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A Brief History of Malone

Since its founding as the Friends Bible Institute & Training School in 1892, Malone University has undergone changes in name, location, leadership, and policy. Its student body has morphed from a strongly evangelical background to a large, heterogeneous body, boasting over forty denominations in 1959. Its classification has gone from Bible institute to Bible college to liberal arts college, and now it holds a university standing. Throughout these changes, though, Malone has remained true to its founding principles of providing students a Christ-based education, allowing open discussion, and producing competent citizens with servant attitudes.

When Walter and Emma Malone wanted to form a Bible school, they found that, in their opinion, “higher criticisms and other forms of destructive teaching” were taking shape in many denominationally-founded colleges at the time, and strove to avoid them. This pattern did not change over the decades of the school’s history, but the Malones’ dream for their institute’s principles has remained true at its core. In 1911, the Friends Bible Institute & Training School became Cleveland Bible Institute, and in 1936, Cleveland Bible College (CBC), making it the second Bible college in the US. In 1947, many more had been founded, so a specific accreditation board was formed for Bible colleges. The board defined Bible colleges

---

2 Ibid., 54.
3 Ibid., 207.
as “liberal arts college[s] in which a Bible major is required for all graduates,” and CBC was quickly accepted into their ranks.

After almost ten years as an accredited Bible college, the people of CBC had an opportunity in front of them. They needed to leave Cleveland for multiple reasons, including the campus’s inability to support the increasing size of the student body and the government’s decision to build a highway through their campus. At the same time, a sizeable plot of land became available for purchase in Canton, which at that time was the largest city in the US without an institution of higher education. The college seized the opportunity and became Malone College, the first and only liberal arts institution in Canton.

Moving to Canton entailed more than just a location change; Malone became a Christian liberal arts college instead of a Bible college, which enabled it to broaden its reach. Its students could now be trained for a wide variety of occupations rather than solely missionary or pastoral work, and this expanded curriculum was much more widely desired in a diverse city like Canton. In addition, students no longer had to stay in school for five years in order to gain the Bible majors required from a Bible college. According to the March 1956 issue of “The Messenger,” a school newsletter, the Board of Trustees voted unanimously to make Malone into a four-year liberal arts college in order to better meet the needs

---

4 Ibid., 211.
6 Osborne, 211.
of their new community. They emphasized, though, that Malone’s attentiveness to the Bible would not diminish; it would hold fast through the continued use of chapel and evangelical professors. The classification of liberal arts unnerved some supporters from the Friends denomination, but Byron Osborne, the president of Malone at the time, assured them that “although the name has changed, the purpose has remained the same: to train young people for lives of consecration and dedicated service.”8 Once again, Malone was changing its shape but retaining its core.

Malone changed slowly for almost seventy-five years, adjusting with its environment, its students, and the church. In 1966 and 1967, however, many factors, including the changing dynamic of students at Malone as well as across the country, called for quick action. As president, Everett Cattell made changes in policy that were no more extreme than those made from 1892-1966, but the fact that they happened within five years made them very significant. One generation of students graduated from a different university than the one in which they had originally enrolled.

These changes, though rapid when considering scope of time, were not extreme or impulsive. They ebbed and flowed with the conversation between Cattell, faculty, students, parents, community members, and the church. Cattell and the Board of Trustees made multiple decisions and revisions between 1966 and

---

7 Ibid., 240-241.
8 Ibid., 58.
1971, and administrators have continued to make changes until the present day. Nonetheless, the five-year span from 1966-1971 signaled a crucial time in the direction of Malone, and the impact of those changes is still felt today.

**Everett Cattell’s Challenge**

After three years of dealing with the repercussions of becoming a liberal arts institution in Canton, the Board of Trustees chose Everett Cattell, a former professor of Cleveland Bible Institute, to succeed Byron Osborne as president of Malone. He was inaugurated on March 17, 1961, in the midst of the liberal arts controversy. When his wife Catherine found out he was chosen as president, she knowingly said, “We’re moving to Canton where they’ll probably crucify Everett.”

Malone in the ’60s was not Cattell’s first experience with controversy. His daughter wrote that he was always entrusted with positions far superior to his level of experience because of his endearing personality traits. In 1936, Cattell was called to India to take over a mission field that had gone awry. He assumed the responsibility, and he stayed there with his family for twenty-one years before becoming the superintendent of the Ohio Yearly Meeting and soon after president of Malone. A colleague of Cattell attributed his genius to “his ability to challenge our small group of missionaries with the wider picture of the church in India.”

---

11 Ibid.
Cattell was described by others as caring, trustworthy, a deep thinker,13 and a peacemaker.14 He translated these leadership qualities into his position at Malone, and his worldview held true throughout his life. He not only encouraged missionaries in India to think of the bigger picture; he also encouraged people of the Friends denomination to consider the wider community of Canton and how Malone could be interwoven with it.

Cattell, though widely respected for his philosophical wisdom, was aware of his lack of experience in collegiate leadership. He was reluctant to take the position of president, but when it became clear that was the path along which God was leading him, Cattell committed fully to the responsibility.15 Cattell’s ability to think deeply was a quality that was much needed at Malone during this time period. His writings show that he strove for balance in many areas of his life, one of the most prominent of these balances being his conviction to spread the gospel with his passion for creating and serving community.16 At a time of conflict between a religious population and the new community into which it moved, Cattell could not have been more prepared, though at the time he did not feel it. Some of his first moves toward balance were to remove the religious entrance requirements for Malone and to reaffirm that faculty would be hired with the

---

13 Brantingham, 73.
15 Ibid., 97.
16 Roberts, 31.
intent to model Christian values as well as instill academic excellence.\textsuperscript{17} This was to slightly appease the community and the church, respectively. It was a balancing game and a difficult one to play, but Cattell was able to navigate his way while continuing to keep Malone’s foundations intact.

The same year it was accredited and accepted into full membership of the Ohio College Association in 1964, Malone College saw an increase in enrollment from 784 to 1010 students.\textsuperscript{18} This was a direct result of becoming more accessible to the Canton community through accreditation. The new liberal arts program brought in students from outside the evangelical denominations, which brought in more tuition dollars. In addition, support from local industry and businesses largely overshadowed the $25,000 gift given by the Ohio Yearly Meeting each year. \textsuperscript{19} Malone was seeing more money than it had ever seen before. The balance here existed in that the Ohio Yearly Meeting supported Malone’s evangelical focus, while the Canton community was principally concerned with Malone’s academic quality.

Different from Malone’s contributors, Cattell, though acknowledging that money was a necessary part of Malone’s success, seemed to focus on the growth of the student body. A few months after accreditation in 1964, Cattell gave his annual report to the Board of Trustees. In it, he discussed many ways to measure school

\textsuperscript{17} Murray, 98.
\textsuperscript{18} Dean of the College’s Annual Report. 31 Aug 1965. MS25.
\textsuperscript{19} Johns, 66.
growth such as statistics, graphs, and money; however, he insisted that the real accomplishments lay in:

such matters as newly opened understanding, new visions of truth and knowledge, developing personality, maturing of life, improvement of social grace, deepening of moral conviction, more perfect commitment to Jesus Christ, and profound discipleship, which, seen in students give us all the deepest reward for our efforts for Malone College.\textsuperscript{20}

After enrollment rose, Cattell reemphasized the importance of intrinsic growth in students and progress with curriculum and faculty over focusing on enrollment numbers.\textsuperscript{21} His desire was for students of all backgrounds to form new worldviews based on the Christ-centered education that Malone faculty were able and encouraged to provide.

From the beginning, Cattell was open with the Board of Trustees, the faculty, the student body, and the community about his thoughts and desires for Malone as a Christian liberal arts college. To the Board of Trustees in 1961 he said, “No one planned deliberately to change from a school in seclusion, meeting our own needs, to a school with an open door, meeting a city’s need, but that is where we are.”\textsuperscript{22} He also confirmed to the student body a few years later in 1967 that Malone was “committed to a heterogeneous student body and a climate of dialogue.”\textsuperscript{23} Cattell was firm in moving forward with Malone’s new identity, and he wanted open-mindedness to abound in Malone’s atmosphere. His balance,

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{20} The President’s Annual Report to the Board of Trustees. 17 Oct 1964. \textit{MS25}.
\bibitem{21} The President’s Annual Report to the Board of Trustees. 31 Aug 1965. \textit{MS25}.
\bibitem{22} Johns, 68
\bibitem{23} Ibid., 69.
\end{thebibliography}
openness, and concern for the well-being of the student body came to be a crucial part of Malone's identity change in the 1960s.

The Malone Experiment

The name that aptly came to describe Malone's unique position as a Christian liberal arts college was the “Malone Experiment.” In 1970 when the term gained prevalence around campus, Cattell was unsure how it came about, but he likened its creation to a speech he gave in 1963 entitled “Malone College: An Experiment in Higher Education.” The main question addressed by the experiment in this speech was “Can a conservative Christian college truly serve a broad community interest?”24 According to Cattell, it most certainly could.

Malone was unique in its position as both a Christian and a liberal arts college, but it was not alone in its situation of tension with society; since the early 1900s, schools tied to denominations had been moving away from their foundations. Throughout history, the vast majority of colleges were founded on Christian faith. In fact, all private colleges and universities in Ohio except Ohio Northern and Franklin Universities were founded based on a calling to prepare men and women for service and missions.25 Over time, however, most of these institutions and their respective churches have gone their separate ways. In the early 1900s, certain groups in society began to increasingly believe that associating

---

colleges with specific religions or sects would be divisive. Thus, these colleges gradually transitioned their religious foundations to be merely available, should students choose to participate. After World War II, the government’s role in education became more prominent, and this increased conformity, making Christianity even more marginalized in colleges and universities. Christian colleges became the exception rather than the norm, because becoming non-discriminating and less divisive meant eliminating Christianity, the perceived cause of divide.

Being the exception unfortunately kept Christian colleges from being fully engaged with secular colleges. Educators at Christian colleges were not considered of the highest quality because they were not completely involved in the world of academic research. Cattell was well aware of this trend, but he was adamant that Malone keep its course. Under Cattell, Malone would be secure in its academic success while simultaneously encouraging its evangelical faculty to promote freedom of inquiry to a heterogeneous student body and requiring chapel attendance and Bible classes. It would be more concerned with the teaching of its students than the research of its faculty, and it would hold true to the balances of the Malone Experiment: church and community relations; Christian commitment and freedom of inquiry; Christian and non-Christian student relations; law and

27 Ibid., 18.
29 Johns. Hope and a Future. 80.
grace; redemptiveness and discipline; and personal freedom and institutional character.\textsuperscript{30}

The Cultural Challenge

In Cattell’s 1963 speech entitled “Malone College: An Experiment in Higher Education,” he outlined some of the balances with which Malone was naturally blessed. One of these was the fact that resident students were mostly from evangelical backgrounds, while commuters were from more secular backgrounds, choosing Malone simply because it was nearby. The “working solution” formed from this situation was specific in regards to alcohol and tobacco—all resident students were asked to refrain from alcohol and tobacco at all times while enrolled as students of Malone College. Commuters were allowed to follow family patterns at their individual homes. Cattell wrote that “while this means that complete uniformity of social life is not the common experience of Malone students, this is actually to be regarded as an advantage.”\textsuperscript{31} Because of their backgrounds, both groups of students were accepting of their respective rules, and Malone’s ideals were not challenged. This was advantageous because without any effort, Malone was pleasing both the church and the community.

The differing rules were not an advantage for long, though. By the time 1970 came along, residential colleges had become more popular for students across the

country. This meant that more students from the Canton community would choose to be residents rather than commuters. In addition, the Kent State Stark branch opened in Canton in September of 1967, which caused many commuters who were originally at Malone for its proximity to their homes to attend Kent State for the affordability and permissiveness it offered in addition to its short distance from home.\(^32\) Kent State, along with the increasing popularity of the residential college across the United States, not only increased Malone’s residential population in relation to its commuters—they increased the percentage of residents who were secular.\(^33\) Because of the rules about alcohol and tobacco use, students who were more secular and would have been allowed to use alcohol and tobacco as commuters (according to Malone’s policy) felt unfairly restricted as residents. Instead of easily having different sets of rules for residents and commuters, the college was now accused of having a problematic double standard.

The Evolving Student

Dissatisfaction with Malone’s rules was not just magnified by the double standard, though. The 1960s themselves were characterized by revolt and protest across the country. Students led dozens of revolutions about civil rights, drugs, music, feminism, and more. Students on many campuses were questioning “the purpose of education, control of student life, and the meaning of authority.”\(^34\) In

\(^32\) Malone’s overall enrollment dropped during this time. See page 22.
\(^34\) Hodges, O’Donnell & Oliver. Cradles of Conscience. 6.
other words, they challenged the idea of *in loco parentis*, a Latin phrase meaning “in the place of a parent.” For many years, colleges and universities had constructed rules governing students’ actions, looking out for their well-being, just like parents.

At Malone, as well as in schools of all backgrounds at the time, *in loco parentis* rules took the forms of curfews and regulations on dress code, music, and sex. The 1955-1956 Cleveland Bible College Student Handbook read, “A neat and orderly room reflects a life which is clean and well-ordered according to the discipline of the Lord. Room checks will be made not less frequent than weekly. Rooms should be ready for inspection by 9:00 a.m. any day. The dean may come at any hour you hope not, so be prepared.”\(^{35}\) It also confined couples to two options: sitting together in the dining hall for dinner Friday, lunch Sunday, and dinner Sunday; or sitting together in the student lounge Wednesday evenings from after supper (at 6 p.m.) until 7:10 p.m. The reasoning for this was that “friendship often develops into courtship, courtship may lead to an engagement, and engagement issues in marriage. The choice of a companion which is properly made will enhance Christian service and enrich society. If these ideals are to be realized, friendships must proceed with prayerful deliberation.”\(^{36}\)

Not surprisingly, *in loco parentis* rules such as those came head to head with the sixties and its push for reform. The turning point for most colleges in the

\(^{35}\) “Student Life in Cleveland Bible College: Student Handbook 1955-6.” *MS25.*  
\(^{36}\) Ibid.
US was in 1961, when six black students were expelled from Alabama State University for participating in a sit-in. The outcome of the court case *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education* was that tax-supported colleges could not expel students without a notice or a hearing.\(^{37}\) This meant that colleges had to have defensible reasons for controlling student life, and students had to be made aware of these reasons.

Malone’s 1961-1962 student handbook did align with the court ruling, as it gave reasoning for specific rules, almost all of them completely revolving around the Bible. For example, students were not allowed to drink or smoke because the Bible says that the body is a temple of the Lord and because alcohol and tobacco had been shown to be detrimental to the body.\(^{38}\) The 1967-1968 handbook was a little more specific with the philosophies behind its rules. It reads:

> The college recognizes that Christian behavior is not legislated but rests upon inner commitment to certain ideals. Certain procedural regimentation is necessary to make operation as efficient as possible....It is right that a Christian college should have on its campus a prevailing moral tone which reflects its commitment to the Christian way of life. While it cannot force its students to be Christian, nor to accept the Christian code as their own, still many will do so from personal conviction and others will conform out of respect for the convictions of their fellow students and the institution.\(^{39}\)

---


This view, though it seems much more liberal than before, still supports the *in loco parentis* model. It holds that regulations are still necessary, but they cannot make someone Christian; they can only provide a legislated moral code which may eventually play a part in someone's turn toward Christianity.

While Malone backed many parameters with reasoning that revolved around pleasing the Lord and striving to be Christ-like examples—a perk of Cattell’s philosophical nature that likely kept Malone students from speaking out as much as students at other schools—colleges that had retracted their Christian foundations throughout the century had less valid philosophies behind their rules, thus causing them to reevaluate and renege many policies when faced with student retaliation. A conservative Christian college like Malone did not see the brunt of the action, but it was certainly not immune to students calling for reform. In fact, the dean of Malone dubbed 1965 as “the year of vocal expression.” 40 Students spoke out about teaching, chapel requirements, and other regulations, and that greatly worried faculty.

The dean also reported faculty responses to the year’s expressions, and although there were many positive comments, there were also multiple worries voiced about the future of Malone. Some faculty members wanted to return to a more evangelical stance on education, accepting fewer secular students. One member wrote about the problem of “a growing freedom by non-Christian students to challenge Malone standards,” another that “it is only as we get more

---

students from evangelical backgrounds that many of our problems will be solved,” and a third declared that “Malone must remain true to its ideals in spite of the cost.” Everett Cattell agreed with the last faculty member, but he defined “remaining true” in a different way.

In Cattell’s 1966 report to the Board of Trustees, just a month after the dean’s report to him, he said:

The past couple years have been exceedingly restless ones on all campuses throughout the country. Berkeley holds the limelight, but demonstrations, resistance to authority, experimenting with and addiction to drugs, pre-marital sex, and obscenity have become epidemic throughout the nation. Even the distinctly evangelical colleges...are being swept by the backwash of this movement. Ten years ago the complaint about students concerned their passivity and neutralism. Now the pendulum has swung to the opposite.

Though protests were happening everywhere and faculty members were afraid of Malone succumbing to the national trend, Cattell was positive both in attitude and in certainty. He sensed the restlessness of students and faculty, and he wanted to make it better. He believed that a Christian presence was necessary in the growingly secular world, but he also knew that many evangelical colleges were holding back so much student retaliation that they would soon burst, making him certain that the way to cure restlessness was not by being more restrictive. To those who did not believe Malone could be a liberal arts school without drifting away from its religious origin by attrition, he quoted Romans 14:23: “Whatsoever is

---

41 Ibid.
42 Referring to the Berkeley Free Speech Movement on the University of California – Berkeley’s campus from 1964-1965.
43 The President’s Annual Report to the Board of Trustees. 08 Oct 1966. MS25.
44 Ibid.
not of faith is sin.” He was determined that Malone’s community understand the situation and approach it openly.

Cattell’s desire for openness on Malone’s campus put all the problems on the table and let the community know that he wanted a solution of integration, but his report did not provide a foolproof way to reach that solution. Samuel Joeckel and Thomas Chesnes, researchers who gathered data about current institutions in the Consortium of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU), suggest that allowing different opinions to be brought up and discussed in an open setting provides an opportunity for healthy dialogue on college campuses, but it also allows steps to be taken forward in finding common ground for policy-making purposes.45

Policy Debate of 1966

Cattell seemed to understand the reality that openness provides avenues for successful policy-making, so over the next few months he discussed campus changes openly with faculty. The Malone University archives contain no hard evidence of complaints being made by students, but Cattell mentioned the increase of secular students as residents, and he wrote an open letter to faculty and the Board of Trustees about making changes to Malone’s double-standard policy—that of drinking, smoking, and dancing. At the time of the open letter, December

of 1966, Malone’s catalogue read, “The college prohibits the use of alcoholic beverages, tobacco, and social dancing on campus, in college-approved housing, and at college-sponsored events. Resident students will refrain from these at all times while under the jurisdiction of the college.” He proposed to delete the last sentence of the policy, and he outlined four groups into which he felt the faculty fell regarding his proposal: One from conservative evangelical backgrounds that would react strongly against change; one not from conservative evangelical backgrounds that wouldn’t see any problem with change; one that appreciated heterogeneity, but thought it was only possible with residents being strictly evangelical—a trend that was changing; and one that would have liked to see a new solution by combining and deleting some of the other groups’ opinions.

Cattell presented his open letter and encouraged faculty to respond with their own opinions, knowing that they differed vastly, but he probably did not anticipate the length and complexity of the issue he had just uncovered. Deleting a sentence from the end of a written policy may have seemed like a small change, but in reality Cattell’s proposal challenged the definition of Malone’s moral standards in the eyes of many involved. Though the true impact of this proposal would not show for four more years, it slowly divided the Malone community more than ever before. Each person, it seemed, had an opinion about what to do. Throughout the end of 1966 and beginning of 1967, Cattell received several faculty

---

47 Ibid.
letters outlining their disagreement (only one letter showed agreement) with Cattell’s proposal to change Malone’s policies. Many faculty members were offended because they did not feel they fell into any of the four categories outlined by Cattell in his open letter.

In what was probably an attempt to gather more hard evidence instead of using generalizations to divide faculty into opinion groups, Cattell handed out a survey on February 21, 1967. The survey included dozens of various statements regarding alcohol, tobacco, and dancing, to which faculty had to respond that they strongly agreed, agreed, were neutral, disagreed, or strongly disagreed. In Cattell’s handwritten notes about the survey’s results, he concluded that faculty generally agreed to prohibit smoking and drinking on campus and at college-sponsored events. They also agreed that Malone should not forbid commuters from drinking or smoking off campus, nor should it police their activities. Faculty members were, however, much more divided over allowing residents to drink or smoke off campus.48

According to Friends scholar David Johns, eight faculty members wanted to transition out of the pattern of in loco parentis in 1967, and “at least three key faculty resigned or were released during this time.”49 One such faculty member was Lowell Roberts, a Bible and theology professor. On February 22, the day after the survey was dispersed, he wrote to Cattell requesting additional time before

---

48 Cattell’s handwritten notes accompanying questionnaire. 21 Feb 1967. MS25.
49 Johns. Hope and a Future. 77-78.
signing another contract with Malone. He wanted to wait and see what Malone's future held before he committed to anything. Along with this first letter he included a harshly-worded letter about his disagreements with the questionnaire, and a month later on March 17, he terminated his contract with Malone.\footnote{Roberts, Lowell. Letters to Everett Cattell. 22 Feb to 26 Mar 1967. \textit{MS25}.}

Lowell Roberts was not the only one upset about the potential changes. Amos Henry, a professor of history and Bible, also left Malone in 1967. Though there is no evidence directly correlating his disappearance to the change, on March 1, 1967, he wrote to Cattell, “Perhaps it is proper to indicate why I have not returned the questionnaire. Since my position has been made clear disfavoring any change of regulations on smoking, dancing, and alcohol, it seems unnecessary to return the questionnaire.” Like Roberts, he disagreed with the changes, potentially enough to cause him to resign the next year. A third professor, Garner E. Hoyt, asked for extra time before signing a contract, but there is no evidence showing his direct departure from Malone. Just as the dean of the college described 1965 as the year of verbal expression, he dubbed 1966 the “year of faculty turnover” due to conflict and uneasiness about Malone's future.\footnote{Dean of the College’s Annual Report. 31 Aug 1967. \textit{MS25}.}

Malone was not the only school going through faculty turnover in the late 1960s. In fact, colleges all over the country were undergoing change for a few reasons. As the baby boomer generation graduated from high school, a “national trough in high school graduates” was left to follow them.\footnote{The President’s Annual Report to the Board of Trustees. 05 Oct 1968. \textit{MS25}.} Students' schooling
preference was also shifting from private to public education, in part due to the move away from religion, and partially because of affordability. In Malone’s specific situation, the Kent State branch that had just opened attracted commuters that had attended Malone when it was the only institution of higher education in Canton. While Malone’s resident numbers increased from 393 to 408 in 1968, its overall enrollment dropped from 1162 to 1107.\textsuperscript{53} This trend continued for the remainder of Cattell’s presidency.

Because Cattell and the rest of the administration were concerned about Malone’s dropping enrollment, the issues of alcohol, drugs, and dancing were placed on a backburner for a few years. In an administrative council meeting in 1969, Cattell and trusted faculty brainstormed ways to increase enrollment. Cattell proposed giving students bookstore or tuition credits for each student they brought to Malone, but the administrative council believed intrinsic motivators such as pride and enthusiasm would be more successful.\textsuperscript{54} These tactics did not seem to work, as enrollment continued to drop over the next four years.

Even though he put great pressure on increasing enrollment numbers, Cattell continued his goal for the enlightenment of students—perhaps his reasoning for wanting more students in the first place, as keeping Malone alive would allow continual illumination in students’ lives. He included an article by Dr. Morris T. Keeton, Director of the Study of the Future of Liberal Arts Colleges, in a

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{53} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{54} Administrative Council Minutes. 06 March 1969. \textit{MS25}.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
1967 faculty bulletin. In it, Keeton asserts that colleges can only ensure safety by taking purposeful risks that go against the social norm. Since all colleges need to prompt their students to think and question, the way for colleges to be unique is instead by changing their “form and function.” Malone was unique in that it held fast to its founding principles, its unique form and function, while many other colleges and universities severed their ties with the Church. Though not apparent during the rest of Cattell’s presidency, Malone’s differences may have ensured its safety in the long run. At a time when high school graduates were running low, having a unique edge also gave a school a competitive edge; the fact that Malone’s religious ties were part of the reason for fewer riots on campus made many wonder whether schools like Malone held the future of education rather than those who had chosen to move away from religion.

One way Cattell promoted Malone’s uniqueness was through promoting The Malone Experiment and its balances of previously separate entities. Since his inauguration, Cattell boasted Malone’s one-of-a-kind opportunity to pave the way as a Christian liberal arts college. He wanted students to be able to experience Malone’s balance, but, of course, with open minds. This desire prompted a speech for the freshmen in 1968 that encouraged them to relinquish any expectations they may have had about Malone. Some, he claimed, would want more religion, while some would want less, but “how much better it will be if you learn very early to

---

accept Malone for what it is rather than what you may have dreamed it would be.”

Students, however, were having trouble accepting Malone for what it was. Unlike the administration in the late ‘60s, which had been focusing on enrollment more than rules, the student body was very much concerned with policy changes, and their desire for change was slowly coming to a head. In the beginning of 1969, student senate made requests for change in music and dress code policies. The administrative council reluctantly agreed to allow “The Vogues” to be the first secular music group to perform on campus after student senate voted 17-0 that the concert would serve the student body’s need.58 The council also “more clearly defined” and “simplified in both definition and appropriateness” the dress code after student senate signed a petition nine months earlier to alter the policy on female slacks, disallowed at that time.

After some months of anger, it was noted by the administrative council that students reeled in their emotions in order to discuss discrepancies in a more professional manner. Student leaders, especially those in student senate, showed initiative to ask questions of faculty and work through problems, one of the most prominent being the behavior regulations of smoking, drinking, and dancing. A student survey was set to be taken on January 25, 1971 in order to gather information about possible changes.59

---

Considering the types of petitions and requests for change sent in from students, it is obvious Malone did not encounter the extreme student rebellion that was seen by much of the country and even internationally. A US Justice Department study showed that there were 577 “campus disorders” at 194 schools between 1967 and May 1969.\textsuperscript{60} Pushes for change were happening across the United States and the world, and Malone’s policy changes were not extreme in light of all the demonstrations performed. Still, the issues of policy change, especially those regarding alcohol and tobacco, were extremely important to those directly involved in the Malone community.

Policy Debate 1971

There was a lot of buzz around the student survey set for January 25, 1971. Around this time, \textit{The Aviso}, the student newspaper, covered the reasoning behind the fight for change on campus. It claimed that Reverend Russell Myers, at that time the General Superintendent of the Ohio Yearly Meeting, spoke in chapel about how the church was not involved in Malone's everyday life;\textsuperscript{61} rather, it held the college’s founding ideals. This bit of information sparked in student leaders the idea that the church did not have Malone in a chokehold—students could actively protest and potentially make a difference in Malone's policies.

\textsuperscript{60} Higher Education and National Affairs. Vol. XVIII No. 28.
The student writers of *The Aviso* argued that if administration did not allow them to choose their own behaviors, they lacked trust in their students. If they did allow it, they were thus allowing students to develop integrity and self-respect and make their community, the Malone community, a better place.\(^{62}\) This was a common feeling amongst students. They were beginning to see the Malone Experiment as inconsistent and leaning too much into *in loco parentis*, and they wanted more freedoms and responsibilities.

When eighty-seven student concerns were brought up at a single student senate meeting in early 1971, the president of the student body, Jon Teuscher, felt called to action; however, some of the pushes for responsibility were taken too far, such as student senate’s request to completely control the dress code and disciplinary action toward students.\(^{63}\) Other requests were more feasible. Senate voted 14-1-6 that possession of alcohol should be left up to the student when off campus and 17-2-2 that any student should be allowed to smoke off campus.\(^{64}\) Cattell responded directly to Teuscher, saying that “the request for smoking and drinking off campus has such deep ramifications that a great deal of discussion is necessary. The matter is before the faculty and may well go to the Board of Trustees in March. We must however be prepared to see even the Board of Trustees needing time to wrestle with this.”\(^{65}\)
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\(^{62}\) Ibid.
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\(^{64}\) Teuscher, Jon. Letter to Everett Cattell regarding student senate’s position. 13 Feb 1971. *MS25*.

did not take a side of the issue at all during his presidency. He took note of the opinions of everyone around him, but nowhere were Cattell’s specific opinions announced—only his ever-constant desire for student growth and balance in all areas of life: Christian and non-Christian students, evangelism and intellectualism, and both faculty and student input on the important issues of alcohol and tobacco.

The way Cattell deeply analyzed and took into account the opinions of everyone involved can be seen by reading the letters sent to him in February of 1971. He received dozens of positive letters, but just as many negative ones. Letters poured in from professors, students, parents, and concerned community members. Each and every letter had some sort of marking by Cattell on it, whether it was underlining, bracketing, or notes in the margins. He took the time to consider each person’s opinion before making any decisions.

Students overwhelmingly supported a change in policy—those who opposed it were few and far between. Some letters on the conservative end of the spectrum describe how the only people who spoke out were the ones who wanted change, so it is possible that a larger portion of the student body favored the policy as it was, but they were not nearly as outspoken as the other end of the spectrum. Most likely, those who opposed the changes were from conservative evangelical backgrounds, just as Cattell described the faculty who did not support the changes. Some of these students wrote more kindly that Cattell had “full support in regards to enforcement of the Constitution set up by the trustees of Malone
College,"\(^{66}\) as they “chose Malone for what the college believed and stood for. For its fine record in the past."\(^{67}\) The majority of students, however, supported changes in policy, asking for even more freedoms than those provided, as could be seen with student senate’s desire for control over dress code and student discipline. Many students reasoned that providing them with more freedoms would allow them to mature and become responsible adults, signaling proof of Malone’s trust in them. They wanted a movement away from in loco parentis.

Word spread fast through Malone and the surrounding community, and the majority of students’ parents were not as keen about lessening in loco parentis as were the students themselves. One set of parents in particular wrote:

> We have been told that the students at Malone would like to change the rules [sic] and allow smoking and drinking off campus. We are sorry to learn of this and hope and pray that it will not come about. Our son is attending Malone because of rules such as these and that is the reason my husband and I encouraged him to attend. We are very much concerned, knowing the troubles on other campuses, that by changing these rules it could lead to other changes if the college doesn’t stand firm. If changing these rules were to happen the college would loose [sic] its name for being a Christian college for which it has long been know [sic]. Our purpose for writing this letter is just to let you know that we are very much against allowing smoking and drinking off campus and we are praying that you will find the wisdom and courage to stand firm on these very basic issues. Concerned parents, Mr. & Mrs. Dale Paxson. \(^{68}\)

Mr. and Mrs. Paxson clearly helped their son choose Malone because of its in loco parentis attitude and rules, making it difficult for them to accept any proposed


\(^{67}\) Ibid.

\(^{68}\) Paxson, Mr. and Mrs. Letter to Everett Cattell. MS25.
changes. Other parents, though, seemed more open, even supportive of, the changes, one example being the parents of a student named Kay. They wrote:

Kay has been telling us a little of the situation at the college. We think of the great pressure that must be upon you these days and want you to know that we are remembering you in prayer. Malone College is dear to our heart and we pray the Lord will give wisdom and divine guidance. We are thankful you are the college president as we have confidence in you.⁶⁹

Whether supportive or argumentative, every single letter was read and considered by Cattell while making his decision.

Responses from faculty slightly differed from those of everyone else because Cattell specifically asked each of them to respond to his proposal. The faculty had two half-day meetings in which points were brought up and discussed, allowing everyone to provide input, and then afterwards, Cattell encouraged them to articulate their thoughts in letters to him. In 1971, just as in 1966, the threats for discontinuation of contracts by Malone employees appeared. One professor wrote a note in which he mentioned six faculty members from his department that would not return if changes were made,⁷⁰ and another claimed that he and his wife had strong convictions and “if changes are made that we feel we can no longer work under, we will be forced to look elsewhere for employment.”⁷¹ There was a large degree of faculty turnover in 1971, which could definitely have resulted from dissatisfaction of Malone’s decisions. However, this could also have been because
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of the loss of funding many private colleges were receiving. In the 1970s, Malone was forced to trim its literature, history, and social science departments, and modern foreign languages were eliminated entirely.\textsuperscript{72} This can be seen when comparing faculty lists from each year, which show the new faculty members to each department and which ones disappear, but do not give reason. It is impossible to tell whether staff members quit out of anger, retired, resigned, or were let go because of outside circumstances.

The majority of the staff, however, did not react as strongly against any changes. Faculty members were allowed to present their views at the two meetings, and many suggestions, such as gradual freedom and responsibility and waivers signed by parents were brought up and discussed. The most formative suggestion, however, came from Eugene Collins and Archie Penner, religion and philosophy professors, respectively. Their belief, summarized at the end of the meeting, was favored by the vast majority of the faculty. It reads:

\begin{quote}
We affirm that our belief and faith has as one of its principles the deep conviction that smoking and drinking are at least a detriment to the health of our youth. While at the same time, our experience knows them to have potentially debilitating results in both interpersonal, social as well as spiritual, values. As our testimony to this principle, we therefore forbid smoking and drinking as a live option for our students who live on campus. But, knowing that the college’s capacity to impose this discipline is limited both by its ability to follow our students wherever they go and also by a given student’s capacity to conceal from us his off-campus activity, it is understood that his choice to smoke and drink off campus is not a result of our tacit permission nor the lowering of our understanding of this principle as a fine and attractive Christian way of life but by
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{72} Hodges, O’Donnell & Oliver. \textit{Cradles of Conscience}. 271.
our honest confession that even great principles such as these can and will be rejected.\textsuperscript{73}

The widely accepted proposal stated that the college did view smoking and drinking as detrimental in many ways, and that was why it was prohibited on campus. It recognized, however, that Malone could not police students’ off-campus activities, so it couldn’t technically make these activities against the rules off-campus. Instead, it would have to be the student’s moral decision, knowing that Malone disapproved of the action. Malone administrators weren’t allowing it by principle, but they were acknowledging that they couldn’t successfully disallow it by physical force.

The “Penner Formula” or the “Penner-Collins Principle,” as it came to be known, was mentioned in many of the staff member’s letters as a possible middle ground for agreement. In Everett Cattell’s “Summary of 51 Written Responses of the Faculty of Malone College Following Two Half-Day Discussions of Student Requests for Change,” he tallied that thirteen people opposed a change in the present rules, while thirty-five supported the Penner Formula, concluding, “It seems clear that this is the area which holds possibility of a formula which may gain agreement.”\textsuperscript{74} Overall, about seventy-five percent of faculty supported change, and twenty-five percent opposed it. The Penner Formula, though, provided the key middle-ground area that Cattell had so long been searching for.

\textsuperscript{73} Minutes of Malone College Faculty. 18 Feb 1971. MS25.
\textsuperscript{74} Cattell, Everett. “Summary of 51 Written Responses of the Faculty of Malone College Following Two Half-Day Discussions of Student Requests for Change.” MS25.
Another suggestion brought up as a result of the *in loco parentis* discussion was Roger Wood's “family versus community” idea. Woods proposed that rather than Malone referring to itself as a family, it should revolve around a community model.75 Though *in loco parentis* rules were being lessened, they still existed; however, using the method of college as community, students would be less likely to see the aspects of it that were still there. When referred to as a family, students saw faculty as the parents enforcing rules on the student-children. As a community, there was a more equal playing field for both parties. In addition to this philosophy, though, there had to be actions put in place to ensure a more equal grounding, mostly through the inclusion of student representatives on some committees and boards. Multiple faculty members mentioned Woods's proposal in their letters in addition to the Penner Formula, stating that they believed it would be a positive change for Malone to adopt. Physical education instructor Jack Hazen wrote:

I believe Dr. Wood’s idea may be the key to solving some of our immediate problems, and may be a deterrent in preventing future conflicts. His comparison of Malone to a community, rather than a family seems just in lieu of the fact that the students are “turned off” by the paternal aspect of our present campus society. By showing our faith and trust in students, by permitting them to serve on all committees, and have voting priviledges [sic] with the faculty and board of trustees, we may be able to foresee needed changes as they occur, thus, providing a more workable situation.76

---

Eight faculty directly said they desired a move away from paternalism, and others mentioned their agreement with Woods’s “family to community” proposal, making his idea another crucial aspect of Cattell's decision. Those who disagreed with either the Penner Formula or the “family to community” proposal countered with the ideas of students’ immaturity and the values of regulation and discipline in character building of the students. They wondered just how much permission students should be given in regards to institutional policy.

The Final Decision

After years of preparation, weeks of discussion, and dozens of letters, Cattell was finally ready to present his findings to the Board of Trustees. Cattell scheduled a meeting on March 26 and 27, 1971 and presented an all-encompassing proposal about the previous five years. He discussed the importance of equal policies for residents and commuters, and he emphasized the need for Malone to hold onto its Christian foundation. But, he asked, “what is normal in a changing world, and what is a moral imperative?” What is allowed to change when culture changes, and what must be held firm throughout all of time? No human can draw that line—only God can make the decision. Thus, Cattell prayerfully gathered information from all areas and trusted that God’s will would prevail in the final decision.

---
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The question of moral imperatives versus changing cultures was an important one for the time because, though many conservative evangelicals did not notice or want to believe it, the church was also changing. In 1963, the Friends church changed its stance slightly on its ban on participation in war, though still supporting “members who refuse to bear arms for conscience sake.”80 This directly paralleled Malone’s decision to morally disagree with drinking and smoking off campus but recant its prohibition against it. The Friends church also no longer disowned members who attended movies, asking only that they avoid any that were “demoralizing.”81 The church hardened its stance against dancing, though, and Malone did the same.82 Clearly Malone was not stepping outside its bounds as a Christian institution if the church was also changing. Each had to decide which regulations existed as moral foundations of life and which could be changed with the times.

*The Aviso* did a good job of summarizing Malone’s situation throughout its five years of difficulty: The church felt victimized because its moral standard was viewed as the source of the problems, Malone felt victimized because of its divided and angry constituents, and the students felt victimized by the *in loco parentis* phenomenon.83 Clearly, something had to change.

---

81 Ibid., 270.
82 Ibid.
The Aviso reported on April 2, 1971 that the Board of Trustees approved Cattell’s proposal to change the policy on alcohol and tobacco use off campus.\textsuperscript{84} The long road to a morally upright lessening in restraint was over. The new policy read, in part:

1. That the use of tobacco, alcohol, hallucinogens, and narcotics give rise to major health and social problems is now self-evident, and therefore is of spiritual concern as well. Malone College strongly disapproves the use of these for all its students at all times. The College seeks to reinforce the decisions of youth who already have not determined to start these habits, and to discourage all from beginning....

3. The use or possession of any type of intoxicating beverage and the use of tobacco is forbidden on campus or its adjacent areas, in college sponsored housing, or at college sponsored events. Violations may lead to suspension.

4. Elsewhere the behavior of Malone students and the maintenance of Malone ideals is a matter of sacred trust dependent upon the conscience and integrity of the student and upon the helpful concern and influence of his friends and peers.\textsuperscript{85}

This adjustment was the best possible balance between conservative evangelicals and secular individuals at the time. In fact, a year later, incidents of smoking and drinking did not seem to have increased, though there was more openness on campus amongst those who did partake in those activities,\textsuperscript{86} perhaps leaked down from a newfound openness among administration. Not only did the policy changes alter protocol for students, but they opened up new pathways of discussion and set the pace for difficult decisions in the future. For example, a council for communication was formed with student members so issues could be

\textsuperscript{84} The Aviso Vol. 10 No. 10. 02 Apr 1971. MS25.
\textsuperscript{85} Minutes of the Board of Trustees. 26 & 27 Mar 1971. MS25.
\textsuperscript{86} Report from the Student Services Committee to the Board of Trustees. 25 Mar 1972. MS25.
discussed directly.\textsuperscript{87} This way, students were treated more like adults, and everyone felt more like a level community than a family enacting \textit{in loco parentis}.

**Analysis**

In the end, there is no clear conclusion to the policy changes, as policies will continue to change over time. Everett Cattell, the Board of Trustees, and everyone else who played a part in the changes did the best they could with the information they had at the time. In 1967, Cattell found faculty, administrators, and trustees divided over the issues of smoking, drinking, and dancing. The issue fell away for a few years, then came back with a vengeance in 1971. After Penner and Collins presented their principle, the house was still divided, but now it was 75\% to 25\%, with a clear majority favoring change under certain circumstances. After countless complaints countered with much support, Everett Cattell and the Board of Trustees finally approved a change in restrictions of tobacco and alcohol.

Though changing a few sentences of one policy on a college campus may seem trivial, the events on Malone’s campus between 1965 and 1971 signaled so much more. As a result of the process, the Malone community had a deeper understanding of exactly what it meant to be a student or employee of Malone College. Cattell’s constant barrage of the definition of The Malone Experiment, Malone’s position as an institution of balance between church and community, and the unchanging morals of the institution itself helped staff, students, parents, parents,
and community members consider the difference between moral absolutes and changing cultures.

Joeckel and Chesnes claim that regulations existing for obedience rather than transformation exist for the wrong reasons, and that students fare much better when they are made aware of the philosophies behind these regulations.\footnote{Joeckel and Chesnes. \textit{The Christian College Phenomenon}.135.}

One of Cattell’s most solidified goals was that of transforming the student body. He desired to form the most practical regulations for the time period while still holding fast to Malone’s founding moral principles. Malone did not completely abandon \textit{in loco parentis}, and many Christian schools have still not taken that step. With the balance of baseline moral principles and acquiescence to changing times, these schools have still not felt that completely eradicating all regulations regarding drinking, sex, curfew, etc. is acceptable morally, even though it is the trend in most secular schools. Interestingly, they have students sign “community agreements,” implementing the “family versus community” principle that Woods suggested almost fifty years ago.\footnote{Ibid., 140-141.}

Contrary to society’s belief, individual choices cannot comprise a community. In a true community, everyone makes his or her own choice, but “believers are commanded to do this with intentionality, humility, kindness, and love.”\footnote{Ibid., 134.} Forming and maintaining these kinds of community decisions is crucial to a healthy community in itself. Malone College made its stance on alcohol and
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tobacco but left the final off-campus decision up to the student. Cattell, whether knowingly or unknowingly, promoted this kind of Christian community through his constant push for health of the student body and balance for all parties involved with Malone College.

Many constituents of Malone at the time argued for a more strict religious homogeneity, but Joeckel and Chesnes argue that that would, in fact, counteract the true aims of education. Another of Cattell’s unwavering goals was the openness of Malone to different ideas. According to Joeckel and Chesnes, a homogeneous institution blocks that free flow of communication and diverse ideas because everyone thinks the same way. Malone therefore did a great job of opening itself up to discussion and higher intellectual capabilities because of its willingness to listen to the ideas of everyone involved, even going so far as to include students on boards that make crucial decisions for the college. This set a precedent for Malone’s continuing legacy.

Implications for Today

Current constituents of Malone can learn many things from Malone’s journey in the past. First, we can be sure that the institution will continue to change. Malone’s culture will shift along with that of every other college, every other church, and every other community. The present situation of Malone University has brought many similar circumstances to Cattell’s era, including
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increased competition, fewer high school graduates, and a continued fear of secularization. However, faculty, students, and community members should have continued faith in Malone.

George Marsden holds that Christian liberal arts colleges are in a great position because, by remaining true to their religious bases while still being open to academic discourse, they offer a very enlightened yet traditional environment in which to exchange ideas about both religion and academia as a whole, something which college-seekers are beginning to desire more and more.92 As Jay Case articulates, society realized that even “highly educated societies were still capable of genocide, nuclear war, racism, sexism, environmental destruction, and student unrest.”93 Thus, the confusion and misdirection of secular colleges sends people back to the Christian university that has stuck to its roots, though still allowing academic discourse to take place.

Malone still has its struggles today, and it will have its struggles in the future, but “in [2014], as in 1892 and 1957, Malone seeks to ‘provide students with an education based on biblical faith in order to develop men and women in intellectual maturity, wisdom, and Christian faith who are committed to serving the church, community, and world.”94 Malone’s moral foundation has stayed the test of time, and God will dictate how that foundation looks in the future, through

92 Marsden. Outrageous. 104, 110.
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changes in name, location, leadership, policy, and anything else that may come its way.
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