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The Story of an Idea

The basic idea of our story is this: religion, theoretically and practically, is inseparable from education; hence it should be taught, even in a tax-supported university, not indirectly or surreptitiously, but unapologetically, comprehensively, and in line with the best educational procedures.

The story is about the School of Religion at the State University of Iowa. It relates the history of the School by tracing the distinctive threads of its successive three-year periods. There are many antecedents to the story, but we begin with the period 1921-24 because of a germinal event which occurred in the academic year 1921-22.

On January 11, 1922, O. D. Foster, University Secretary of the Council of Church Boards of Education, presented a paper to the Conference of Church Workers in Universities, assembled in annual session at the Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago. His subject was “Schools of Religion at State Universities.” Three men from Iowa City heard the paper and agreed that Foster’s idea was so significant that something should be done about it at the State University of Iowa. The three were Rufus H. Fitzgerald, YMCA Secretary, Herbert L. Searles, pastor for Presbyterian students, and Walter Schäfer, pastor for Congregational students. Contacts were soon made with University officials, who in turn conferred with local religious leaders. This led to the appointment of a representative committee with instructions to study the subject and submit a plan. Its members were: Rufus H. Fitzgerald, chairman, Father William P. Shannahan, and Professor Edwin D. Starbuck. In due course the committee submitted recommendations to Walter A. Jessup, the President of the University. The President regarded the matter of such importance that in March, 1923, he referred it for further study to a special all-University faculty committee, consisting of Dean George F. Kay, chairman, Dean Carl E. Seashore, Dean Chester A. Phillips, Professor Edwin D. Starbuck, Professor Forest C. Ensign, and Professor M. A. Shaw. This committee studied the subject for a full year. Conferences were held with many educational and religious leaders, but chiefly with O. D. Foster who in the meantime, while continuing his former work, had organized and become the executive of the American Association on Religion, a national group of Jewish, Roman Catholic, Protestant and university representatives. The result was that in March, 1924, Dean Kay and his committee presented to President Jessup a plan which in large part had been formulated by Foster and which later, with some modifications, became the constitution of the School of Religion. Its essential feature may be seen in the following sentence: “the governing board”
shall be “constituted in such a way as to secure the cooperative efforts of the religious bodies of the state and of the University in the support and control of the School.” The plan was presented by President Jessup to the State Board of Education, and on May 22, 1924, it was officially approved by that body.

During 1924-27 an organization was created in conformity with the formulated plan. This part of the story is extremely important. Many a plan has been excellent except for one flaw—it wouldn’t work. The first step in seeing whether this plan would work was to bring together, as the plan provided, two representatives from each of the religious bodies of the state, and University representatives equal to the total of those from the religious bodies. A conscientious effort was made to have these individuals appointed in a manner which would make them truly representative. The eventful meeting was held in the Senate Chamber of Old Capitol, Iowa City, on May 12, 1925. Jews, Catholics, and Protestants were there, together with representatives of the University. Many of them had never met before and none had ever been in just that kind of a meeting. But, according to all accounts, it was a deeply moving occasion. One minister declared it was the best revival he had ever attended. A layman said that when he left he couldn’t keep back tears of joy and that he felt like praying. The plan was approved, and the group proceeded to elect trustees to constitute the governing board of a School of Religion. These trustees, nine representing the religious bodies and six the University or at-large, were chosen unanimously. The first executive committee was Dean G. F. Kay, chairman, R. H. Fitzgerald, secretary, Father W. P. Shannahan, Rabbi Eugene Mannheimer and Judge H. C. Ring.

The first problem was finance. It was thought that the three religious groups—that is, Jews, Catholics, and Protestants—should each support a professorship. To provide support for the administrative side of the work, an appeal was made to John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and in the spring of 1926 word came that he would grant $35,000 to test the experiment for three years. Then for the larger part of another year a search was made for an administrative director. At a meeting of the Board on March 14, 1927, the position was offered to and accepted by M. Willard Lampe, who at that time was Secretary for University Work of the Presbyterian Board of Education, and also a member of the American Association on Religion. At the same meeting the Board took the final steps to make the School of Religion a legal corporation.

Perhaps the next stage of the story, 1927-30, was the most risky and exciting of all, for it had to do with the embodiment of the idea in a faculty, and through the faculty in a curriculum. The chief question
was—could a group of teachers be found, representing different religious faiths, possessing the proper academic preparation and training, who could live and work together day by day, endeavoring cooperatively to achieve the common objectives of the School, respecting each other's differences and at the same time functioning in full loyalty, each to his own faith?

The embodiment of the idea in a faculty was not easy, but the very idealism of the venture seemed to iron out difficulties. During this period there were a Jewish professor, a Catholic professor, and a Protestant professor in addition to the Administrative Director. There were many differences of opinion among them, as was to be expected. Unity was achieved by doing nothing except by common consent. There was considerable experimenting with the curriculum in the interest of unity, comprehensiveness, the desires of the professors, and the requests of the students. Many requests were made for joint participation by the faculty, in radio talks, public meetings, written symposia of opinion, etc., and it was gradually learned from trial and error what could be done and what had better not be tried.

So it can be recorded that the idea survived its embodiment in a faculty, whose members had never met one another before, and some of whom were replaced after short terms of service. This, however, is telling the story in its lowest terms. The truth is that in spite of all differences of opinion among the professors, and some of these differences involved the very philosophy of the School, and in spite of all the changes and adjustments that were necessary, there was during this period a camaraderie—a mutuality of respect and helpfulness—which gave solid ground to a belief that the idea was fit not only for an idealist's dream, or the occasional gatherings of good-natured people, but also for the daily grind of continuous work in a common cause.

In 1930 a new strand appears in the story, and during the next three years the idea was expanded in the direction of the extracurricular life of the campus. There were several reasons for this. First of all, the genius of the idea was to encourage students not only to study religion but to live consistently with their knowledge and insights. All of the teachers were chosen because of their interest not only in the academic teaching of religion, but in actual religious faith and life. Then, too, it was seen, after the test of a few years, that only a relatively small proportion of the students would or could take the curricular courses; hence the desirability of reaching the mass of students in other ways. Moreover, the School of Religion was requested by the campus religious groups themselves to assume a leadership in the extracurricular field. They petitioned the President of the University to appoint a committee to study
the moral and religious life of the campus, and this committee, on which every component part of the organized religious life of the campus was represented, requested that the School of Religion do two things: suggest the best forms of cooperation among the religious groups, and provide for a continuous study of the whole problem of religion in the University. Finally, the expansion of the work in this direction was made possible by Mr. Rockefeller’s second grant to the School. His first grant terminated in 1930. The second, which was for a five-year period, was larger than the first for the purpose of making it possible for the School to maintain an extracurricular laboratory. Hence, in 1930 a new professor, William H. Morgan, was added to the staff with primary responsibility for the laboratory side of the enterprise.

We come now to the fifth stage of our story—1933-36. This was marked by a growing integration of the School in the life of the University as a whole. Here are a few illustrations. Beginning in 1933 and continuing to 1944, there was a freshman course entitled “Religion and Ethics,” which was given cooperatively by the School of Religion and the Department of Philosophy. Again, about 1933 there was considerable discussion among representatives of several departments of the University about the advisability of establishing a course on the subject of marriage. In 1934 such a course emerged in the School of Religion. It was directed by one of our professors, first Moses Jung, then William H. Morgan, but it was built upon the active and generous participation of professors from many departments.

Finally this integrating trend may be seen in a very significant attitude taken by the administration of the University itself. Mr. Rockefeller’s second grant ran out in 1935 and his personal contribution to the School was concluded at that time, but the Davison Fund, Incorporated (founded by John D. Rockefeller, Jr.), agreed to help, provided some plan should be adopted by which the administrative expenses of the School would be met from other sources. With this situation facing us, the University, under the leadership of President Eugene A. Gilmore, agreed to seek support out of state funds for the administrative work of the School, and with this understanding the Davison Fund made grants for two years. This made the period of the Rockefeller support of the School a complete decade. Invaluable as this support was, perhaps its greatest service was to pave the way for the University itself to take the position that it could well afford to finance the administrative phases of an idea so broadly conceived and so essential to all that culture and education mean.

During 1936-39, probably the most important thread of our story was the subjection of the whole plan to thorough critical analysis.
There was a revision of the constitution and bylaws of the School. The most important change was the merging of two boards into one. Originally there were a Board of Electors and a Board of Trustees. The former was made up of two “electors” from each participating religious group and of University electors equal in number to the total representing the religious groups. The only function of the electors was to elect the governing board, called the Board of Trustees. The chief purpose of this dual arrangement was to provide a “buffer” between the constituent groups and the governing board. In the revised plan, which still operates, there is only one board, all of whose members are elected by the Board, subject to the prior approval of the several groups they represent. It was felt that the Board of Electors did not have a sufficient function to justify its existence, and that the new plan provided equally well for the unity and representative character of the governing board, and for all the “buffer” that was needed.

Another matter which received critical attention was the relationship of the School to extracurricular religious activities. It was agreed that this relationship should be vital but not formal, and that there should be clear differentiation between the two. It was recognized that the precise relationship between any professor and extracurricular religious work could not be determined by any single principle but would vary with each professor. It was also recognized that important as the School’s extracurricular service was, academic excellence should be its chief concern.

This period 1939-42 was characterized by steady growth along established lines and by the assurance which comes from meeting the inevitable changes of time. A new President, Virgil M. Hancher, came to the University, and there was a new Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, Harry K. Newburn. Moreover, during the whole life of the School up to 1940, George F. Kay had been both the President of its Board of Trustees and the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. Dr. Kay gave up the deanship in 1940. He remained a member of the Board until his death in 1942, but insisted that the School should elect someone else as president. The new president was F. C. Waples of Cedar Rapids, whose term of office, like Dean Kay’s, was long continued.

The School by this time had met about every possible change of official personnel. Some of these changes involved the best friends the School ever had. Personal factors are of the highest importance in an enterprise like this, but a sense of the intrinsic worth of the School has been deepened by its growth through changing leadership. One could not ask for friendlier or more constructive administrative supervision than the School has enjoyed from the successive presidents and deans.
1942-45 were war years. One member of the School's faculty, Rabbi Morris N. Kertzer, was given leave in 1943 to serve as an army chaplain. He was on the Anzio beachhead, was among the first to enter liberated Rome, later served in France, and returned to his work in the School in the fall of 1945.

The period was marked by uninterrupted work, despite the war; also by a growing confidence in the School on the part of all its constituents. The University showed this confidence in many ways. For example, the School was requested to participate in a new program of “core courses.” This program, adopted by the College of Liberal Arts in 1944, required students who were candidates for the A.B. degree to take four “core courses,” one in each of four areas. “The Introduction to Religion,” later called “Religion in Human Culture,” was offered by the School and accepted as one of the core courses in “Historical-Cultural Studies.”

The religious groups also showed an increasing confidence and warmth of interest. Catholics started developing a student center on the west side of the Iowa River, and provision for the Catholic teacher in the School was part of their plan. Iowa’s Episcopal and Methodist bishops accepted membership on the School’s Board of Trustees. The Methodists, who constitute the largest denominational group in the University, incorporated financial support of the School in their official benevolences.

Religious groups not hitherto officially connected with the School also showed a mounting interest. A Unitarian minister initiated correspondence which led to the election of a Unitarian to the Board of Trustees. Many of the smaller religious groups accepted invitations to participate in the work of the School; for example, they sent representatives to speak and answer questions in the radio class “Little Known Religious Groups,” taught by Professor Marcus Bach. The favorable attitude of the general public was revealed by the fact that despite our presentation over the air of viewpoints about which people are sensitive, the response was almost without exception warmly appreciative.

The Board of Trustees itself reflected this growing confidence in the School by amending the bylaws so as to double its membership and thus utilize the increasing interest of faculty, religious leaders and the state at large.

Probably the most distinctive development during 1945-48 was a clarification of the School’s policy toward its faculty. Requests had been received from various sources for additional teachers on the staff. To meet this situation a plan was drawn up which, on the one hand, recognized the three main divisions among religions in America—Jews, Catholics, Protestants—and, on the other, attempted to avoid sectarian
emphasis by observing principles of fairness, of balance, and of unity in diversity. The plan, in essential part, was as follows:

1. Whenever any denomination or, preferably, group of denominations desires to support a teacher on the staff, the way is open to consider such a proposal provided, first of all, the supporting group or groups are willing to have such a teacher function, however strictly or loosely, as a Jew, a Catholic, or a Protestant, without any additional denominational label in staff relationships.

2. The fundamental qualifications of any teacher in the School are: academic fitness comparable to that required in other departments of the University, spiritual fitness as judged by his own religious group, and the practical fitness of a genuinely cooperative spirit in team play, as required by the interfaith character of the School.

3. Additional teachers should be selected, so far as possible, so as to give additional balance to the staff, (a) in its proportionate representation of the religious bodies of Iowa; (b) in its representation of the various fields of specialized religious study; and (c) in its representation of major schools of religious thought.

4. The primary professional responsibility of every teacher in the School should be to the School itself.

5. Any established religious faith may participate in the educational work of the School by providing lecturers who will give instructions at stated times, or for blocks of time, in courses offered by and under the supervision of the regular staff.

6. “Guest lecturers” may be invited to teach for limited periods.

7. This policy has grown out of the genius and experience of the School. It is subject to modification in the light of future developments.

Under the provision for “guest teachers,” which was used for the first time in this period, Howard Thurman, distinguished Negro, gave courses in mysticism, and O. D. Foster, who had become an authority on Latin America, gave courses on “Approaches to Inter-American Understanding.” T. Z. Koo, distinguished Chinese, became “guest teacher” during the first semester of 1948-49, offering a course on “Spiritual Insights of Chinese Culture.”

The high mark of enrollment in the School’s courses for one year was reached in 1947-48. The number was 2,407, counting enrollment in the two semesters and the summer session separately. This record corresponded with the growth of university enrollment, due to the coming of the GI’s. The School’s courses have always been optional.

During 1948-51 it was natural that consideration should be given to the implications for the School of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the McCollom Case. This decision declared unconstitu-
tional a plan of released-time religious instruction in Champaign, Illinois. It was the judgment of all the legal advisers of the School that the decision did not necessarily have any adverse implications for the School. There were so many differences between the two situations that no application of the decision was deemed possible. Moreover, the decision itself states that it applies only to the plan at Champaign, and that it must not arbitrarily be applied to any other. However, since the School involves a form of cooperation between the University and religious denominations, it was thought advisable by the Board to state as clearly as possible in its Articles of Incorporation that the objectives of the School are of a strictly educational character. Hence Article II of these Articles was revised to read as follows:

**Article II**

The objects of this corporation shall be:

1. To provide courses that will help students gain an understanding of the history and literature of religion and a thoughtful insight into its nature and meaning.

2. To foster through the study of religion an appreciation of the spiritual values in human culture.

In this and other ways, the Board sought to make additionally clear that the School is designed to present the facts of religion sympathetically but without indoctrination, to reveal both differences and likenesses among historic and contemporary religions, and to provide for the study of the whole role of religion in human culture without obscuring any essential element—least of all its significance in the life of those who teach it, yet with no appeal for response from students except the appeal of all good education to broader and deeper understanding, to integrity and to self-fulfillment.

The period 1951-54 was one of celebration and of the search for a new director. In May of 1952 the School observed the twenty-fifth anniversary of its operation. At a University Vespers three distinguished speakers discussed the place of religion in tax-supported higher education. They were Rabbi Arthur Lelyveld, National Director of the B’nai B’rith Hillel Foundations, U.S. District Judge William F. Riley, a Catholic, and Professor Clarence P. Shedd of the Divinity School of Yale University. At the School’s annual luncheon, attended by 200 guests, talks about the philosophy and achievements of the School were made by Catholic Bishop Ralph L. Hayes, Methodist Bishop Charles W. Brashares, Rabbi Eugene Mannheimer, Chancellor Rufus H. Fitzgerald, and President Virgil M. Hancher. Another feature of the observance was the publication of an historical account of the School entitled *Of Faith*
and Learning, written by Professor Marcus Bach. Still another feature was the publication of Campus Prayers—a booklet of prayers which had been offered on various occasions by the author of this Story of an Idea. The booklet was presented to him as a gift from the School’s Board of Trustees. Moreover, the twenty-fifth anniversary was widely publicized in the press. This led to a great increase in the number of inquiries about the School.

The search for a new director required much of this period. It led to the election of Robert Michaelsen who had been a teacher in the School from 1947 to 1951 and, since then, had studied at Harvard on a Ford Foundation grant and had become a professor at Yale.

During 1954-57 the School’s program was vigorously extended in significant ways. For example, a plan was carried through whereby the National Lutheran Council supplied funds for the employment of a teacher, with the understanding that this teacher should function on the School’s staff not as a Lutheran but simply as a Protestant. This was in accord with the Board’s policy as stated on pages 8 and 9. The plan has proved very satisfactory, and the School’s staff was thereby enlarged and strengthened.

Then, during this period, the School arranged pioneering conferences in cooperation with other units of the University. Thus, William G. Pollard, nuclear physicist and Episcopal clergyman, was brought to the campus for a stay of two weeks. He lectured in many classes and led discussions in two conferences, one for teachers of science and the other for clergymen. Another example was a series of conferences on “Ministering to the Sick,” sponsored jointly by the School and the University’s graduate program in hospital administration. The object was to explore means by which clergy, physicians, and hospital staff might work together in the care of patients. Likewise, with the assistance of the Old Gold Development Fund, the School offered a series of lectures on “Science and Religion.” The first of these was by Dean Harold K. Schilling of Pennsylvania State University. This lecture was dedicated as a memorial to Professor George W. Stewart, a founder of the School, under whom Dr. Schilling had studied. Other lecturers were Gregory Zilboorg, psychiatrist, and William F. Albright, orientalist.

Another colorful innovation was made possible by the Danforth Foundation, which provided leaders and funds for a short-term course in “Religious Perspectives in College Training.” The course was given under the direction of Professor Michaelsen in the summer of 1957 and was open to teachers in disciplines other than religion. Twenty-four such teachers were enrolled. The course was repeated in the summer of 1958, with an enrollment of twenty-five.
A dramatic extension of the School’s influence was a trip to Europe in the early summer of 1957 by Professors Welch, Bargebuhur, and Forell—Catholic, Jew, Protestant—who jointly visited universities in Germany, Switzerland, and France for the purpose of describing the philosophy and work of the School. One feature was a broadcast by the trio over Radio Free Europe. The trip was arranged by European friends of the School, and was financed by Craig Sheaffer, a trustee.

A symbol of the expansion of the School during this period was a doubling of its office space. Several new offices were equipped so that each member of the staff had much improved facilities for study and conference.

Distinguishing the period 1957-60 there was a great expansion of the School’s graduate work, with no lessening of its other activities.

When the School was coming into existence, Dean Carl E. Seashore expressed the view that equal emphasis should be put upon graduate and undergraduate work, but this was not done. It was generally agreed that the first and primary purpose of the School was to provide an opportunity for undergraduates to study religion as a part of general education. Yet the School has always made some provision for graduate study. During the first twenty-five years, thirteen students won the Ph.D degree and twenty-eight the M.A. degree. But the number of graduate students mounted to forty. Of these, eight were candidates for the Ph.D., and twenty-three were preparing for the Ph.D. comprehensive examinations.

Many things were done to enrich the graduate program. For example, provision was made to employ graduate students in the School’s work, notably as assistants in the core course, where they led discussion sections. Moreover, policies were developed for a more rigorous selection of graduate students and for a type of guidance which made increasing demands upon both the students and the staff.

This effort to enlarge and improve graduate work was climaxed by a successful appeal to the Danforth Foundation, which granted $40,000 for two specific purposes: to make possible the appointment of an additional full-time professor for at least a three-year period, and to provide visiting lecturers, each of whom was to come to the campus for periods of time ranging up to one semester.

The School’s graduate program is the only one in an American state university which leads to a doctorate in religion. A unique feature of the program is that every student, whatever his religious background, is required to become familiar with the history and thought of Judaism, Roman Catholicism, and Protestantism, and also with the living non-Western religions.
The triennium, 1960-63, was a period of experiment and steady growth. Enrollment of students for 1962-1963 was 2,435, the highest of any year. Over 600, mostly freshmen, were enrolled in the course RELIGION IN HUMAN CULTURE. There were 59 graduate students, of whom 18 were candidates for the Ph.D degree, 27 were preparing for the Ph.D. comprehensive examinations, and 8 for the M.A. (Recent graduates with the Ph.D. degree were teaching in West Virginia, Texas, Kentucky, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Australia, and Iowa.) A unique and very significant advance was the formation of a plan by which three theological schools in Dubuque, Iowa, will cooperate with the School of Religion in making available the resources of all to students pursuing graduate study. One of these schools is Roman Catholic, one is Lutheran, and one is Presbyterian. (Specifics of this plan are furnished on request.) Moreover, the Danforth Foundation made a second grant in the amount of $18,000, to be matched by University funds, to enable the School to continue engaging distinguished scholars for limited and extended periods of time, of the caliber of those who taught, particularly on the graduate level, during this triennium, viz., Rabbi A. J. Heschel, Dr. W. F. Albright, and Dr. David M. Stanley, S. J., New Testament specialist who was on the faculty for most of the period. (See reference to Father Stanley in TIME May 3, 1963, Religion section.)

Because of this growth the University assigned to the School new and enlarged space for its offices and work, to be occupied by the fall of 1963. Provision was also made for the appointment of an assistant to the administrative director.

A strong stabilizing factor in all of this growth was a continuing regular faculty. There was no change of personnel during the period, and only a very few for a much longer time. The School also owed much to an office secretary of long service.

By board policy the tenure of board presidents has been briefer in recent years than at the beginning. The sequence of presidents has been impressive: Dean George F. Kay, Frank Waples, Professor George W. Stewart, Robert Lappen, Francis J. O’Connor, Judge Henry N. Graven, Philip D. Adler—outstanding men dedicated to the ideals of the School.

The following summarizes the current activities at the School:

Areas of Study:

- Religion in Human Culture
- The Old Testament
- The New Testament
- Jewish History
The Catholic Church
Protestant Christianity
The Religions of Mankind
Religion in America
Correspondence Courses and Saturday Classes

Typical Extracurricular Activities:

- Personal Counseling
- Advising Campus Religious Groups
- Conferences on Ethical and Religious Questions
- University Lectures by Religious Leaders
- Radio Broadcasts over WSUI:
  - Classroom Broadcasts
  - Interviews and Discussions
- News Bulletins

This, then, is the story of an idea as it has developed over a period of forty-two years. But just as it would be impossible to trace all the beginnings of the story, so it is impossible to tell how it will weave itself out in the days to come. Prudence suggests that we should not look upon the idea as inevitable or the story as self-perpetuating. We are living in a world where an idea like this will not perpetuate itself automatically. It will always have to fight its way against prejudice, misunderstanding, cynicism, and indifference, even against a false sense of security on the part of its friends. Nevertheless, we are entitled to take high hope from the fact that for more than a generation it has shown itself to be a virile idea, and to believe that if it continues to be fair to all participating groups, sympathetic with the fundamental purposes of a state university, and concerned to be both educational and religious in the best sense of these terms, it will continue to attract people of insight and good intentions, and to sustain the enthusiasm of those who come under its spell.
Historical List of the Faculty

Administrative Directors
M. Willard Lampe, Ph.D., 1927-Dec. 31, 1953
Robert Michaelsen, Ph.D., Jan. 1, 1954-

Catholic Teachers
Rev. Henry K. Takkenberg, M.A., 1927-Feb., 1929
Rev. William P. Shannahan, Feb.-June, 1929
Rev. J. Elliot Ross, Ph.D., 1929-1930
Christian Richard, Ph.D., Feb., 1936-39
Rev. Donald Hayne, M.A., 1939-42
Rev. Joseph B. Code, Ph.D., 1942-43
Rev. Bonaventure Schwinn, Ph.D., 1943-44
Rev. J. Ryan Beiser, Ph.D., 1944-49
Rev. Robert J. Welch, M.A., 1949-
Rev. David J. Bowman, S.J., 1958-59 (2nd Semester)

Jewish Teachers
Maurice H. Farbridge, M.A., 1927-29
Moses Jung, Ph.D., 1929-39
Rabbi Morris N. Kertzer, 1939-46
Rabbi Gilbert Klapermann, 1943-45
Rabbi Judah Goldin, D.H.L., 1946-51
Frederick P. Bargebuhr, Ph.D., 1951-
Rabbi Ben-Zion Gold, 1957-58
Leo W. Schwarz, M.A., 1960-62

Protestant Teachers
Rev. Charles A. Hawley, Ph.D., 1927-37
Rev. David C. Shipley, Ph.D., 1942-45
Rev. Robert Michaelsen, Ph.D., 1947-51
Rev. Cyrus R. Pangborn, Ph.D., 1951-54
Rev. Robert L. Campbell, Ph.D., 1955-56
Rev. James C. Spalding, Ph.D., 1956-
Rev. Franklin Sherman, M.A., 1958-61
Rev. George W. Forell, Th.D., 1954-58; 1961-

Teachers with Special Assignments
William H. Morgan, Ph.D., 1930-41
Marcus Bach, Ph.D., 1941-1963

Guest Teachers
O. D. Foster, Ph.D., 1945-47
Rev. Howard Thurman, D.D., 1946 (Summer), 1947-48 (2nd Semester)
T. Z. Koo, LL.D., 1948-49 (1st Semester)
Winston L. King, Ph.D., 1955 (Summer)

Teachers under the Danforth Grant
Abraham J. Heschel, Ph.D., 1960-61 (2nd Semester)
William F. Albright, Ph.D., 1961-62 (2nd Semester)
David M. Stanley, S.J., S.S.D., 1961-