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Preface

"In life, change and growth often summon feelings of joy accompanied by pangs of sorrow. This emotional dialectic shifts from an anticipatory joy for unknown changes that open exciting new dimensions, to a memorial sorrow founded in the "known" past and the loss of this known construct or definition. Celebration stands between these reactions, mediating and ultimately transcending the apparent juxtaposition of these emotions and sentiments....

Messiah's Philadelphia Campus, brainchild of notable educators Ernest Boyer, Albert J. Meyer, and D. Ray Hostetter, has inspired many who have walked across the threshold at 2026 North Broad Street. For 36 years the Campus has rocked the foundations of young Christians as they have actively and reflectively engaged the campus community, our North Philadelphia neighborhood, and the City. This location, provocatively raising questions regarding the ideals this City has come to represent and our Christian faith is perceived to uphold, has required both students and faculty/staff to step back and reconsider the boxes they inscribe on the world and readjust the parameters and areas in which their faith extends and how their faith extends. Yet, this Campus has also faced its share of difficult times.

This project piecing together the history of Messiah's Philadelphia Campus, bridges the dialectic between joy and sorrow; it is a celebration of historical motion, marked both by continuity and change. This "celebration" not only highlights a way for redemption and reconciliation for Messiah's Philadelphia Campus, but in acknowledging and celebrating the history of our campus we also acknowledge and celebrate our neighborhood and city. These are valuable and vital spaces. These are places for life and growth and a community-wide determination to achieve these goals. Just as celebration transcends the dichotomy of joy and sorrow, the Philadelphia Campus' history moves us beyond the pedagogies that have created and shaped its existence. We have heard it said, but truly, what other program (at any college) garners the glowing respect and timeless devotion former students of the campus have showered upon it? Speaking as an alum, our experience at the Philadelphia Campus is not defined by the pedagogy and purpose of an era, but the place and the people, our context, that make it the incredible destination for embarking on lifelong journey of learning that it is.

Bethany Parliament '02

Dr. LaGrand: I took out her 2nd paragraph, which was extraneous (thought). I would still like to use them, but would like to discuss it with you. Maybe Thurs. or Fri? Will turn in the last section asap. Thank you for your patience!
I. Beginnings

"[The urban center is] one of the most exciting and innovative ventures we have undertaken, one that will require great investments of thought and imagination."
C.O. Wittlinger, Academic Dean, Messiah College, 1967

In 1968, Messiah College launched an innovative relationship with Temple University, which would come to be called “The Philadelphia Campus.” It is fundamentally important to note that from the very beginning, this idea was the result of many conversations and meetings. Thus, it is impossible to attribute the credit for the idea to one person, or even one conversation.

When D. Ray Hostetter assumed the Presidency of Messiah College in 1964, an atmosphere of expectation pervaded the campus. Hostetter wanted to move the campus forward during his presidency. E. Morris Sider, in writing a history of the College, wrote the following about Hostetter’s outlook upon entering office. “He saw a tremendous future for Messiah College, but to achieve that promise would mean not settling for mediocrity.”

The school had been accredited as a degree-granting four year college in 1963. In 1964, there were approximately 250 students at Messiah College and academic offerings were limited to theology and Christian ministries courses along with the typical complement of liberal arts courses that many colleges of similar size offered, including history, English, and math, as well as professional programs in home economics and nursing. The physical plant consisted of Old Main, Hoffman, and Hostetter Chapel. By the end of his presidency, Messiah was a completely different institution. In 1984, Sider reflected that, “Such developments as greatly increased enrollments, rapid expansion of facilities, and successful

---
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management of funds do not, of course, happen by chance; they suggest careful and long-range planning. Indeed, committee reports and minutes from the time period reflect that Hostetter and others were very aware that they were on the cusp of great potential for growth and innovation.

One of the clearest signs of change was the establishment in 1967 of a Philosophy Study Committee whose task it was to reexamine the College’s institutional philosophy. A memo from the President to the committee on July 31 of that year stated that

...we will miss a timely opportunity if we do not deal with coming to a meeting of minds on the cardinal aims of the College at this time. Otherwise, I fear, we will merely walk out of habit and imitation as a Christian liberal arts college...We need at this time a detailed specification of our distinctive purposes, I believe, worse than we need a theoretical statement. Although extremely difficult it is very necessary....Priorities are rarely discussed by colleges, but unless we decide on priorities that are timely and up to date, we have no firm guide for a program of uniqueness, no basis for pioneering a new way and new emphasis designed to meet the challenge of a new age, no basis for imagination or creativity, and we will have no precise way of knowing...whether the curriculum is a clear reflection of institutional purpose.4

Hostetter recognized that with regional accreditation came new responsibility to offer a rigorous and unique educational experience. From this, as well as other writings of his, it is clear that throughout much of his professional career, Hostetter was greatly concerned with the state of Christian higher education. As president of a small college with a distinctive faith commitment, he was prepared to pioneer new educational opportunities in order to make Messiah an institution that would stand out among others in the field of higher education. A reputation for innovation and excellence would not only serve Messiah well, it would prepare students to live in a “new age” and serve as a role model for other institutions, especially those of secular nature. At the time, large universities had been

---

3 The College was first accredited in 1951 to grant degrees in Theology and Religious Education.
3 Sider, 246.
4 D. Ray Hostetter, memorandum to Philosophy Study Committee, 31 July 1967.
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criticized roundly for being “multi-versities,” too pluralistic and broadly focused to make much of an impact on students or society. Hostetter had already begun envisioning the ideal of a Christian university. In one paper on the topic, he wrote, “the Christian University will probably be closer to the ideal of the university than today’s fragmented, pluralistic institutions...because of its commitment to unity, to wholeness, and to a coherent center for truth.” Toward the end of his tenure as President, many feared that Messiah might indeed be the institution he proposed to move toward university-hood. But Hostetter was more creative than that. In a recent interview he explained that, “the university was never going to be on Grantham campus. I thought it could be at Temple or an even more prestigious college or university, or near several, but have the full prospect of growth in its own right.” Hostetter believed that “a Christian university must be in dialogue with secular universities and the ideas coming from them,” because proximity to a wide variety of institutions would encourage much-needed discussion between students and faculty of diverse backgrounds. These ideas characterize Hostetter’s presidency; he was both an administrator and a visionary. About his administrative style, Hostetter admitted that “one thing that might characterize my administration is that I liked to think into the future about a decade.” Albert J. Meyer, a leader in education and professor at Goshen College recalled that, “years before “diversity” had become a key word in American higher education, Ray spoke of the importance of intercultural experience for students. He also spoke of the value of having a diversity of value-based college programs on a university campus.” While many

---

Christians felt that Christian higher education should be separate from “the world,” including secular institutions of higher learning, Hostetter envisioned a relationship of collaboration, mutual respect, and communication.

It is also important to consider the wider socio-cultural context of the United States during the late 1960s as the Philadelphia Campus became a dream and then a reality. John Yeatts, who was a student at the time the Campus opened, said it felt as though “the world was coming apart. Martin Luther King died, Bobby Kennedy died,...the cities were burning...everyone’s attention was focused on the city.”9 Even those in rural Grantham could not ignore the Civil Rights movement, the anti-war movement, and the increasingly global nature of world affairs. As the College’s leadership looked to the future, they recognized that it would be important to educate students to be able to live in, or at least understand the urban setting, to be conscious of social problems, and appreciate diversity. It is clear that the national events of this era played a large role in the choice of Philadelphia and Temple University as potential partners.

In 1966, Albert J. Meyer began conducting research on a report for the Mennonite Board of Education (MBE). Meyer had been teaching physics at Goshen College in Indiana and was asked to study the topic of “church-related sub-communities” at colleges and universities across the United States, Canada, and Europe. Due to what they perceived to be the increasing secularization of education, the MBE felt that it was time for a study of some kind to document whether Christian communities in higher education were important

---

9 John Yeatts, in interview with the author.
for faith and scholarship integration. Explaining the desired outcome of the report, Meyer wrote,

The project design included visits with some leading American educators and an individual visit with each of the eleven presidents of the Council of Mennonite and Affiliated Colleges. The purpose of the visits to the presidents was to inform them of the resources available to them through the project and to explore with them individually ways in which new structures might help them better achieve their educational objectives.10

Before he had a chance to speak with Messiah College representatives, Meyer attended the National Conference on Higher Education in Chicago, which was put on by the Association for Higher Education. It was there, in March of 1967 that he spoke with Ernest L. Boyer, who was presenting at this conference, about his research. They had spoken in the past about the concept of residential colleges and Meyer desired feedback on this most recent study.11 During their conversation, Boyer mentioned that D. Ray Hostetter was also attending the conference, and they arranged a meeting with him for the following day. Meyer recalls that, “Ernie and I discussed the SAR project. He was interested and suggested we meet with D. Ray Hostetter, president of Messiah College, the following evening.”12 On the second day of the conference, the three men got together and Meyer outlined his study. He later wrote that,

We discussed the possibility that Messiah might consider the establishment of a residential college on a university campus and keep the Grantham program an arts program as an alternative to expansion at Grantham into elementary education, home economics options, business administration, engineering, etc.13

---

Whatever the pretext for this conversation, by the end, all three men were intent on pursuing this idea further. Meyer must have seen this as a practical way in which his study could be of use to Christian higher education, even before it was published, but more than that, the idea seemed to express what he considered to be an ideal environment for education. Looking back recently, he reflected that,

In the SAR project, I was particularly interested in ways church sub-colleges could offer distinctive programs in general education. I was interested especially in the way a Messiah sub-college at Temple could offer a distinctive general education “package” for many students beginning their studies at the sub-college starting with the freshman year. I would have seen Messiah at Temple attracting some urban and minority students who would not have been interested in beginning at the Grantham campus, as well as some who wanted to enter programs not available at Grantham.14

By this time, Boyer had been on the Board of Trustees at Messiah for some time, having been recruited by Hostetter early in his presidency. He would have had an interest in advancing his alma mater’s educational program as well as seeing his ideas on collaboration enacted, for by this time, he had published several articles on this topic. From this point on, D. Ray Hostetter would have the greatest impact in the shaping of Messiah’s urban campus. It was he who brought the idea back to Messiah and began conversations about its viability. He would remain a strong supporter and champion of the idea throughout his administration. These three innovators remained in close correspondence throughout the beginning phases of the Campus’ development.

As early as one month later, the Board of Trustees met to discuss the idea of a branch campus affiliated with Messiah College. In reflecting on this meeting, Meyer wrote that, “As it developed, it became clear that Ernest Boyer and...others were especially interested in an urban center or college that would give students from rural backgrounds

inner-city experiences.”\textsuperscript{15} Many in leadership at Messiah were concerned about students’ level of engagement with the city and the idea of an urban satellite campus seemed like an appealing remedy for this quandary.

By July 1967, Messiah had received the first of three Title III grants from the United States Office of Education. The $10,000.00 grant was part of the 1965 Higher Education Act, a key component of President Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society program. The money allocated for these grants was meant “to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education.”\textsuperscript{16} As a small, developing college, Messiah was a good example of the kinds of institutions Johnson hoped to aid through these measures. That same week in July, Hostetter drafted a letter to six universities, explaining Messiah’s interest in a partnership. He wrote, “While we did not apply for the 10,000 grant for the above purpose, we are extremely pleased to receive it and want to fully investigate cooperation ideas.”\textsuperscript{17} Among the institutions who received a letter was Pennsylvania State University, with whom Messiah already had a cooperative program in order to grant degrees in nursing.

In discussing how best to approach the targeted institutions, Boyer suggested that, “Messiah should be specific rather than general in terms of its long range goals, and yet begin the relationship on a very modest and workable basis. As I see it, the discussion should begin at the highest administrative levels and in time involve faculty who may need

\textsuperscript{15} Meyer, “Report on ‘Messiah College...’,” 2.
\textsuperscript{17} D. Ray Hostetter, letter to Horton G. Stever, 25 August 1967.
to promote the program internally and see that the plans actually work." Thus, by August 25th of that year, Hostetter had contacted the presidents of Carnegie-Mellon University, University of Pittsburgh, Drexel Institute of Technology, University of Pennsylvania, and Temple University requesting a meeting to discuss the idea further.

Five institutions responded favorably to the idea and meetings were scheduled. Carnegie-Mellon regretfully declined further discussion due to the pressures and complications of their recent merger. In September, Meyer and Hostetter traveled to Philadelphia to meet with representatives from each of the three universities there. By this point, Messiah had already decided that partnering with an institution in an urban setting was a priority, thus disqualifying Penn. State from consideration. Hostetter and Meyer discussed the idea at UPenn first, on the morning of September 21, 1967. Although the University's representatives continued to be interested, some obvious problems soon became clear. Due to budgetary constraints, tuition was significantly higher than Messiah's. In addition, space to build upon, or even to house a small pilot program was not readily available and from the Messiah representatives' point of view, it was necessary to retain the possibility of expansion. As well, UPenn's admissions standards would have excluded some Messiah students. While the University's representatives remained open to the idea, it was clear that the situation was not ideal.

Later that same day, Meyer and Hostetter met with administrators at Temple University, including Dr. Edwin Adkins who at the time, was serving as Associate Vice President for Research and Program Development. Adkins was very familiar with Goshen

---

19 See Appendix A.
College and the Mennonite church and expressed a great deal of interest in working with a Mennonite-affiliated institution. Temple had just received money from the state and was growing rapidly. After the visit, Meyer wrote, “there is an urban and service orientation, rather than an elitist atmosphere.” Adkins continued to impress the Messiah representatives by outlining Temple’s development plan and relating it to the proposed collaboration by clearly showing how such a partnership would further Temple’s visions for the future, going so far as to suggest that the University hoped to gather several residential colleges around it, which might represent several denominational and faith backgrounds. In addition, Adkins also expressed interest in what Messiah College could bring to Temple in regard to a diversified curriculum. In general, there seemed to be a significant amount of agreement and openness in this meeting to a degree unrivaled by any of the others scheduled for the tour and so Temple remained high on the list of potential partners. In writing about this experience, Meyer referenced a passage in Lewis Mayhew and Hugh Brown’s *American Higher Education*, which was published in 1965.

As urban life comes more and more to dominate the life-style of the nation, one can argue that those institutions which embrace the city and help solve its problems will grow in influence. Institutions such as San Francisco State College, Brooklyn College, Temple University, and the University of Chicago may well come to be the true intellectual leaders.  

It is not difficult, then, to understand why Temple would have seemed to be an obvious and wise choice for Messiah College’s invitation to collaboration. Boyer was not able to attend these meetings, but he did join them in the evening to discuss potential models for the program.

---

The next day, Hostetter and Meyer met with Drexel administrators, at which point it became clear that there were significant barriers to the development of a pilot in conjunction with their school, as well. Once again, tuition was high and scheduling appeared to be problematic as well. Full-time Drexel students would be given priority and their year was arranged on a quarter system which did not correspond with Messiah’s calendar. That afternoon, they flew to Pittsburgh to meet representatives at the University of Pittsburgh where the same kinds of issues surfaced. Distance was also a clear obstacle, however, both Drexel and UPitt continued to be highly favorable toward the idea and all four universities requested a prospectus further outlining the details of such a partnership.

Hostetter began writing just such a document right away, which came to be titled, “Study Prospectus for a Messiah College Urban Center or College.” In it, he asserted that

The small college with a valid ‘justification for existence’ should seek to find ways of taking its respective strengths and affiliating with the strengths of a large institution. Hopefully, the large universities will perceive such affiliation as not only a factor in conserving the strong independent college and educational diversity, but also as a means of contributing to the solution of some of the problems associated with “bigness” and enhancing their own educational community.²²

Through this proposal, Hostetter had found a practical way of enacting the new Philosophy statement he had encouraged the College to embrace. Of course, the true benefit of this relationship would hopefully be felt by the students. Hostetter went on to write that, as far as students as his college were concerned, many

...come largely from rural or small town backgrounds and thus become inhabitants of a campus that is also somewhat isolated in location. Upon completion of their preparation, these very students are almost certain to live, and work, in a more highly
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²² D. Ray Hostetter, “Study Prospectus for a Messiah College Urban Center or College,” 10 October 1967, 2.
urbanized society. It is somewhat absurd to speculate that they are being educated properly if they have received little in the way of cross-cultural association and interchange and have not been exposed to "where the action is" in today's world.23

Indeed, the concern that students should be educated for an increasingly urbanized future is repeated again and again throughout the writings of this period, both at Messiah and in the national community of educators. Not only would such a partnership enhance the development of the institutions and people involved, it would also foster diversity at both institutions, encourage dialogue between people with different world views, and it would be distinctive in higher education. At that time, no other Christian college of Messiah's size had proposed creating something so extraordinary as a satellite campus on a public university campus. Recently, Albert Meyer reflected on the experience of pitching the proposal to Temple University administrators during their initial meeting. He wrote,

I will never forget a question raised at a meeting with the Temple administrators: How could Messiah assure Temple that its sub-college would offer a genuinely innovative and different undergraduate program? The Temple administrators and the rest of us present wanted the new venture to be an model for exciting liberal arts education—a model that might be replicated and enliven arts education for the whole undergraduate program of Temple University.24

It was projected that the Campus would be both for students interested in completing majors not offered at Messiah through Temple's programs, and also for those who sought enrichment of a program already in existence at Messiah, who might come more for the experience of the city than academic necessity. Service was also to be a large part of the vision for the new Campus. In his Prospectus, Hostetter explained that, "Messiah College has a deep philosophical commitment to instilling in young people a vision for enlightened service. This dimension of educating for service to society is almost farcical

unless the student is aware of the prevailing dilemmas of man and the nature and context of his great problems in urban society.”

Thus, the new Center was to provide a multi-faceted living and learning context for all involved, from both institutions, as well as a model that would be distinctive throughout higher education. Initial predictions suggested that within a short period of time, enrollment would be large enough to justify building a high rise facility. It was expected that, “after the program is established, there would be several hundred students enrolled with a maximum of four to five-hundred students. It is perceived that at the point enrollment goes beyond approximately four-hundred students a second center or college would need to be started in order to maintain optimal educational benefit.”

Hostetter and others believed that the Messiah Living-Learning Center, as it was sometimes called, would be immensely popular and appeal to many students in a way that would enrich and enhance Messiah’s population and programs in Grantham, rather than compete with it unhealthily. At the time, Hostetter predicted that,

> With the opening of an urban center, it is not expected that this will in any way curtail enrollment at the base campus, but rather it is supposed that this novel approach and the addition of curriculum possibilities will greatly increase admission requests. While the future is unknown, the movement of higher education would lead one to speculate that perhaps at some time the center of gravity in enrollment may move to the urban college or colleges as compared to Messiah’s campus in the ‘haven setting.’ Perhaps in that event [students] would be [interested in] a ‘retreat semester’ to the ‘haven campus’ for contemplation and reflection [to]...get away from ‘the real world.’

It should not be surprising, given the radical proposals contained in just this one section of the Prospectus, that many members of the Messiah College community in

---

25 Hostetter, “Study Prospectus...,” 4. It is interesting to note how closely Hostetter’s words mirror those of John Dewey who in his *Moral Principles in Education*, published in 1959, wrote that “the only way to prepare for social life is to engage in social life. To form habits of social usefulness and serviceableness apart from any direct social need and motive, apart from any existing social situation, is, to the letter, teaching the child to swim by going through motions outside of water.” (14)


Grantham were seriously disturbed by the plans for a second campus. Faculty feared that
taking advantage of the broad coarse offerings at the University would force their own small
programs to stagnate. There was also concern over exposing students to the secular
worldview(s) they might encounter at Temple. And as one faculty member opined, in a
letter written to the President around this time,

"Perhaps it is something of a myth that students on a large university campus are
closer to the "real" problems: I myself attended three large universities and all of them had
very much of an ivory tower complex...My basic commitments are still to the small Christian
college; otherwise I should now be teaching at some place like Temple University."

Thus, the decision to open a campus with Temple was seen as a risky move, and
one that placed Messiah at a clear crossroads: stay a small, distinctive, Christian
community, or become a large, secular multi-versity.

Yet despite opposition plans moved quickly due to strong support from both
President Hostetter and members of the Board of Trustees, including Boyer. Even the
Academic Dean, Carlton O. Wittlinger, was soon replaced by a more willing participant: Dr.
Daniel Chamberlain. By 1967, Wittlinger was nearing retirement and had little time to
spend setting up a new campus. So Hostetter asked Chamberlain, who was working,
ironically enough, for Boyer at the SUNY offices in Albany, New York. Chamberlain was a
former president and dean of Upland College and had come to know Hostetter through
professional exchanges in regard to the merger of Upland's alumni association with
Messiah's in the early 1960s. So it was that even before officially assuming the office of

---

28 In a recent interview, Dr. Hostetter ruefully admitted that expressing such optimism at the beginning was
perhaps unwise and that as a more seasoned administrator, he would have been more cautious, considering
that faculty support is so important for a project of this nature and it is possible that some withdrew their
interest because the ideas would have seemed threatening at the time.
29 E. Morris Sider, letter to D. Ray Hostetter, undated
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Academic Dean, Chamberlain began assisting Hostetter in making the necessary preparations for a partnership with Temple University.

In October of 1967, the Academic Affairs Committee and Board of Trustees at Messiah College approved a pilot project to be initiated in September of 1968. A Philadelphia Campus Advisory Board was set up and its members included Trustees like Ernest Boyer, administrators from Grantham, Philadelphia community members, and future faculty and administrators of the Center. This Board would be responsible for all decisions related to curriculum and programming at the Center.

On October 26, 1967, Hostetter and other administrators made a second visit to Temple. Of this meeting, Meyer wrote,

The Temple representatives indicated definite interest both in a pilot project and in long-range developments that could involve a number of residential colleges. It was decided that a pilot project with fifteen to thirty students and a faculty complement of three or four persons supported by Messiah should be begun in September 1968.31

On March 22, 1968, a press conference was held at Temple University to announce the new partnership and a press release followed. Several members of each administration were present, including both Hostetter and Temple’s president Paul R. Anderson, but also in attendance were representatives from the United States Department of Education and the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. In acknowledging Messiah’s reasons for opening the Living-Learning Center, as it was termed, Hostetter was both forthright and optimistic.

Parts of his speech are excerpted here:

Messiah College values its smallness which provides a setting to better carry out its student development objectives. It also values its unique educational philosophy which is implemented by a highly qualified faculty. Yet, the College recognizes that it cannot meet the implications of the explosion of knowledge with the adequacy it wishes because it does not have the strength of curricular and facility resources of the large university...Messiah

31 Meyer, 6.
College views this first time experience in the United States as one that may have far-reaching effects on higher education. Indeed, each of the presenters during the conference commented on the history making potential of this venture. Dr. Muirhead from the United States Department of Education complimented both Presidents by saying, “I join with many others in saluting both the courage and the vision of these fine institutions as they turn their hand to an enterprise that may very well be an historic landmark in higher education.” Temple, as well as Messiah, stood to gain from the collaboration. President Anderson reiterated this by claiming that,

Even more do I recognize that a successful experience here in Philadelphia could benefit the future course and cause of the small college in America. Conversely the values Temple University should gain will strengthen the University in its supportive role as an ally of our liberal arts colleges. This therefore is an historic day here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as two institutions, vastly different in size, structure, and character yet with a unified spirit and goal join together in an endeavor not previously known in American education...Today we at Temple share a deep sense of appreciation for the trust placed in our hands along with Messiah College by the federal government as it makes funds available to carry out this experiment...We are also delighted that the Commonwealth of the City of Philadelphia can share the distinct privilege of seeing so unique an educational idea initiated here.

Thus the new venture was launched, with much pomp and circumstance, as well as a widespread sense of hope and expectation.

II. Launching the Vision: A Pilot Project

“Messiah has taken a great step forward; the years to come will show how great. The challenges to come are many; the awards available are great.” – Student editor, 1969 Clarion

“I must admit I have never been more impressed or proud of anything this college has undertaken than the new satellite center; 2026 North Broad Street has created a relaxed and natural environment which far surpasses anything I had even remotely contemplated.”

---

32 How does one cite a press conference?  
33 Press Conference!  
34 Press Conference!
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Elwood A. Pye, member of the first class of students at the Center, Ivy Rustles student newspaper, 1969.

By 1968, when the campus started, student population at the Grantham Campus had risen to 539, according to the President’s Report of that year. Initial projections expected the Campus to house 350 of the 1250-strong student body Messiah hoped to have in at least ten years. However, although these and other figures and proclamations of this time were acknowledged widely, the pilot project began on a much smaller scale. The Center was planned to house no more than thirty students, initially, and would offer only upper-divisional general education courses. Students would be required to take at least three credits of Messiah coursework from the Center and residence at the Center would also be mandatory. These regulations are important to note because they symbolize the two foundational characteristics of the Campus: continued academic engagement in the context of life in a small, Christian community. As though anticipating student protest, in the March 1968 Intercom which announced the Living-Learning Center curriculum, the committee responsible for these measures made sure to explain that, “our program will be placed at a serious disadvantage if we have students living with us during semesters when they have no direct academic involvement with our program.” Shortly after, the 2024, 2026, and 2028 buildings on north Broad Street were leased by the College.

The first semester, Fall of 1968, there were twelve participants, at least six of whom attended in order to complete a major not offered by Messiah. John Yeatts was a student at the time and described the students who participated in the first few years in this way:

...the students that first went down there...were down there because they were interested in causes. They were pretty politically sensitive young people. These were the

---

35 Fact check and where from.
36 Intercom, March 26, 1968.
Dr. Gerald Swaim was hired as the Dean of the Campus. He would serve as the primary administrator and would report to the President. Swaim had taught at Huntington College in Indiana which was also Mennonite-affiliated. Ronald J. Sider, who was finishing his doctorate at Yale University, was hired as a faculty member. Although Sider had planned to accept a teaching post in his native Canada, something about Messiah's offer appealed to him. Indeed, the choice was life-altering. In a video taped interview with students from the Philadelphia Campus in 1992, Sider explained that,

I was going to go up to Waterloo to teach Reformation History [before receiving the call to work at Messiah]. The Philadelphia Campus opened my life in exciting ways. It got me more involved. It was partially because of being at the Philadelphia Campus and teaching the Christianity and Contemporary Problems relating to the problems of the city course that I wrote my book and organized my political group in the U.S. and not in Canada. I would imagine that my life would have been fundamentally different if I had not come to the Philadelphia Campus.

In addition, at least two other people made up support staff at the Center, including Wendy Price, who worked in the food service department. By the end of the first year, the Center achieved an enrollment of twenty-four students for the fall semester of 1969. In 1970, after two years of operation, the Board of Trustees approved the adoption of the Center as a satellite campus—the pilot project had been declared a success. All parties were pleased by the results and expected it to grow rapidly. The townhouses at 2030 and 2032 north Broad Street were purchased soon after.

38 Daniel Chamberlain, in interview by author, 2 April 2004.
39 Quote from Presentation?
As early as the spring of 1971, the Center was challenging students in serious ways. One student contributor to the Clarion of that year asked, after a year spent in Philly: “Is the Messiah Center a realistic idea?” The student went on to explain that the practical and intellectual challenges students in the program faced did not have simple solutions. It is clear that the writer is questioning the practicality of the call to Christian service in a fallen world, as much as he or she questions Messiah’s program; the smaller question informs the other and vice versa. That same year, the Clarion’s front page showed two locations for the College, one in Grantham and the other in Philadelphia. Such a move symbolizes the closeness of identification with the new campus as a very real extension of Messiah College. At the same time, culture of unity due to small, intentional community developed. 1973 is the first time the Center community was likened to a family, a comparison that has been repeated through the years to the present day.

Students and faculty ate together in a communal cafeteria and all students and most staff lived on the campus. The cafeteria fostered unity for the small campus in ways that sometimes surprised visitors from the Grantham campus. Jay McDermond, who spent January Term at the Campus in 1973, remembers that,

...the other thing the Philadelphia Campus had that I thought was so intriguing was the fact that you could walk into the cafeteria and eat whenever and talk to whoever. Somebody’s always there, and not just other students, but like I said, Ron Sider, I mean, Ron Sider was famous. And Ron Sider actually sat down with me one day and we just talked. And I thought, “Gosh, am I going to be able to hold my own?” And he was just wonderfully engaging...And at Messiah, even back then, our profs were approachable but we never had lunch with them. And it kind of hit me that, what a wonderful learning environment this is where we actually eat lunch together everyday.41

40 p. 103
This strong sense of community was important in a time when tensions of all kinds, including political and racial, were high. McDermont remembered the following story about a time when these issues were addressed directly while he was at the Philadelphia Campus.

...somebody had something stolen while I was there, and we all were called together because some of the Euro-students had accused an African-American student of letting a friend in...then, something valuable disappeared and so it immediately [became] a race issue. And so everybody was called together and [we] worked at community...it was one of the great things about [the Philadelphia Campus], when you had sixty people, you could get everybody together, there was no excuse for not being there...Ron Sider did a great job of mediating that...I think that’s one of the first times that I saw...people actually attempting to pursue peace and reconciliation. I’d heard people talk about it, from a distance, abstractly, and this [incident] really concretized the fact that, not only do Christians say it’s important, but some Christians actually work at it.^{42}

Early in its life, the Living-Learning Center was achieving many of the objectives its engineers had hoped for. By 1976, people in both Philadelphia and Grantham had begun referring to the campus as the “Philadelphia Campus.”

Swaim left Messiah in 1973 and after a brief stint with Sider at the helm as Acting-Director, Abraham Davis was hired as the second Dean of the campus in 1975. By now, the Campus had expanded to include the 2016 and 2018 buildings, to make a total of seven townhouses in all. Although ways to expand further and increase enrollment were discussed, the PCAB decided not to pursue a decision at the time. Due to fears that Temple would expand across the street and buy up properties in the neighborhood, many in the community surrounding the Philadelphia Campus became very upset. From their point of view, this was yet another large conglomerate coming in to take away the integrity of their neighborhood and buy up their houses. At first many assumed the Messiah was part of Temple’s plans for development, although the differences were soon made clear, especially
as many members of the Philadelphia Campus community attended neighborhood churches. It is unclear how the controversies over expansion and the development of a “Clean Block Committee” by some in the area deterred Messiah from purchasing more facilities in the area.

During this time, Sider developed a course entitled, “Christianity and Contemporary Problems,” which was later adapted to Grantham’s integrated studies general education curriculum. This class dealt with the interface of Christianity and the social issues that those living at the Campus witnessed everyday in Philadelphia. Starting with this class, it has been a precedent that courses taught at the Philadelphia Campus are in part designed to help students make sense of the culture shock of living in north Philadelphia and experiencing what to many are completely foreign circumstances of deep poverty and deprivation. Sider’s family lived on campus and then near it and was very involved in campus life. Of those years, Sider recalls that he and the staff “…were delighted with the powerful impact on students that [the program] had. I probably spent more intense, personal time with students in those years than I ever have since.”

In addition to his work at the Campus, Sider also published several articles in various Christian magazines and educational journals, each pertaining to the uniqueness of the Philadelphia Campus as an educational model. As these pieces were published, a theme began to emerge: one of Sider’s main concerns was that students develop a concern for social justice. As he wrote in Religion in Life magazine in 1976, “If, as is the case with Messiah College, the cluster college is located in the inner city, it offers an ideal location for encouraging more concern
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42 McDermond, interview.
43 Ronald J. Sider in telephone interview by author,
for social justice among Christian college students. The effects of racism and poverty are painfully obvious if one lives for a semester or two in North Philadelphia! Many of the students had come for this purpose, but some had come to complete majors not yet offered in Grantham and less desire to reach out into the community.

In 1975 at a meeting of the Philadelphia Campus Advisory Board, which had met regularly since the Campus’ inception, usually on site at the Center, Sider requested that a review of the campus be conducted. It appears that this review was suggested in order to reevaluate the mission and purpose of the Center, in order to make improvements and receive feedback on the program in its eighth year. Although the review was, overall positive in that those who conducted it concluded that the Center was still worthwhile and doing important work, there were many changes and enhancements proposed. It is clear that the vision for expansion had not died by this point. As well, many students responded unfavorably to being forced to participate in service.

III. A shift in purpose

"More than 100 trips later, I have an entirely different feeling about the Philadelphia Campus. It is one of our success stories in almost every way. I view it as one of our strong program areas with great potential for the future." Jay Barnes, Dean of Student Life, "Philadelphia Campus Briefing Book for President Sawatsky," 1994

When Don Wingert came to the Philadelphia Campus, it was a viable program, but not yet performing up to potential, according to many involved with Messiah during that time. With new leadership came a subtle shift in purpose, though this was not expressed by a change in mission or purpose statement.

---

From the early 1970s, the number of majors that Grantham students could complete at Temple had been growing. By the time Dave Brandt came to Messiah to fill the position of Academic Dean in 1977, every major that Messiah has ever offered in conjunction with Temple, with the exception of the newest additions in 2002 and computer science, which was added in 1980, had been established. The business department had already been well-established in Grantham, including accounting, economics, business administration, and business management to the point that the program was completely independent of the Philadelphia Campus. In addition, the general major of “behavioral sciences” was completely housed in Grantham as were recreation, physical education, and health.

As part of the interview process, Brandt was taken to the Philadelphia Campus for a tour, a sign, surely, of the Campus’ prominence in the view of Grantham administrators. The lines of authority had always been blurry in regard to the roles of the Academic Dean at the Grantham Campus, who reported to the President, and the Dean of the Philadelphia Campus, who also reported to the President. Yet, as we have seen, Daniel Chamberlain had played a very influential role as Dean during his tenure. It would be critical that whomever filled the position would be sympathetic to the vision and purpose of the Philadelphia Campus. In recalling his experience of the Philadelphia Campus during his interview, Brandt said,

45 Minutes, Philadelphia Campus Advisory Board, March 1975.
46 These dates are inexact because they are based on college catalogues which were published biennially until the late 90s.
47 See appendix C.
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[I felt] a combination of joy and also some dismay...physically the campus was not nearly as attractive as it is now [in 2004]. The facilities were, well dingy is maybe a bit of an overstatement, but not much. I remember meeting with a group of about half a dozen students in this room that felt dark and dreary and it was just...ugly...I thought to myself, 'yes, but, the students [are] really happy campers,'"...I thought, 'Wow, if we did this right, think of how they’d really be pleased.'

During this process, the vision for the Campus was outlined by Grantham administrators and the future Dean could see the strengths and weaknesses of such a plan right away. As is often the case, Brandt brought the insight of an outsider whose distance from the program could bring a fresh perspective. Right away he began thinking about the program in new ways. He recalls that,

I remember thinking...as I drove back to Grantham that night...that we were using this Campus the wrong way. We were using it to get students at Messiah...to do majors we couldn’t do in Grantham, when I thought, why not use this as an opportunity for students to get a taste of urban life? Use it as...a kind of lab school and say 'Ok, sure, Messiah’s in Grantham, but you’ve got the chance to spend the semester in Philadelphia, right in the middle of the city. So you care about cities? We can do that for you.' That’s why I say that I saw opportunity [when I visited] but I also was a little discouraged.

The idea of the Philadelphia Campus being a place where students could experience the culture of the urban context was not new; part of the draw to Temple University as opposed to Pennsylvania State University was the former institution’s situation in north Philadelphia. Yet apparently, by this time, eleven years into the Campus’ history, experiencing the culture of the city had been deemphasized in favor of an emphasis on academics. It is also true that Sider, Davis, and others emphasized the Philadelphia Campus as an opportunity to learn more about social problems and injustices, using the city as a textbook from which to understand these phenomena, without stressing the cultural richness of Philadelphia as a draw to the program. The Campus seemed good as it was, but
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48 David Brandt in telephone interview by author, 8 April 2004.
49 Brandt, interview.
Brandt recognized that there were issues of both practical (in regard to the physical plant) and abstract (in relation to impact on students) potential still to be addressed.

Brandt's reforms would have to wait two years to be put into motion. A year after his appointment to the office of Academic Dean, Abraham Davis stepped down from the position of Dean of the Philadelphia Campus, leaving Boyd Reese to be the Acting-Director. At the same time, Dean Brandt subsumed the role of Philadelphia Campus Dean, so that the Philadelphia Campus would have a Director, only, who would in turn report to him. Though not recorded as such, it is clear that this shift in reporting structure symbolizes the abandonment of the original vision of a stand-alone, relatively independent campus in Philadelphia.

Administrators during much of the 1970s had been primarily concerned with the important business of community outreach and the process of educating the young people at the Campus, nurturing them intellectually and spiritually through what was often a difficult period of reflection and self-examination. As a rule, they had not given the physical plant the much-needed attention buildings of that age and condition required. This was a problem that Brandt was intent on remedying.

In addition, Campus culture had become questionable to many in the surrounding community. Don Wingert, who worked under Brandt at the time, remembers that there were a number of issues in the late '70s that I particularly remember Dean Brandt being concerned about...apparently they felt that the students and even the faculty and administration somehow felt that the Campus was exempt from lifestyle expectations and that was becoming a bit of an issue as stories would come back and [people would say] "I thought that was Messiah College." So they were getting criticism from constituents and
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50 Little is known about Reese. Few of those interviewed for this project could give any background on his involvement with Messiah College and the archives, as well, are silent on this matter. Daniel Chamberlain guessed that he might have come into service at the College through the CCO.
families and some informal investigations were done to try to figure out what was going on.\textsuperscript{51}

Not only were the physical facilities in trouble, but student life had also taken a blow. If the student population of the Philadelphia Campus had been perceived as made up of “radicals” before, now it was also seen as a place to party and in general disregard the ethos of the Messiah College community, what we today refer to as “The Community Covenant.” In order to sustain the Campus as a viable part of Messiah College, it had to be made more appealing to the “average” Messiah student. And so Dean Brandt was also interested in finding someone who could not only take care of the physical facilities but also bring the Campus back into line with the standards of Messiah College student life.

Enrollment had not increased substantially and on average the Campus was attracting approximately 30 to 40 students per semester.\textsuperscript{52} Brandt hoped that by fixing up the facilities, cleaning up the community, and emphasizing the richness of the cultural experience of urban life, the Campus might attract more students and operate up to its potential, at least as he saw it. From his point of view, it was “...a place to give students...a cultural experience that we couldn’t do in Grantham,” and later he would reflect that, “...for a long time we used it as sort of the home base for some of the cross-cultural courses.”\textsuperscript{53} In Brandt’s point of view, this was the true strength of the Philadelphia Campus. In his opinion, using Temple’s courses to fulfill a major was basically a means to an end.

He explained his vision to me in the following way:

\ldots what I saw was that the Philly Campus, rather than ever becoming this free-standing Christian university, could serve as kind of a bridge for us to get things started at a

\textsuperscript{51} Don L. Wingert in interview by author, 26 February 2004.
\textsuperscript{52} Wingert, interview.
\textsuperscript{53} Brandt, interview.
relatively low cost...it really was using Temple’s resources to phase this major in over a couple of year period until we had enough students in Grantham to do our own thing...\textsuperscript{54}

Thus a new purpose and vision for the Campus was born. The Philadelphia Campus would be a bridge for majors; as programs became popular and attracted students, Grantham would develop its departments until it could afford to house a major, at which point, the major would be transferred to Grantham, or “brought back,” as many have termed the process.

Brandt asked Don Wingert to consider moving to Philadelphia to take charge of the Campus and Don accepted. He remembers

...in some ways I felt like—and a few people likened me to—the old Western marshal riding into this corrupt Western town to clean it up. It was not an easy first year because we did challenge behaviors that violated the Community Covenant—it was called an ethos at that time—and a couple of students ended up being suspended or expelled because they refused to accept that. There were kind of two camps, you had the students who said, “Well, it’s about time, because we thought this was Messiah College,” and there were others who didn’t like to see that kind of special sanctuary become “just like Grantham” which was hard for them, but I think because...of the turnover in Philly, within two years we were able to kind of get the message out that the Philadelphia Campus is for any kind of student...\textsuperscript{55}

As a show of commitment, Brandt made it a priority to visit the Campus at least once a month. He and Wingert would switch offices for a day, giving each time to familiarize themselves with issues that needed to be dealt with, as well as general campus culture in both places. While the Philadelphia Campus began to resemble Grantham, and hence, Messiah College, more both in terms of the quality of the facilities and the spirit of the place, enrollment numbers rose.

Wingert also realized how important the Temple-Messiah relationship was to the program and began to broaden and deepen the connections that Messiah had with the

\textsuperscript{54} Brandt, interview.
\textsuperscript{55} Wingert, interview.
University. From Wingert’s perspective, Temple administrators viewed Messiah’s program in the following way:

I always felt that Temple people supported the arrangement out of almost a fascination with its uniqueness and what they referred to over and over again as [Messiah] bringing diversity to Temple, which is always kind of a fun concept to think about because we at Messiah have often thought about how un-diverse we are and how hard we have to work at ethnic diversity and yet here we were, enriching Temple with our confessional diversity, if you will...the more post-modern people’s consciousness became, the more they liked this thing because they could say, “Look, we’re open, tolerant, and we have this religious organization that brings good students to our campus and they behave themselves and don’t try to tell us we should be like them.” So keeping that [admiration] alive became a top-priority [for me].  

Initially, his strengths as an administrator with experience in general operations seemed most important, yet Wingert quickly learned that directing the Philadelphia Campus would be much more all-encompassing. Reflecting on this, Wingert explained that

For myself, just being an operations kind of person,...it took me a few years to realize that not only was it important that I broaden the contacts, but I was also learning to enjoy that and develop myself into someone who enjoyed networking and getting to know people. So I began to be pretty intentional, so that when I got an invitation to attend a Temple event, I would make it a high priority to be there just to see and be seen and have people get to know who I was.

One of the most important targets of his attention was the Registrar’s office. Because taking classes at Temple had continued to be an integral part of the Philadelphia Campus experience, Messiah, and thus, Wingert and his staff, had to be able to ensure that Messiah students would be able to enroll in the classes they needed. Although the Temple-Messiah relationship remained strong at the higher levels of administration, employee turnover in offices like the Registrar’s made it difficult at times to maintain this connection. In 1982, Don engineered the signing of an agreement between Temple and Messiah which for the first time spelled out clearly the relationship they had shared for fourteen years. Part

56 Wingert, interview.
57 Wingert, interview.
of this agreement stipulated that, "...the appropriate Temple office shall make the necessary arrangements to allow Messiah students access to courses on at least an equal basis with their classmates at Temple." While having a written agreement must have eased Wingert's mind about the nature of the collaboration and the rights assigned to Messiah College and its students, registration time continued to be stressful. When interviewed later, he explained that,

There were a few times when bureaucratic snafus or a clerk somewhere not processing registrations on time...I'd almost have a heart attack because I'd realize, "I've got to sign up 80 students, here, and if they don't get the classes, it's a total crisis, the whole program will collapse, it will be a catastrophe." The program would probably be irreparably damaged if we couldn't guaranteed our students access, so I spent a lot of time and energy focusing on that...fortunately, at any given time when we had opposition, there was always somebody in the Provost's office who said, "This is our deal and we've got to make it work,"...So we were able to continually maintain that relationship until eventually, we go direct computer access and were able to put students in ourselves which meant that we could be assured that it wasn't in the hands of a Temple employee who might not realize how important it was.59

These were just the sort of complications that Boyer had warned about in his writings on collaboration, for although strong commitment from the President's office was critical, faculty and staff would be the ones to act the relationship out daily. In an article he wrote in 1967 entitled, "Commitment to Collaboration," Boyer elaborated on this idea. He wrote:

If the system is created by legislative decree, very often a coordinating core is also formed to hold the alliance together. Almost inevitably, though, such legislation is subject to interpretation—indeed, it must be interpreted, inference must be drawn from it, and the permissiveness that should characterize it must be exercised if a workable organization is to emerge. The responsibilities of the new structure must be defined in detail, as must the authority upon which it can draw to help meet its obligations.60

Messiah and Temple had not maintained a "coordinating core" and this is what Don worked to create, primarily with a written agreement and then consistently through

58 See Appendix D.
59 Wingert, interview.
intentional nurture of relationships at all levels in the Temple bureaucratic structure. Later, Don expressed his admiration for how well the collaboration has worked on an administrative level by saying that, "I would...praise Temple for its warm and open acceptance of the Messiah program. I saw that as a jewel that we needed to honor and protect...well, it couldn’t be a jewel, because it is an organic, living thing,...[I] had to cultivate and nurture that relationship. Without it we would just have a little extension program down there."  

By the time this agreement had been worked out, the Philadelphia Campus had stabilized under Wingert’s leadership. Student behavior was, for the most part, in line with Messiah standards and the physical plant improvements had been made or were planned for the near future. The community included students, faculty, and staff and was strong and close-knit. The cafeteria continued to play a critical role in the development of this unity. As one student wrote in the 1991 Clarion, “one common hangout for students is the cafeteria. Although meals are served three times a day, there are always snacks, leftovers, and fruit to eat during the off-hours. Because it’s open twenty-four hours a day, students congregate there to study, play cards, talk, eat, and relax. If you can’t find the person who borrowed your sweatshirt, the first place you call is the "caf."  

As well, the installation of phone service between the two campuses, which made it possible for students and staff to make calls without charge back and forth between Philadelphia and Grantham, increased the feeling of unity between the two campuses and increased morale at the urban site, as did the regular exchange of Campus Mail. Under Brandt and Wingert, van and car trips
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between the campuses became routine. Besides the traveling each administrator did each month, students from the Philadelphia Campus would visit Grantham regularly and at least once a semester, lead a common chapel and participate in a promotional event in Eisenhower Campus Center often referred to as “Philly Day.” The Philadelphia contingent used pretzels and at one time, even authentic Philadelphia cheesesteaks in order to spark the interest of their fellow students at the main campus. As well, students from Grantham were encouraged to visit the Philadelphia Campus and there were planned weekends of tours and city-exploration for interested students.

Although some majors had been brought to Grantham by this point, several remained at the Philadelphia Campus, enriching the community there with a strong and diverse enrollment. Reflecting on this time period, Wingert has said,

I think that for me, the heyday, if you will, of Philly Campus prime was probably the mid-to-late 80s and early 90s,...after we kind of cleared up the concept so that “ordinary” Messiah students could consider Philly without feeling that they would be going to a place that had a reputation for just being fit for the political radicals and...it was seen as pluralistic and appealing to a broad base. I kind of developed the concept of it being multi-faceted; there’s something in Philly for everyone, and as long as everybody’s willing to accept that you’re still at Messiah College.63

Yet while Philadelphia Campus seemed to going through its “golden age” there were lingering concerns, mostly on the part of Wingert and others in Philadelphia, about the continued withdrawal of academic majors to the main campus. By 1990, there were few programs that continued to require time at the Philadelphia Campus. Of all the changes, the loss of the engineering program was the hardest-hitting.

---------------

this part is still being worked on, as is the next section


\[63\] Wingert, interview.
IV. Renewing the Commitment

V. Legacy

In analyzing the legacy of the Philadelphia Campus, I have found it helpful to construct an alliterative using four words that seem to define what this program provides for both Messiah College and Temple University, and faculty and students in both settings: Distinction, Diversity, Development, and Dialogue.

As far as anyone can tell, this relationship is the first collaboration between a small, church-related college and a large public university in which the college sets up an independent satellite on the campus of the university in order for students to pursue academics, service, and cultural enrichment. Especially during the first years of the pilot project, people at many levels of American Higher Education saw this initiative as historic and monumental. During the 1968 press conference publicly announcing the affiliation, William Letterer the chairman of the Committee on Higher Education for Pennsylvania's House of Representatives, stated that this was an “historic occasion where in the field of education, David and Goliath shake hands and start working together.”64 Although it is hard for some today to realize that our small, nondescript campus is an historical landmark, in 1968 it was, indeed distinctive. Letterer would go on in his comments to reflect on the concern many in congress expressed when deciding how much funding to allocate to state-supported institutions like Temple, at the expense of private colleges like Messiah, many of whom had fallen on hard times economically. This unique opportunity, to partner two very different institutions who anticipated realizing mutual benefits, was not lost on those
attending the press conference that day. Temple's President at that time, Dr. Anderson, remarked that,

Even more do I recognize that a successful experience here in Philadelphia could benefit the future course and cause of the small college in America. Conversely the values Temple University should gain will strengthen the university in its supportive role as an ally of our liberal arts colleges. This therefore is an historic day here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as two institutions, vastly different in size, structure, and character yet with a unified spirit and goal join together in an endeavor not previously known in American education...Today we at Temple share a deep sense of appreciation for the trust placed in our hands along with Messiah College by the federal government as it makes funds available to carry out this experiment...We are also delighted that the Commonwealth of the City of Philadelphia can share the distinct privilege of seeing so unique an educational idea initiated here and we convey to our senators and to the members of Congress representing Pennsylvania our gratitude also for their interest and their support.

Each participating institution would have the privilege of distinction in higher education for pursuing an ideal of collaboration that so many talked and wrote about, but few make a reality.

The presence of students from Messiah College adds diversity to Temple's campus, both religious and ethnic. As an urban, public institution, Temple attracts a diverse range of students in terms of ethnicity, faith background, and economic circumstance, although it cannot actively recruit these students as such. For many reasons, the predominantly Caucasian, middle-class, Christian students that attend the Philadelphia Campus contribute to this diversity. Conversely, Messiah's students and faculty learn and teach in an environment that is far different from that to which they are accustomed, both in terms of the people and experiences they encounter on Temple's campus, and in the wider city of Philadelphia. Dr. John Yeatts commented, after having taught at the Philadelphia Campus and on Temple's campus in the IH department, that, "I have never been in a more cross-cultural setting, or a more multi-ethnic setting, or a more diverse setting, than a Temple
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classroom."\textsuperscript{65} This sentiment is echoed by many from Messiah who experience the Philadelphia Campus in any capacity. Thus, both Temple and Messiah benefit from an increased exposure to a diversity of perspectives through this arrangement.

In all areas, both Messiah and Temple embrace development through this cooperation. Temple is enabled to more fully sustain its commitment to public service and education by offering this opportunity to Messiah students. Many academic departments at Temple have benefited from the introduction of students from Messiah. As Dr. Parkyn, Messiah’s current senior Vice President, has stated:

“Temple is a school that is getting stronger and stronger but certainly historically and even today, our student body—in terms of standardized, academic qualifications—tends to be a higher caliber than Temple’s in the aggregate and our policy relative to the Philadelphia Campus is that not everyone can go, you have to hit a certain g.p.a. and the like, and so the better half of our students are the ones who go there. So that’s been a great benefit, historically to Temple, and the programs that our students have tended to study in, have faculty members who were always eager to have Messiah students and, almost universally, when we would pull a program out...the faculty in those programs at Temple were disappointed with our decision.”\textsuperscript{66}

But the Philadelphia Campus represents an opportunity for Temple’s development in more practical ways, as well. When Ray Hostetter and Albert Meyer first met with Temple representatives to discuss the potential for such an arrangement, Meyer recorded the following:

[Dr. Edwin Adkins, Associate Vice President for Research and Program Development] expressed a great interest in sub-college undergraduate education, and [was] quite interested in considering the possibility that a number of residential colleges, including some sponsored directly by Temple, might be started on campus. Adkins was most interested in the idea that Messiah might develop an experimental general education curriculum and might be a kind of model for experimentation and, possibly, adoption in the university.\textsuperscript{67}

\textsuperscript{65} In a recorded interview with the author. It is significant to note that Dr. Yeatts had already spent a year teaching abroad at Daystar University in Kenya by this time.

\textsuperscript{66} In a recorded interview with the author.

\textsuperscript{67} p. 4 Meyer ROMCTCD
In this way, the small urban living learning center contributes significantly to Temple as an institution, albeit in many unrealized areas, to date. Of course, it is relatively easy to point out the ways in which the Philadelphia Campus has aided in Messiah’s development. Students and faculty have been equipped to better fulfill Messiah’s mission through their experience in Philadelphia and in this way the program has clearly effected the personal development of many in our community. Most practically however, the addition of Temple’s course offerings to Messiah’s catalog in 1968 boosted the college to curricular heights otherwise unattainable for an institution of its stature. Through this collaboration, Messiah has expanded its own offerings significantly. Approximately 55% of the majors Messiah currently offers (including pre-professional programs and teaching certification) can be traced back to this affiliation with Temple. As Messiah was able to advertise more majors, it attracted more students who were interested in these studies and over the years, was able to build departments from this increased student interest.\textsuperscript{68} In the late 1960s, Messiah lacked the endowment and numbers (of both student and faculty) to encourage this kind of growth on its own, yet a major goal of the administration at the time was to expand the campus on all fronts. The solution had to be economical and sustainable, and as David Parkyn pointed out in an article for \textit{Planning for Higher Education}, the Philadelphia Campus was both. “A satellite campus associated with a major university provided the opportunity for this small college to establish new academic majors and introduce new disciplines to the curriculum more rapidly and aggressively than

\textsuperscript{68} 45\% of Messiah’s majors required time spent at the Philadelphia Campus, and an additional 10\% of the current majors are housed in departments that grew as a result of this association.
otherwise would have been possible.\textsuperscript{69} Thirty-six years later, Messiah College offers over sixty-seven majors and has a student body nearing three thousand and indeed, is the clear beneficiary of increased development through their affiliation with Temple University.

In his "Study Prospectus for a Messiah College Urban Center or College," D. Ray Hostetter outlined the goals and potential benefits of affiliating Messiah with a public university in an urban setting. His audience for this prospectus was varied and included the campus leaders of several major public universities, so Hostetter had to choose his words carefully when speaking about the possibilities of interfaith dialogue. He wrote, "a diversity of curriculum could be added to the university offerings in that general education would at times follow unconventional courses and be interdisciplinary in nature...in such an association an avenue for those concerned in the university for dialogue pertaining to faith and the disciplines would be provided."\textsuperscript{70} Hostetter was referring to Bible courses and other classes which would focus on Christian beliefs, or incorporate a Christian worldview into course material as well as drawing attention to the fact that the presence Messiah students and faculty would reinforce campus dialogues by presenting a distinct set of beliefs. Later in the article I have already quoted, Dr. Parkyn quotes Dr. E. Jane Middleton, then chair of Temple's Social Work Department as saying, "the strengths of the Messiah-Temple relationship are related to the diversity of opinions that come with students who have different perspectives. It is important for students to learn to talk to each other, to hear what others have to say, to understand there are different perspectives and different


\textsuperscript{70} Hostetter, SPPAMCUCOC, p. 6.
worldviews, to learn to appreciate these differences.” Just as students benefit from exchanging perspectives in the classroom, so do faculty. Although few Messiah professors have taught on Temple’s campus, the ones that have come back with glowing reports and much of what they say centers around the valuable dialogue that occurs in that setting. While each values the climate of distinctive Christianity at Messiah, they point out that Temple’s status as a public university encourages a diversity of opinion and open exchange that is rare, particularly because students at Temple appreciate dialogue with religious people, a circumstance Messiah students may take for granted at times. John Yeatts offered this anecdote to illustrate this phenomenon.

My Temple students that I had in class would come over and talk to me because sometimes they wanted somebody like a religious person to talk to...One night we talked for about an hour and a half and one of them turns to me and says, “Do you mind if we go out and have a cigarette?” I said no, go ahead and they went out in the street, right in front of the Philadelphia-Temple Campus and came back up when they were done and we talked for a couple more hours. And that kind of dialogue doesn’t happen [here], you know, we just don’t...The thing that’s easy to do, teaching at Temple...[is] teach a Bible course,... because the students raise the problems for you. You don’t have to raise them. They see them.

Whether in classroom or in informal discussions, the Messiah-Temple affiliation fosters precious dialogue between people from wide-ranging backgrounds and commitments. This dialogue enables each participant to further appreciate others’ viewpoint(s) while also presenting a challenge to individuals to assess their own opinions more carefully. (expand – quote on the importance of dialogue in education?)

These four characteristics of the Messiah-Temple partnership encourage both tangible and intangible distinction, diversity, development, and dialogue. The more pragmatic aspects of these characteristics are also the easiest to advertise and offer as
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reasons for continuing the relationship. However, many alumni and faculty who have experienced life at the Philadelphia Campus would argue that the intangible benefits of this interchange that are the most long-lasting and valuable. Of all the gifts the Philadelphia Campus experience gives to faculty and students, perhaps identity formation is the most unexpected. It is common now to hear of identity as shaped by an encounter with the “other,” someone vastly different and unknown. In Philadelphia, we who have grown up in rural areas, or suburbia, find diversity beyond our expectations, people living in extreme poverty, and scholarly disciplines we didn’t know existed. When people live at the Philadelphia Campus, their everyday wanderings, the service they engage in, and their studies lead them on a journey of discovery of both the self and others and this in turn informs the way we perceive those we thought were familiar, including our alma mater. To stay on the campus at Grantham for four consecutive years would mean risking stagnation and parochialism, for as wonderful as any college is, there is value in seeking out other perspectives, especially when the institution is situated in a more secluded, or to borrow Hostetter’s term “haven” setting. It is by observing and engaging in a new perspective that one realizes one’s own perspective more clearly.

For some students, this evaluation will cause them to consider leaving Messiah for Temple or another similar institution. For others, like myself, this scrutiny will engender a deeper sense of respect for the college that has provided us with this profound opportunity. As Floyd Stoner ('70) wrote, in reflecting on his experience as one of the first students to be enrolled at the Philadelphia Campus, “it allows young adults who’ve really not been

Education, .
exposed to the city to live with the support and contacts that the college offers. I look back with fondness and appreciation for the institution that created it. quoted The real reason that the Philadelphia Campus continues to succeed in offering these opportunities to students has to do with the personality of human interaction with others, the city, and the University, from the context of a small, Christian community. I believe that it was the potential for this kind of environment that first inspired Ernest L., Boyer, D. Ray Hostetter, Albert J. Meyer, and others to design this innovation in teaching and learning which has influenced so many. It is the realization of expanding this potential that has sustained the Campus through thirty-six years of existence, accompanied by changing trends and a steady flow of administrators and staff. The gift of intangible personal development toward service and reconciliation is what remains today and it is what continues to inspire students, faculty, staff, and administrators to invest in this Campus year after year.

72 1988 Bridge article, p. 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Finish State Hw.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1966-67)
Academic Majors
Accounting
Art History
Bible
Biology
Business Administration
Chemistry
Communication
Early Childhood Education
Elementary Education
English
French
Health and Physical Education
Human Development and Family Science
Human Resource Management
Journalism
Mathematics
Nursing
Philosophy
Politics
Recreation
Social Work
Spanish | Spanish Business
Theatre
Teacher Certification
Art (K-12)
Chemistry (7-12)
Elementary (K-6)
Environmental Education (K-12)
German (K-12)
Mathematics (7-12)
Social Studies (7-12)
Preprofessional Programs
Pre-Dental
Pre-Law
Pre-Ministerial
Pre-Veterinary
Art (Studio)
Athletic Training
Biochemistry
Broadcasting, Telecommunications & Mass Media
Business Information Systems
Christian Ministries
Computer Science
Economics
Engineering
Environmental Science
German
History
Humanities
International Business
Marketing
Music
Nutrition & Dietetics
Physics
Psychology
Religion
Sociology
Sport & Exercise Science
Therapeutic Recreation

Biology (7-12)
Early Childhood (N-3)
English (7-12)
French (K-12)
Health & Physical Education (K-12)
Music (K-12)
Spanish (K-12)
Pre-Health Professions Advising
Pre-Medical
Pre-Physical Therapy

23/46 Academic Majors
5/14 Teacher Certification Programs
0/7 Pre-Professional Programs
28/67 Majors required time at the Philadelphia Campus at some point (42%)
36/67 Includes majors which are the result of department growth attributable (in part) to the Philadelphia Campus (54%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Major</th>
<th>By Year Started in Philadelphia</th>
<th>By Year Brought to Grantham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>1972 1976</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1972 1982</td>
<td>Communication/Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Sciences</td>
<td>1972 1974</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>1970 1974</td>
<td>Behavior Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>1972 1974</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management</td>
<td>1972 1974</td>
<td>Business Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/Speech</td>
<td>1970 1980</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1970 1974</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1972 1990</td>
<td>Communication/Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>1970 1980</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Education</td>
<td>1972 1974 1972 disc.</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>1972 cont.</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1970 1988</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1972 cont.</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>1970 1986</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1970 1988</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio, Television, Film</td>
<td>1972 cont.</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1972 1978 cont.</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>1972 2002</td>
<td>Radio, Television, Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1970 1980 cont.</td>
<td>Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>1974 cont.</td>
<td>Health and Safety Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td>1972 disc.</td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>1980 1974</td>
<td>Geology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PC and GC stand for the years of program commencement and completion, respectively.
AGREEMENT BETWEEN
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY AND MESSIAH COLLEGE

This document summarizes concisely the relationship that has existed between Messiah College and Temple University since 1968. Assisted by a USOE grant under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Messiah-Temple program commenced on an experimental basis in the fall of 1968 with facilities at 2026 North Broad Street. The operations and facilities have expanded and developed into an established program no longer funded by the federal government.

Elements basic to the relationship are:

1. Messiah students may enroll in Temple courses as non-matriculated, "special" students. They shall be accorded all privileges, accesses, and services normally provided to regular, matriculated Temple students (with the exceptions of participation in intercollegiate athletics and eligibility for Temple academic honors and awards). Messiah students shall be issued Temple identification.

2. Messiah students shall be admitted to Temple University by virtue of their status as Messiah College students. Messiah College shall have the right to withdraw its students from Temple University independently from any Temple disciplinary and grievance procedure. However, Temple University's disciplinary and grievance procedures shall apply to Messiah students on the same basis as other Temple students.

3. Messiah students majoring in areas not offered at Messiah College need to meet Temple University's major requirements. They shall receive academic advising from both Temple University and Messiah College toward that end. Each Temple college/school and department involved shall assist Messiah students and faculty in determining the appropriate courses required and certifying that major requirements have been met.

4. The appropriate Temple office shall make the necessary arrangements to bill Messiah College for Messiah students tuition, rather than the students individually.

5. Due to the non-matriculated status of Messiah students at Temple, the appropriate Temple office shall make the necessary arrangements to allow Messiah students access to courses on at least an equal basis with their classmates at Temple. This is essential since they do not have access to required courses during the freshman and sophomore years as do Temple students.
6. Temple University students shall be permitted to take Messiah College courses at the Philadelphia Campus for general elective credit at Temple. The individual Temple colleges/schools shall determine if such credits are applicable to Temple major requirements. Charges for these courses shall be paid by Temple University to Messiah College on the same basis that Messiah pays Temple for courses taken by Messiah students at Temple University.

7. Faculty and staff of the Messiah College Philadelphia Campus shall have the same privileges as their Temple counterparts, including Tuition Remission but excluding payroll-related benefits. They shall be issued the appropriate Temple University identification.

Faculty, staff, and administrators of both institutions are hereby directed to cooperate in facilitating the elements of this agreement and to develop and institute the necessary policies and procedures to fully implement each element.

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 14 June 1982

Marvin Wachman, Ph.D
President, Temple University

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 18 June 1982

D. Ray Hostetler, Ed.D.
President, Messiah College