

**THE LEXINGTON “HERESY TRIAL”:
WILLIAM CLAYTON BOWER AND THE PROGRESSIVE SCHOOL**

W. Alan Smith
Florida Southern College

**REA/APRE ANNUAL MEETING
CHICAGO, NOVEMBER 7-9, 2003**

The initial two decades of the twentieth century saw an uneasy and short-lived resolution of a battle over the proper interpretation of the Bible that had begun to fester as the preceding century came to a close. In the United States, the relationship between the emerging culture of new sciences and the established orthodoxy of traditional Christianity (especially Protestant forms of Christianity) became the focal point of emotional, often invective, exchanges in journals, pulpits, classrooms, and courtrooms. At issue in the growing debate was the nature of the Bible itself. The two identifiable sides in the struggle were those who advocated the “liberal” theology and its use of historical-critical methods of biblical interpretation and their opponents, who regarded themselves as conservatives or traditionalists. These two approaches to understanding the Bible had significantly different understandings of the nature, authority, and inspiration of the Scriptures. The battle that raged in the church over this issue impacted every aspect of theology, including religious education.

In essentially the same time period, the field of religious education was beginning to feel the influence of the educational philosophy of John Dewey and the “progressive” school of education. Many of the leaders who helped to establish the Religious Education Association in the earliest years of the century had been educated in both the liberal theology, with its characteristic approach to the Bible and the progressive philosophy of education and its emphases upon growth and the centrality of personal experience.

One of those early twentieth-century religious educators was William Clayton Bower. An ordained minister in what would later be known as the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Bower was appointed to the Alexander Hopkins Chair of Bible School Pedagogy at the College of the Bible in Lexington, Kentucky in 1912 (Stevenson 1983, 37). Bower’s educational experiences had introduced him to such leading figures as Edward Scribner Ames and Winifred Ernest Garrison at Butler College in Indianapolis and George Albert Coe at Columbia University, where he pursued his doctoral degree (36-7). When he arrived on the campus of the College of the Bible in 1912, Bower walked into the heart of a controversy between liberals and conservatives that eventually erupted into what has been called the “Lexington Heresy Trial” in 1917.

I wish to use a study of the issues involved in this event in William Clayton Bower’s life as a case study in many of the major themes that led to the establishment and early development of the Religious Education Association. Because Bower is a representative figure in liberalism and progressivism, the background and resolution of the “heresy” trial illustrate theological and pedagogical matters that are fundamental to the self-understanding of the REA. Bower’s own

association with the organization lasted from its early years until his death in 1982 at the age of 104.

Some Basic Assumptions of Liberal Theology

There is no absolutely certain place to begin tracing the origins of liberal theology, but one option is to start with two themes that emerged in the Enlightenment: the centrality of reason and the focus on the self. Rene Descartes' oft-repeated dictum, *cogito, ergo sum* ("I think, therefore I am") has been characterized as identifying human reason as the major feature distinguishing humanity from the rest of the created order. There is no question that reason played a central role in the Enlightenment as a whole. But Descartes' statement has another feature that is not always recognized: the only word that appears twice in the sentence is "I". The Enlightenment was about more than reason alone; it was about the shifting of the locus of authority from tradition to the autonomous, thinking self. The pre-modern era of Christendom had placed the individual under the hegemony of the Church and its tradition (Brueggemann 1993, 3) Modernism reversed the flow of this authority, regarding the work of the autonomous rational subject as central to the human enterprise (Lakeland 1997, 17).

In response to this dual emphasis upon reason and subjectivity, Friederich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) claimed that religion was not a matter of the content of one's belief, nor was religion solely a matter of one's practical actions; true religion was understood as a feeling or intuition. "One's religion is thus based on one's experience, on a 'feeling of utter dependence' on the ground of nature—God." (McKim 1985, 41) Donald McKim claims that Schleiermacher shifted "the focus of religious authority away from the traditional source, the Bible, to an individual's religious experience." This shift paves the way for Schleiermacher's development of hermeneutical method as the attempt to understand the "mind of the author" rather than the objective meaning of the biblical text. This "psychologizing move" in biblical method was intended to assist the reader or interpreter to "understand the text... better than its author" (Linge 1976, 112). This Romantic development in hermeneutics further refined the historical-critical method of interpreting Scripture that had begun as a result of the Enlightenment. At the heart of biblical criticism, as it developed in the nineteenth century, was the priority of the activity of the interpreter over the voice of the text itself. Proper method could reveal truth. At the same time, Schleiermacher's attention to the individual's experience of an immanent God contributed to the emergence of personal experience as a central issue in progressivism. Reason was no longer regarded as "pure" reason; the locus of authority was the experience of the rational subject.

Liberal theology was also influenced by several significant developments in the sciences during the nineteenth century. The first of these influences was the growing acceptance of scientific method as the norm for virtually all scholarly investigation. The empirical method that was developed by the natural sciences was based on the priority of observation and experimentation. As empiricism began to dominate the methods used by the social sciences and by those in the humanities as well, the focus on objective observation of the data under investigation began to bring the pre-modern period's emphasis upon external authority into question. The resultant development of theology in light of empirical observation led "theologians to interpret experience objectively." The historical-critical method of biblical studies that became the

standard method for liberal theology shifted the “locus of authority from the ‘external’ Scriptures to the ‘internal’ religious experience [which] represents a reaction to the way in which Scriptures were understood in the light of the modern biblical research of the period.” (McKim 1985, 43)

A second major contribution of the sciences to liberal theology was the emergence of the theory of evolution as a major influence on nineteenth-century intellectual thought. As McKim suggests, the nineteenth-century emphasis upon mechanical causation as the law of the universe and the extension of the claims of biological evolution to other fields of the scholarly enterprise “emphasized the unitary process [out] of which nature and human existence emerged and continued to exist. Positively, this prepared the way for an emphasis on the immanence of God.” (42) Liberal theology operated out of an assumption of history as a record of the dynamic, progressive self-revelation of God. With the historical-critical method of biblical studies, liberals had a tool to identify this self-revelation and to use the results of this investigation of the Bible and tradition to reconstruct theology. (45) The emerging belief that God was becoming progressively more present to human experience and that each successive era of human history provided further evidence of the essential goodness of humanity and its development toward perfection resulted in an era of increased optimism. As Lester Mc Allister and William E. Tucker suggest:

The genius of liberal theology was its openness to all truth and its insistence on genuine dialogue between church and world. Fearing nothing more than an outmoded faith, liberals reconstructed Christian theology in order to harmonize it with prevailing currents in philosophy and science. Their emphasis on historical optimism, the immanence of God, the dignity of [humanity], and the humanity of Christ stood in vivid contrast to traditional Christianity. Exponents of liberalism resolved the apparent conflict between Moses and Darwin by insisting that evolution could have been ‘God’s way of doing things’. They defended the principles of biblical criticism on the ground that the Bible was not only the record of divine revelation but also an intensely human collection of documents. (McAllister and Tucker 1975, 362)

The application of this approach to reading the Scriptures allowed liberal interpreters to identify the cultural conditions that influenced the development of the Bible. As Paul Achtemeier states, “What all of this means is that the Scriptures have been conditioned by the culture within which they took their origin in the same way that all other writings are so affected.” (Achtemeier 1980, 42) Biblical scholars began to recognize and discuss “discrepancies” in the Bible. Interpreters began to comment upon morally questionable acts and sentiments in the Scriptures. Persons began to identify varying “degrees of inspiration” within the texts of their faith. All of this led to a decisive change in the ways persons of faith began to understand the “truth” in relation to the Bible: “Scriptures therefore must be seen as a collection of materials written by fallible men who reflected the culture out of which they came and for which they were writing. Accordingly, Scripture itself is best described as a mixture of the word of God with the erring words of its human authors” (43-44)

The Controversy At the College of the Bible

The emergence of liberal theology as the primary form of theology in “mainline” theological seminaries at the turn of the century met with severe and vocal opposition from a variety of directions in the churches of the United States. The Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) was represented by two major journals as the nineteenth century came to a close: the *Christian-Evangelist* increasingly recognized the validity of historical criticism and offered numerous opportunities in its pages for this approach to biblical interpretation to be heard. The *Christian Standard*, on the other hand, remained a staunch defender of what it saw as the “authentic faith” in the infallible, inerrant nature of biblical truth. The debate among persons advocating these two positions toward the nature of the Bible ran in published exchanges between these two journals and their editorial staffs from 1893-1917. McAllister and Tucker point out that among those who identified themselves as Disciples, the liberal position in the *Christian-Evangelist* was led by James A. Garrison (the journal’s editor), who sought to “champion the right of Christian scholars to pursue honest investigation and to report their findings” (McAllister and Tucker 1975, 366)—even while frequently disagreeing with some of the conclusions reached by that investigation—and Herbert L Willett, the young scholar recently appointed to the chair of the Disciples Divinity House at the University of Chicago by William Rainey Harper, who wrote a weekly commentary on the Scriptures for the Sunday school lesson for the journal. Willett attempted to find ways to bring the work of biblical scholars to the awareness and the acceptance of the laity. (366-7)

The more conservative members of the Disciples church began to regard Willett and his historical critical studies as blasphemous and wrote numerous letters to the editorial staff of the *Christian Standard* to complain that the *Christian-Evangelist* and the University of Chicago were “sheltering a heretic” in Willett. (367) The leader of the charges against Garrison, Willett, and others who adopted the liberal theology was John W. McGarvey, who began to offer a regular feature on “Biblical Criticism” in the *Christian Standard*. McGarvey, who was also president of the College of the Bible in Lexington, Kentucky, offered a sarcastic apologetic for a fundamentalist understanding of Scripture. His frequent targets for ridicule in the *Christian Standard* included Willett, Charles A. Briggs (who was suspended from the Presbyterian ministry for “departing from the Westminster Confession of faith”, 362), and William Rainey Harper. McGarvey argued that, since the Bible is the word of God, it must be verbally inspired and absolutely inerrant. He saw defending the integrity of the “authentic faith” from what he claimed was “destructive criticism” as his duty and his calling. (368)

The growing conflict within the Disciples came to a crisis point in the plans for the centennial observation of the founding of the Disciples church in 1909. Willett and Perry C. Rice, who also advocated the liberal theological position, were both on the schedule to present speeches at the meeting in Pittsburgh. The editorial staff of the *Christian Standard*, which had the contract to print the “Centennial Convention Report”, inserted an editorial statement in the report, disavowing any endorsement of the positions taken by these two speakers and refusing to take responsibility for even the appearance of their names in the document. The controversy over the nature and authority of the Bible had become a major issue for the Disciples as they began their second century of existence.

McGarvey died in 1911. Shortly after his death, most of the members of the faculty at the College of the Bible also either died or retired due to illness. In fact, in 1912 only Hall C. Calhoun, McGarvey's hand-appointed successor and an ardent critic of liberal theology and its treatment of the Bible remained on the faculty. Calhoun was the dean of the college and served as acting President upon McGarvey's death. Because of the decimation of the faculty, R.H. Crossfield, the President of neighboring Transylvania College (a Disciples undergraduate school) was appointed to serve jointly as President of both the college and the seminary.

According to Dwight E. Stevenson, Crossfield "sought progressive university men to fill the vacancies" in the faculty, appointing William Clayton Bower and Alonzo W. Fortune in 1912, and Elmer E. Snoddy and George W. Hemry in 1914. "Representing the 'New Theology', these men were immediately suspected as heretics by many vocal critics, who sought to have them dismissed." (Stevenson 1983, 37) The criticism of the theological position represented by these professors grew from their appointments beginning in 1912, reaching its height in 1917. Dean Calhoun, who reflected the beliefs of his mentor, McGarvey, was receptive to the voices of students and supporters of the institution who felt the positions of the professors was antithetical to the true faith.

Bower was especially suspect. He had been appointed to the recently-named Alexander Hopkins Chair of Bible School Pedagogy following experience as a Disciples pastor in California and New York. Bower had taken his undergraduate studies at Butler College (now University) in Indianapolis where he had been taught by W. E. Garrison and Edward Scribner Ames, two Disciples scholars who advocated the "New Theology". It was this experience that introduced him to this new way of understanding theology. Bower stated, "I was amazed to find that the scholarly professors of this institution... did not have hoofs and horns." (Bower 1957, 19) Later, Bower pursued his doctoral studies in education at Columbia University, where his mentors included William H. Kilpatrick, E. L. Thorndike, and George Albert Coe. (Stevenson 1983, 37) Through his training, Bower had been introduced to both liberal theology and the progressive approaches to religious education advocated by Coe. The combination of these two schools of thought made Bower a focal point of the controversy in Lexington. At issue was the charge that Bower and the others taught both the theory of evolution and practiced the historical-critical approach to Scripture (in a 1976 interview in the *Bethany Guide*, Bower discussed the charges and readily agreed both were true. Wigglesworth 1976, 5-6)

In March of 1917, a group of students led by Ben F. Battenfield wrote a circular letter addressed to approximately three hundred pastors in the denomination. (McAllister and Tucker 1975, 369-70) The letter began, "I address you as one who has the interest of the College of the Bible at heart to ask you to do all you can to take it out of the hands of destructive critics." (Stevenson 1983, 37; note the similarity of language with McGarvey's earlier charges against Willett and his colleagues) The letter went on to charge Bower and his fellow professors with deluding the majority of the student body into discarding the true faith. (McAllister and Tucker 1975, 370) Later that month, the *Christian Standard* published the entire text of Battenfield's letter, along with a statement from Dean Hall Calhoun in which he stood with the students in supporting the charges. The incident precipitated into a raging controversy.

The Trustees of the College of the Bible were forced to call a special session to hear the charges against President Crossfield and the majority of the members of the faculty. In May of 1917, they convened to consider the charges that had been brewing for five years. The Board met for nine days, hearing testimony about the “heresy” that Bower and others had been teaching. Bower described the scene in this way:

There was a long table in the center. On one side sat... Mark Collis, pastor of Broadway Christian Church and president of the Board. On the opposite side sat the accuser, Dean Calhoun, and an attorney with a large bag of law books. Seated at the end was a stenographer. Seated along the south wall were the accused and around the other walls were the Trustees. (Bower 1957, 40)

Bower saw the courtroom setting and the mechanisms of a jury trial in place, and raised an immediate objection:

I instantly arose to call attention to the configuration of the room and the fact that we were heading straight for a trial... and I said, ‘I here and now take my stand as a Disciple. If my services are in the judgment of the Board not satisfactory, or to the best interests of the college, I recognize the right of the Board to dismiss me as a professor. But as a Disciple I refuse to be tried for heresy. (40-41)

Bower’s objection to the charge of heresy was based upon two primary issues: academic freedom and the long-standing tradition of biblical criticism in the Disciples church, which can be traced to one of its founders, Alexander Campbell and most of those who followed in his style of reading and interpreting the Bible through the use of human reason and the tools of history, archeology, and an understanding of Christian anthropology.

Following the arduous nine-day trial, the Board of Trustees acquitted the accused of all charges. A newspaper report of the outcome of the trial summed up the results in this way:

The Board has found no teaching in this College by any member of the faculty that is out of harmony with the fundamental conceptions and convictions of our brotherhood which relate to the inspiration of the Bible as the divine word of God, divinely given, and of divine authority, or to the divinity of Jesus Christ or to the plea of our people.

The Board has found no student whose faith in any of these things has been shaken, but has had evidence that the faith of many students has been strengthened. (*Lexington Herald*, May 10, 1917)

Bower later stated that the tide was turned in the trial when excerpts from a book on evolution were read to the “most active member of the opposition” during the hearings. The trustee to whom the passages were read objected strongly to the claims being made in the excerpts—and then realized that he was listening to a statement he himself had written some time earlier. (Obituary for Bower, *The Disciple* 27)

At the conclusion of the heresy trial, Dean Calhoun resigned from the College of the Bible. Through a series of articles in the *Christian Standard* he continued to press his claim that Bower

and his colleagues were leading the Disciples into false teaching. Calhoun eventually left his connection with the Disciples and transferred his church membership to the Churches of Christ (non-instrumental). Bower, on the other hand, remained at the College of the Bible until 1926 when he was appointed to the University of Chicago in the department of Practical Theology at the Divinity School. During his remaining tenure in Lexington, Bower served as Dean of the College from 1921-1926 and produced some of his earliest influential writings, including *The Educational Task of the Local Church: A Textbook in the Standard Course in Teacher Training* (1921) and *The Curriculum of Religious Education* (1925), and had begun serving on the International Lesson Committee. When he moved to Chicago, Bower re-united with W. E. Garrison and E. S. Ames, his professors from his undergraduate days at Butler College. The University of Chicago was still under the influence of William Rainey Harper and the tradition of free investigation of Scripture and theology that Harper had fostered.

Liberal Theology and Progressivism in Bower and the R.E.A.

Bower listed numerous influences in the formation of his approach to the Bible and to the practice of religious education. He warmly embraced the label of a theological liberal, but refused to accept any description of being a radical. (Honeycutt 1982, B7) As a student of George Albert Coe at Columbia University and later a colleague with him at Chicago, he was well schooled in the “functional” approach to religious education. Bower readily mentioned the influences of John Dewey and W. H. Kilpatrick in the area of education and of Alfred North Whitehead in philosophy and theology. (Wiglesworth 1976, 6) He listed the influence of the Religious Education Association, of which he was a director, as “probably the greatest single influence” in the change of attitude toward the use of the Bible in religious education. He especially identified the role of William Rainey Harper in leading the R. E. A. toward being a “body of inquiry, open-minded and critical, with the objective of bringing religion into education and education into religion.” (5)

Bower’s “functional approach to the Bible” was already being used in his early experience at the College of the Bible. One of the clearest expressions of this approach was in his book *Christ and Christian Education* (1943). Here, Bower presented an educational theology by outlining what he saw as Jesus’ own approach to teaching: 1. Jesus did not start with the Scriptures or any other expression of tradition, but with the experience of living people; 2. Jesus thought of religion as a quality of everyday life rather than an experience that was separated from these events or limited to ceremonial acts; 3. Jesus did not give persons ready-made solutions to their problems that were derived from tradition or from Scripture, but threw them back on their own resources to find those solutions; and 4. Jesus “placed his emphasis upon action as the outcome of thinking and purposing.” (Bower 1943, 20-25) His understanding of the Bible may be seen in his claim that “[t]he Bible becomes the Living Word for us only as it is brought into functional relation with our own experience as living members of the continuing Christian community in the contemporary world.” (88)

Ralph Heim mentions Bower’s *The Living Bible* (1926) as one of the initial expressions of the “functional approach” to the Bible, which Heim says “means using the Bible purposively in relation to life’s total activity, employing it primarily as a resource to affect actual adjustments of current personal and social living in some definite respect.” (Heim 1960, 55) In this book, Bower

described his understanding of the Bible as “authoritative, but not to be treated as a dead level static book from Genesis to Revelation, as it is to so many people.” Bower claimed that he and his colleagues in the International Curriculum of Religious Education:

took a functional versus an authoritative view of the bible. It was considered a resource—not the only source of authority for life. The liberals were concerned with the findings of science, history, technology, archeology, sociology—in whatever disciplines you could find relevant material for the life in which the Bible was to be used. (Wiglesworth 1976, 5)

This understanding of the use of the Bible as a resource for Christian living was already present in his work while at the College of the Bible. His *Curriculum of Religious Education* (1925):

contended that religious education is concerned primarily ‘not with the transmission of knowledge about the Bible or the Christian tradition, but with the growth of persons into Christ-like personalities in social relations’. The content of the field consists of the experience of ‘growing persons responding in Christian easy to real-life situations.’ The Bible? Along with other forms of the Christian tradition, it is a ‘resource’ to help growing persons interpret their experiences, ‘to judge possible outcomes, to make choices and commitments; and to carry these commitments through beyond verbalization to action.’ (Stevenson 1983, 39)

Harold Burgess claims that this book became a standard of the religious education movement during the second quarter of the twentieth century because of the “deliberate introduction of scientific methodology to all levels of educational endeavor.” (Burgess 1996, 83)

Bower consistently maintained many of the themes that came from the liberal theology in which he had been trained. He regarded the Bible as more than simply a collection of doctrines and authoritative statements. Rather, he considered the Bible as one place a growing and searching Christian could find ways to understand and develop her or his own experience of God’s immanent presence in the world. For Bower, the goal for the Christian was to live a Christ-like life, and the only way one could do that was to reflect on his or her experience in light of the Gospel accounts of Jesus’ relationship with real humans in real-life situations. Like many other products of liberal theology and progressivism, for Bower the starting point for all learning was the lived experience of the person in community. “[Bower] saw education as a creative process. Education was understood as initiation into a creative, social experience, and the goal of religious education was to help persons develop moral and spiritual qualities.” (M. E. Moore 1983, 30) Harold Burgess characterizes Bower’s objectives of religious education as: 1. to help growing persons achieve a Christlike personality; 2. to bring society under the ideals of Christ in the progressive realization of the kingdom of God; 3. to make resources of the Christian faith available for dealing with the issues of the day; and 4. to build a sustaining fellowship which is the church. (Burgess 1996, 90)

Among the influences that Bower mentions, the figure of William Rainey Harper looms large. As the founding president of the University of Chicago, where Bower taught following his fourteen years in Lexington, Harper developed a reputation as a serious, if careful, biblical

scholar. He practiced the historical-critical methods of scholarship, but was relatively moderate in his conclusions. As Stephen Schmidt says, “[h]is exegesis was based on solid linguistic and textual work. His conclusions were measured and careful.” (Schmidt 1983, 23-4) Another feature of Harper’s work with the Bible was that he committed himself to finding ways to connect the work of the scholarly community with the lives of “common persons”. Schmidt claims the development of the Religious Education Association was a part of Harper’s attempts at popularizing the benefits of historical-critical method. Another feature of Harper’s thought that impacted the work of Bower and others was Harper’s commitment to building the “democracy of God”. (22) This recurring theme of the progressive school of religious education was one of the issues that led Harper to bring George Albert Coe as his designated successor in working out this progressive vision of a reconstructed society. Coe succeeded Harper at the reigns of the R. E. A. and carried on the liberal approach to understanding the Bible and tradition as well as developing his own version of “functional religious education.”

Coe was one of the most dominant influences on Bower’s work. Coe’s Christology “moved from the historical Jesus to the incarnate experience of Jesus in the life of all Christians.” (38) Coe urged Christians to abandon the old Christian Education methods of indoctrination and “to adopt the principles of modern psychology and methodology” which were driven by three ideals: 1. “the ideal of freely unfolding individuality; 2. the aspiration for political freedom that came to partial expression in the French Revolution and in the early stages of the American experiment in popular government; and 3. incorporation of the ‘scientific movement’ into the educational process.” (Ulich 1968, 273-4) Coe did not treat the Bible as an infallible and absolutely authoritative document. Rather, he focused on “the spirit of Jesus with its emphasis on brotherly love, faith and hope must be emphasized. The most daring and the most unflinching social teaching will never cease to look back to Jesus.” (274) If given a choice between seeing religious education as handing on religion from one generation to another or as working to create a new world, Coe would have opted for the latter. He proposed creative, not transmissive education, thus combining liberal and progressive themes in his work. (Groome 1980, 118) Bower’s own work reflected many of these same themes and his close work with Coe in the Religious Education Association and the International Council of Religious Education undoubtedly increased the influence of Coe on Bower’s thought. Bower and Coe were both equally at home in conversations with contemporary theorists of general educational dialogue as in religious discussions and both were committed to wedding the two forms of education together. (A. J. Moore 1984, 99) Charles Melchert maintains that Coe, Bower, Paul Vieth, Luther Wiegler, and Adelaide Case were among those persons who made religious education a respectable scholarly enterprise. (Melchert 1970, 20-21)

Conclusions

The “Lexington Heresy Trial” became a focal point of an era of controversy over the developing themes of the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century. Several of the major Protestant church bodies were engaged in similar struggles over the proper ways to read the Bible and apply it to one’s everyday life. Among the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) communion, William Clayton Bower’s liberal approach to the inspiration and authority of Scripture, his commitment to the claims of science and the theory of evolution, and his grounding in the progressive school of religious education and its ideals of building the

“democracy of God” on earth and beginning education with the lived experience of the student rather than transmitting the authoritative tradition of church doctrine made him a ready target for the more conservative side of the Disciples tradition. The trial identified clear differences between these two camps of theology at the turn of the century. The themes Bower developed in his long and distinguished career were consistent with themes that were at the heart of the early years of the Religious Education Association. He worked closely with many of the leaders of that organization and served for several years as an officer in the Association as well as an editor of and regular contributor to the journal. As a result, the “Lexington Heresy Trial” and its resolution that supported both academic freedom in an institution of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) and the acceptance, if not endorsement, of liberal/ progressive theology and religious education set the tone for an era of religious education that was creative rather than transmissive, functional rather than authoritative, and experience-centered rather than tradition-centered. James H. Garrison recognized the significance of the outcome of the trial for the denomination, and his summary statement may serve as a worthy conclusion to the paper: “Our whole educational future, as a religious people who have emphasized intellectual freedom along with simplicity and soundness of faith, has a brighter outlook because of this incident.” (McAllister and Tucker 1975, 371)

Works Cited

- Achtemeier, P. J. 1980. *The inspiration of scripture: Problems and proposals*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Bower, W.C. 1925. *The curriculum of religious education*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons.
- _____. 1936. *The living bible*. New York: Harper & Row.
- _____. 1943. *Christ and Christian education*. New York: Abingdon- Cokesbury Press.
- _____. 1957. *Through the years: Personal memoirs*. Lexington, Ken.: Transylvania College Press.
- Brueggemann, W. 1993. *Texts under negotiation: The bible and postmodern imagination*. Minneapolis, Min.: Fortress Press.
- Burgess, H. W. 1996. *Models of religious education: Theory and practice in historical and contemporary perspectives*. Wheaton, Ill.: Victor Books.
- The Disciple*. 1982. Obituary, November 7: 27.
- Groome, T. H. 1980. *Christian religious education: Sharing our story and vision*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Heim, R. D. 1960. The use of the bible in religious education. In *Religious education: a comprehensive survey of background, theory, methods, administration, and agencies*. Ed. M. J. Taylor. New York: Abingdon Press: 54-65.

Honeycutt, V. 1982. Dr. William Bower, educator and theologian, dies at 104. *Lexington Herald*, July 26: B 6-7.

Lakeland, P. 1997. *Postmodernity: Christian identity in a fragmented age*. Minneapolis, Min.: Fortress Press.

Linge, D. E. 1976. Editor's introduction. In *Philosophical hermeneutics*. Hans- Georg Gadamer. Tr. and ed. D. E. Linge. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press.

McAllister, L. G. and W. E. Tucker. 1975. *Journey in faith: A history of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)*. St. Louis: Bethany Press.

McKim, D. K. 1985. *The bible in theology and preaching: How preachers use scripture*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Melchert, C. F. 1970. Theory in religious education. In *Foundation for Christian education in an era of change*. Ed. M. J. Taylor. Nashville: Abingdon Press: 20-29.

Moore, A. J. 1984. Religious education as a discipline. In *Changing patterns of religious education*. Nashville: Abingdon Press: 89-105.

Moore, M. E. 1983. *Education for continuity and change: A new model for christian religious education*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Schmidt, S. A. 1983. *A history of the religious education association*. Birmingham, Ala: Religious Education Press.

Stevenson, D. E. 1983. William Clayton Bower: Pioneer in religious education. *Discipliana* 43 (3): 35-40.

Ulich, R. 1968. *A history of religious education: Documents and interpretations from the jewish-christian tradition*. New York: New York University Press

Wiglesworth, M. F. 1976 (October). Anniversary interview. *The bethanyguide*: 3-6.

