches did finally recognize that there was a significant gulf between the educational institution and the denomination, there were occasional efforts to hold the institutions accountable. In the early 1960's the Lutherans attempted this. They sought to engage their institutions in a dialogue on the role of faith in the university, but the institutions used their freedom to ignore the Lutherans. Part of the problem was that the leading scholars in the church approved of the lack of influence by the church. One Lutheran theologian, Martin Heineken claimed that, “the first task of a college is to be a first rate educational institution. Its task is not redemption, but education.” (Burtchaell, p. 481)

---

<sup>12</sup>The Academy's theological school is chaired by the Executive Bishop of the Church, clearly sees its primary mission to train pastors for the General Church, and requires all full-time faculty to be preaching, if not in charge of, a smaller congregation of the General Church on at least a monthly basis.

After being dean of the Theological School for 7 years, I am more convinced than ever of the need for our faculty to be competent pastors and doctrinal scholars. Ideally each faculty member would excel in both areas, but since that is unlikely, I think we need to have a good percentage (half?) of the faculty with strong practical pastoral experience who can convey that to the students.

As the Academy approaches a university status, having Ph.D's on the faculty will be important, both for New Church studies and communicating with the world around us. However, should this become a dominant force in the school our professional pastoral training is likely to suffer.

The colleges further claimed they did not exist for the church's benefit, but they were vehicles of service for the church in the world. Thus secularization, although never termed that by those who promoted it, would be beneficial to church institutions! Various covenants were drawn up between Lutheran colleges and the church, but these had little meaning and no effect.

This pattern was also seen at Methodist institutions. There,

“As the campus constituencies contained a more and more dilute Methodist presence, the church constituencies would restate their commonality in broader and broader terms to keep it plausible.” (Burtchaell, p. 337)

Often the “rhetoric of concern” began to be voiced even as the institutions were making the critical turn away from religion. Covenants and statements of purpose were proposed to redefine the relationship, but the colleges and universities were able to dictate the language of these and they only amounted to a cover while the secularization process went on apace.

### **The Critical Turn**

All of these factors set the stage for the separation of these institutions from their religious heritage - if not in name, at least in fact. There was no singular cause, but the secularization of colleges and universities occurred through a confluence of many factors. In 1970 the Presbyterians identified several markers when assessing how the rift had occurred at Lafayette:

“Piecemeal dismantling of the traditional church-relationship of Lafayette may be detected in the abandonment of religious quotas in admissions policy and religious criteria in faculty selection; in the absence of Presbyterian clergy on the Board of Trustees; in the rigorous academic approach in the Religion Department with its stance of complete separation from the chaplaincy; in the abandonment of compulsory Chapel attendance beginning with the second semester of the 1964-5 academic year; in the refusal of the faculty, during the following year, to provide a meaningful time-slot in the mid-week class schedule for a voluntary chapel observance; in the removal of the requirement of two semesters of academic religion courses in the spring of 1970; and in the discontinuation of Invocation at Faculty meetings in November of 1970. The increased freedom of social arrangements, the abandonment of the college's role *in loco parentis* might also be considered part of this picture.” (Burtchaell, p. 175)

Burtchaell, surveying the process in a wide variety of settings, observed,

“The elements of the slow but apparently irrevocable cleavage of colleges from churches were many. The church was replaced as a financial patron by alumni, foundations, philanthropists, and the government. The regional accrediting associations, the alumni, and the government replaced the church as the primary authorities to whom the college would give an accounting for its stewardship. The study of their faith became academically marginalized, and the understanding of religion was degraded by translation into reductive banalities for promotional use. Presidential hubris found fulfillment in cultivating the colleges to follow the academic pacesetters, which were selective state and independent universities. The faculty transferred their primary loyalties from the college to their disciplines and their guild, and were thereby antagonistic to any competing norms of professional excellence related to the church.” (p. 837)

These forces fueled a common desire for autonomy. As Burtchaell notes, “It requires only the possibility of emancipation-and-survival to provoke the educator's preference for autonomy.” (p. 823)

Given all these factors, is secularization inevitable? Or, is there one critical turn that, if prevented, would prevent the complete separation?

Burtchaell claims that secularization only becomes inevitable, "the moment when the sponsoring church was removed from college governance." (p. 827) Once this link is broken, all the forces pushing for secularization will predominate and an educational institution will spin out of the church's orbit. For if the church is no longer acknowledged and looked to as the source of mission, governance, finances, faculty, and students, then it becomes an outside intruder. At this point "the critical turn... often involves forcing those who spoke for the church out of college governance." (Burtchaell, p. 834) Once those who speak for the church are not the primary voices in the educational institution, then secularization is the only alternative.

Is it irreversible at this point? The board of Christian education in the Presbyterian Church made this declaration in 1970:

"The history of higher education in this country is replete with examples of where what was a condition of mutual support and cooperation has passed into one of merely historical and perhaps largely sentimental attachment on the part of a few. The transition from a church-related college to a secular one may proceed almost imperceptibly at first, but as the distance widens it also accelerates and then becomes irreversible..." (Quoted in Burtchaell, p. 166)

When the governing bonds with a church are severed, when presidents no longer have as their primary focus the religious mission of the institution, when the faculty and administration wholeheartedly embrace the norms of professional excellence and regard the religious mission of the institution as secondary, when secular accrediting agencies reinforce this by establishing secular standards and holding institutions accountable to them, when the need for money drives key decisions, and when students are not fundamentally interested in the religious perspective of the institutions, allegiance to any set of religious norms and affiliation with a church evaporates. The only question is how long the process will take.

## **Postscript**

Is the Academy in danger of secularization? Probably only the most pessimistic of Cassandras could claim we are on the brink of plunging into the pit of secularization. We are blessed with a clearly stated primary religious mission, strong though few formal ties to the General Church, a dedicated New Church oriented faculty, a student body who is being taught the faith of the New Church, and an endowment that allows a freedom from undue secular influence.

However, we would be naive to think that we have any special protection against the forces which have led so many educational institutions to drift and finally depart from their religious organizations. Rarely was a singular decision made to separate, but a succession of smaller decisions led to the departmentalization and eventual elimination of religion as a factor in these institutions. Any one of the factors that affected other institutions could become a strong force at the Academy. As an educational institution we are no more immune from them than we as individuals are immune from the evils identified in the Writings because we aspire to be "New Church."

Secularizing forces will ever be present, and the only sure guard is for all members of the Academy family to ever reclaim, reinvigorate, and realize the charter purpose of the Academy:

"propagating the Heavenly Doctrines of the New Jerusalem, and establishing the New Church signified in the Apocalypse by the New Jerusalem, promoting education in all of its various forms, educating young men for the ministry, publishing books, pamphlets and other printed matter, and establishing a library."

## **Appendix I - Changes in Mission Statements**

These examples have all been taken from Burtchaell's book.

### **Lafayette (Presbyterian)**

**1890:** "The aim of Lafayette College is distinctly religious. Under the general direction of the Synod of Pennsylvania of the Presbyterian Church its instruction is in full sympathy with the doctrines of that body. At the same time religious instruction is carried on with a view to a broad general development of Christian manhood within the lines of general acceptance among evangelical Christians, the points of agreement, rather than disagreement, being dwelt upon."

**1935 (approximately):** "Lafayette College aims to be distinctly Christian and is related to the Presbyterian Church not only historically and legally but by hearty accord in spirit and purpose. Religious instruction is carried on with a view to the development of Christian manhood and leadership in Christian service, not in any sectarian sense, but in full accord with essential truth as accepted by all evangelical Christians..."

**1950:** "Lafayette College is a private, church-related college, organically connected with the Presbyterian Church. The religious program on the campus is based on the belief that each student should enjoy complete freedom as he pursues religious truths and seeks a responsible religious expression."

**1985:** "Lafayette College seeks to promote the continued intellectual, imaginative, emotional, and spiritual growth of its students and faculty. The College sustains a concern with human meaning and values, a concern animated by its tradition - though now attenuated - ties with the Presbyterian Church. The College encourages recognition and respect for a wide variety of interest and opinions, and it draws strength from the diverse talents and backgrounds of its students and faculty. It asks them to work together to make Lafayette, from residences and playing fields to libraries and classrooms, an environment conducive to inquire and discovery."

**1989:** "Since the 1840's Lafayette has had a lasting, though evolving, relationship with the Presbyterian Church, but its religious programs embrace all faiths."

**1993:** "In 1854, the College formed a mutually supportive association with the Presbyterian Church...Today, Lafayette is an independent, coeducational, residential, undergraduate institution with a faculty of distinction..."

### **Millsaps College (Methodist)**

**1927-52:** "Millsaps College is church related college under the care and control of the Mississippi and North Mississippi Conferences of the Methodist Church. The college is non-sectarian but devoutly Christian. During the 1948-49 session it numbered in its student body members of thirteen denominations [54 percent were Methodists that year] and in its faculty members of four denominations."

**1955:** "Millsaps College has as its primary aim the development of men and women for responsible leadership and well-rounded lives of useful service to their fellow men, their country, and their God. It seeks to function as a community of learners where faculty and students together seek that truth that frees the minds of men."

As an institution of the Methodist Church, Millsaps College is dedicated to the idea that religion is a vital part of education; that education is an integral part of the Christian religion; and that church-related colleges, providing a sound academic program in a Christian environment, afford a kind of discipline and influence which no other type of institution can offer. The College provides a congenial atmosphere where persons of all faiths may study and work together for the development of their physical, intellectual, and spiritual capacities....

As an institution of higher learning, Millsaps College fosters an attitude of continuing intellectual awareness, of tolerance, and of unbiased inquiry, without which true education cannot exist. It does not seek to indoctrinate, but to inform and inspire. It does not shape the student in a common mold of thought and ideas, but rather attempts to search out his deeply held aptitudes, capacities, and aspirations and to provide opportunities for his maximum possible development..."

**1990:** "Millsaps College is a community founded on trust in disciplined learning as a key to rewarding life.

In keeping with its character as a liberal arts college and its historic role in the mission of the United Methodist Church, Millsaps seek to provide a learning environment which increases knowledge, deepens understanding of faith, and inspires the development of mature citizens with the intellectual capacities, ethical principles, and sense of responsibility that are needed for leadership in all sectors of society.

The programs of the college are designed to promote independent and critical thinking; individual and collaborative problem solving; creativity, sensitivity, and tolerance; the power to inform and challenge others; and an expanded appreciation of humanity and the universe."

#### **Davidson** (Presbyterian)

**1963:** "Davidson recognizes God as the source of all truth. As a college committed to the historic Christian faith, it sees Jesus Christ as the central fact of history, giving purpose, order, and value to the whole life....The primary loyalty of the college extends beyond the bounds of the denomination to the Christian Community as a whole, through which medium it would seek to serve the world."

**1994:** "Davidson commits itself to a Christian tradition that recognizes God as the source of all truth, and finds in Jesus Christ the revelation of that God, a God bound by no church or creed. The loyalty of the college thus extends beyond the Christian community to the whole human community and necessarily includes an openness to and respect for the world's various religious traditions."

#### **New Rochelle College** (Catholic women's college)

**1963:** "The College of New Rochelle, a Catholic liberal arts college for women, proposes to educate its students to be thoroughly formed, truly Christian members of the Church and of Society, distinguished by minds training to think correctly and by wills formed to response to true value...As a Catholic college, the College of New Rochelle assumes as its own the world-view and penetrating analysis of man and his relations to God and to other men which theology alone can provide."

**1965:** "Committed to the Christian tradition in its uniqueness and complexity, New Rochelle provides a full program of theology. Far from compromising academic freedom or excellence, such commitment bears witness to the liberating role of Christ and to God's revelation in Him. The college holds firmly that theological and philosophical studies open up dimensions of reality which are necessary to genuine educational growth, and that faith is relevant to learning and to life."

**1971:** "The College strives to articulate its academic tradition and religious heritage in ways that are consonant with the best contemporary understandings of both. It provides opportunities for spiritual growth in a context of freedom and ecumenism."

#### **Concordia University** (Lutheran-Missouri Synod)

**1981:** "Under the grace of God, Concordia College is a community directed by God's Word, motivated by the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and dedicated to Christian scholarship.

As an institution owned and maintained by the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, Concordia is committed to the mission of the church to bring the Good News of Jesus Christ to the world. This commitment is met by (a) offering programs providing for the education of dedicated people who desire to serve the Church in full-time positions of public ministry, (b) offering programs providing for the education of dedicated

people who will serve the church as Christian laypeople, and (c) serving as a model of Christian character and living for all who come in contact with it...

While respecting the Christian prohibition against violating the sanctity of the individual conscience, Concordia seeks to affirm faith in Jesus Christ as the only Savior from sin, sincere acceptance of the Holy Scriptures as the revealed truth of God, a sense of wonder and appreciate for all the works of God, a growing ability to evaluate human learning and conduct in light of God's Word, and ready consent to the will of God in every life situation...."

**1988:** "Concordia offers Christian education at the collegiate level as its way of sharing the Gospel of Jesus Christ, aiding students to develop a sense of vocation and preparing them for leadership in a variety of fields and endeavors. As a university of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, Concordia aspires to the highest standards of excellent, blending a confessional Lutheran perspective with a liberal arts foundation for the free pursuit of knowledge and understanding. The spiritual elements of the collegiate life and worship provide a focus for growth, renewal and personal expression of faith.

Concordia University challenges itself

- to become an institution which intentionally serves as a locus for Christian higher education, sharing the Gospel from a confessional Lutheran perspective;
- to provide undergraduate programs in academic disciplines, church work and other professions, rooting them in the liberal arts to prepare persons well-educated for ministry in the church and world...

## ***Appendix II - Changes of Attitudes in Religion Departments***

These examples have all been taken from Burtchaell's book.

### **Olaf College (Lutheran)**

**1961-62:** "St. Olaf College gives opportunity in the curriculum for a systematic study of the sources, history, and teachings of Christianity and the application of its principles to modern conditions and problems. It is natural also that the history and principles of Lutheranism should receive attention."

**1992-93:** "The study of religion is an integral part of the liberal arts curriculum and attends to the religious elements of culture-scriptures, rituals, symbols, traditions, beliefs, worship practices, values, and theologies. At St. Olaf the study of religion emphasizes study of the Christian tradition, its history, practice and contemporary expression."

### **Linfield College (Baptist)**

**1960:** "The aims of the Department of Religion are: (1) to give to the student an awareness of the place, the nature and the function of religion in human life; (2) to assist the student in the adjustment of his religious outlook while he is advancing in his understanding of other fields of knowledge; (3) to provide pre-theological training and guidance for persons planning to do graduate work in religion; (4) to direct the student in the acquisition of such data and skills as will qualify him for intelligent non-professional leadership in the program of the Christian churches of the regular denominations. The endeavor is to promote a spirit of unity rather than divisiveness in the face of the world's need."

**1977:** "From the beginning, men and women have sought answers to questions of ultimate significance. This most personal of human drives has long been associated with the process of education, and while the various academic disciplines add much to an understanding of the infinite, many of the questions are couched in religious terms. Drawing upon more than 3,000 years of revelation and religious experience, the religion department is dedicated to helping students in their personal search for a deeper understanding of religious truths."

**1993:** "Religion is a complex and variegated phenomenon which has had a profound effect upon human culture. Religion has appeared as a dramatic and fearful encounter with the holy, as laboriously acquired

spiritual discipline, as exemplary story and ritual, and as intimate communal interdependence. Religion has evoked both trust and terror, bliss and rage, peace and war, and hope and despair. In its various cultural and historical manifestations, the experience of religion has called forth the best and the worst in human conduct.

By learning to ask appropriate and productive questions about religion, one develops the capacity to know one's own way and the ways of others as well. The academic study of religion is indeed an integral part of a liberal arts education which can create mutual respect and support within the world community.

Objectives of the department are: to provide an awareness of the place, nature and function of religion in human life and culture; to study the history and sacred texts of a variety of world religions; and to aid students who desire to increase their knowledge and understanding of religion. Assistance is also given by the department to students preparing for the seminary and for graduate work in religious studies."

### ***BIBLIOGRAPHY***

"The Academy of the New Church College and Theological School Self-Evaluation Report to The Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools," Bryn Athyn, Pennsylvania, September 1982

Burtchaell, James T., *The Dying of the Light: the Disengagement of Colleges and Universities from Their Christian Churches*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1998.

George, Timothy, "The Baptist Tradition," found in *Theological Education in the Evangelical Tradition*, edited by D.G. Hart & R. Albert Mohler, Jr., Baker Books, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1996.

Leith, John H., *Crisis in the Church: The Plight of Theological Education*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky, 1997

Marsden, George M., *The Soul of the American University: from Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1994.

Rudolph, Frederick, *The American College and University: A History*, University of Georgia Press, Athens and London, 1990 edition (original edition 1962).

Veysey, Laurence R., *The Emergence of the American University*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1965.