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An Appendix furnishes significant information relative to the final year of his administration, revealing the condition of the Seminary in 1986. It includes the fifteen-year projections of Donald K. Campbell, the third President of the Seminary, and it concludes with a transcribed interview with Donald K. Campbell.

Everyone who has been interviewed for the purposes of this study agree that John F. Walvoord took a nondescript, bankrupt school and turned it into one of the largest theological seminaries in the world. He began with a handful of faculty and students and built an institution of sixty faculty, over two thousand students, and a multi-million dollar physical plant. As an educational leader, he is a model for students of education to emulate.
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PREFACE

At the 1986 Spiritual Emphasis Week at Dallas Theological Seminary, Charles R. Swindoll said, "D.T.S. is a dangerous place to be. For the enemy is at work here more than any other single place in the world today. He knows that seminary is where cynicism sets in. It's where you start to doubt and be discouraged and fall into . . . depression."

Dallas Theological Seminary has been an institution that has been on the cutting edge of theological education since it was founded in 1924. For fifty of those years, Dr. John F. Walvoord has taken an active leadership role in this institution. This study will examine in detail how he began his career, and take a look at all he has accomplished over these years.

The bulk of research has come from the Archives of Dallas Theological Seminary. Dr. Walvoord's correspondence, all carbon copied, is on file. These files began when he became Registrar and continue until the close of 1954, after he had been in the office of President almost two full years. Records subsequent to that are still on file in the President's Office and were not available for study. The correspondence was catalogued in chronological order for the purposes of this study.

Dr. and Mrs. John F. Walvoord were very helpful in
providing personal insight into the various events recorded in the study. Also of tremendous help was John Witmer, the Librarian at Dallas Theological Seminary, who has served for many years alongside Dr. John F. Walvoord. Roy Zuck, the Academic Dean was helpful, as well as F. Duane Lindsey, the Registrar. Donald K. Campbell, now the third President of Dallas Theological Seminary was helpful as well, and excerpts from a personal interview with him are included in the Appendix.

At the Spiritual Emphasis Week, Charles R. Swindoll went on to say, "There is more of an openness on this campus than I've sensed before. I hear healthy discussion in classes and chapels and a better awareness of the real-life issues. . . . I'm encouraged by what I see on our campus." From its meager beginning in 1924, Dallas Theological Seminary has grown to be a vital part of theological education in America today.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the Spring of 1986, John F. Walvoord completed his administrative career at Dallas Theological Seminary. He had served the seminary for over fifty years, as Registrar, as Assistant to the President, and for thirty-four years as President. During his presidency, the seminary added four major buildings, two new academic departments, two degree programs, an extensive summer school curriculum, and was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (6, p. 19). In April of 1986 he stepped down as President, and has now assumed the new role of Chancellor, where he continues to serve the school in his itinerant ministry and through writing.

During these fifty years, he wrote nineteen books and hundreds of articles for Christian periodicals and scholarly journals. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, the oldest conservative theological journal in the United States, has published over one hundred and twenty-five articles by John F. Walvoord.

In addition to his administrative and writing career, he pastored Rosen Heights Presbyterian Church in Fort Worth, Texas, for sixteen years. At the same time he served as Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at the seminary.
Throughout his career, he has maintained a rigorous itinerary which has taken him to hundreds of churches and colleges in the United States and on six continents. "The 1981-82 total cumulative enrollment of 1,625 makes the Seminary the fourth largest in the world. These students came from fifty states and twenty-six foreign countries, and represent seventy-four denominations and independent churches" (7, p. 19). By 1986, Dallas Theological Seminary had fluctuated between third and fifth largest seminary in the world. To grow from its meager beginning in 1924 to where it is today required leadership. John F. Walvoord provided that leadership for fifty years.

A historical study of the administrative career of John F. Walvoord is justified because of the growth of the seminary under his leadership and because of his influence upon higher education in America. "The simple desire to acquire knowledge about previously unexamined phenomena has been a major impulse in historical inquiry" (1, p. 562). Biographies have been an important subcategory of histories written from a sustained curiosity, combined with the conviction that the subject merits the study. A history of a specific school such as Dallas Theological Seminary might be termed a biography of an institution, but it would prove much less interesting than an account of an individual life, such as that of John F. Walvoord. This is due to a chauvanism which frequently underlies institutional histories (1, p. 563).

In writing about the career of John F. Walvoord, there
are several problem areas which the author has attempted to avoid. The first of these is to avoid "presentism," or the imposition of modern thought patterns upon the minds of a different era. Avoiding "presentism" is often equated with being objective in historical research (1, p. 570). A second area of concern is that of the variability of personality. Personalities change; ideas grow and become different. The historian disregards an essential part of his task if he presents a study in which the person is full-grown and invariable. This problem leads to an over-simplification of the historical development of a person or a period of history (4, p. 56).

A third problem to be avoided is the issue of influence. Many historical studies try to estimate the influence of an individual such as John F. Walvoord by examining the career or writings. John F. Walvoord has been involved not only in administration and teaching, but writing, conference work, and by sitting on the Boards of many organizations. But the idea of influence is abstract and is likely to lead to disagreement even among experts. It is conceivable that a person or event mentioned often will be less influential than a person or event mentioned seldom (4, p. 58).

A fourth problem concerns the area of values. Any judgment regarding the significance, the greatness, or the influence of a person must always begin with the question: "What would have happened if this person had not lived?"
That is as near as the historian can come to the process in the natural sciences where the investigator removes a factor in order to determine its function in an experiment. What would Dallas Theological Seminary and modern American religion have been like without John F. Walvoord (4, p. 60)? In researching his career, it has become apparent that Dallas Theological Seminary would not be the same today without his leadership, and the Bible Church and parachurch movements have been greatly affected by him.

A fifth problem is that of reaction. An intriguing aspect of the problem of historical influence is that of reaction against an antecedent person or event. Usually a leading personality, a great book, or an original idea or action creates among its contemporaries some kind of favorable reaction. Many ideas or creative people are neglected by their contemporaries because "they were living before their times." Ideas or persons too far ahead of their time have no effect on their own generation either by influence or reaction against them. A person such as John F. Walvoord can be studied to see which persons were positively influenced by his life and career, and which persons reacted against him. Reaction against antecedent developments is a frequent and striking "cause" of historical events (4, pp. 61-62).

Chapter Two shall be devoted to an analysis of the religious scene in America immediately prior to the founding
of Dallas Theological Seminary. It shall include a description of the Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy from which the seminary was founded. "Modernism" theology was a theological revolt within American Protestantism from about 1900 to 1930. Most major Protestant denominations felt compelled to abandon traditionally held concepts of biblical beliefs and interpretations. Dwight L. Moody, a famous American evangelist during this period of time, did not hesitate to criticize the Modernist philosophy of biblical interpretation:

[The] picture is of a man following his minister's sermons carefully, and cutting out of a Bible whatever the minister said was not authentic. . . . One day this man carried to his pastor a badly mutilated Bible, from which numerous leaves and parts of leaves had been cut, saying:
"Here Pastor, is your Bible."
"My Bible?" said the clergyman impatiently.
"Yes, I have cut out all that you say is fable and allegory and folk-lore, and also the mythical and so-called unauthentic parts, and here is what is left."
"Give it to me," said the Preacher.
"No you don't," the man replied. "You haven't touched the covers yet, and I am going to cling to them at least."
"I believe," said Mr. Moody, "that there are a good many scholars in these days, as there were when Paul lived, who, professing themselves to be wise, have become fools. . . . I have said that ministers of the Gospel who are cutting up the Bible in this way . . . are emptying the churches and driving the young men of this generation into infidelity. . . . It is a singular fact that few men, otherwise well-educated, are acquainted with the English Bible. I can secure a hundred who can teach Greek and Latin well, where I can find only one that can teach the Bible well" (5, pp. 423-26).

Chapter Three will examine the founding of Dallas Theological Seminary and give a brief sketch of the men who were instrumental in its founding. In 1926, William Adams Brown
who was a professor of theology at Union Theological Seminary in New York, reflected on the changing religious attitudes reflected in modern thinking. Brown listed four major changes affecting theological education in America. These were changes in Physical Science, Historical Criticism, Sociology, and Psychology. The Gospel of Christ was being transformed into what he called a "social gospel." It was in reaction to these new attitudes in religion that Dallas Theological Seminary was founded (2, pp. 372-373).

Chapter Four will attempt to give a brief historical review of the early life and higher education of John F. Walvoord. The remainder of the study will be devoted to the historical study of the administrative career of John F. Walvoord from 1945 to 1986. It is divided into several chapters. Chapter Five will examine the Archives of Dallas Theological Seminary and reveal what John F. Walvoord did in his first full year as Assistant to the President. Chapter Six will examine his duties as Assistant to the President from 1946 to 1952. The chapter will be broken down into the seven major aspects of his job description as defined by Lewis Sperry Chafer, the founding President of the seminary. Chapter Seven will reveal what the Archives state about his first full year as President of Dallas Theological Seminary, covering up to the end of the available Archival material in December, 1954. Chapter Eight will span the years from 1955 through 1986, including an examination of literature available
through the seminary and information recorded from several personal interviews. Chapter Nine will be a concluding chapter summarizing the study. This summary will be done through a number of personal interviews with people that have been close to John F. Walvoord over the years. An attempt has been made to follow a chronological approach throughout the study, and to follow it in individual subdivisions as well. "That is, after all, the way history happens" (4, p. 51).

Sources used in the study are varied. Because so little actual material is available specifically about John F. Walvoord, the bulk of information has been obtained by direct conversation with Dr. and Mrs. Walvoord, his immediate staff, faculty, Board members of the seminary, alumni from various walks of life, and the seminary Archives.

In this study an attempt has been made to avoid theological terms that might not be familiar to those in other disciplines. Because of the theological distinctives of Dallas Theological Seminary, some terms are unavoidable. Several key terms are defined here for the sake of understanding, having been taken from the Evangelical Dictionary of Theology.

**Evangelicalism:** The movement in modern Christianity, transcending denominational and confessional boundaries, that emphasizes conformity to the basic tenets of the faith and a missionary outreach of compassion and urgency. Theologically it stressed God as an infinite personal being; Biblical Scripture as His divinely recorded revelation; the sinfulness of
man; salvation of man through the death and subsequent resurrection to life of Jesus Christ. Salvation is an act of unmerited divine grace received through faith in Christ, not through any kind of penance or good works (3, p. 379).

Fundamentalism: A movement that arose in the United States during and immediately after the First World War in order to reaffirm orthodox Protestant Christianity and to defend it militantly against the challenges of liberal theology, German higher criticism, Darwinism, and other movements regarded as harmful to American Christianity. A series of twelve volumes titled The Fundamentals (1910-1915) articulated what the writers believed to be fundamental to Christianity and orthodox to Protestantism. . . . By 1980 fundamentalism has entered a new phase. It has identified not only with a theological crisis in Protestantism but with a crisis in social, economic, moral and religious America in general. Secular humanism is the enemy now, not modernism as in the early 1900s (3, p. 433).

Modernism: A major shift in the late nineteenth century in theological thinking. The main distinction was the desire to adapt religious ideas to modern culture and modes of thinking. Modernism rejected Christian belief based on biblical authority alone. All of one's beliefs must pass through the mind and pass the tests of reason and experience. The Bible becomes the work of writers who were limited to their times and is the writing of men, not the supernatural writings of God. Thus they do not possess absolute authority. God is seen as present and dwelling within the world, but not apart from or elevated above the world as a transcendent being. Because God is present and works in all that happens, there can be no distinction between the natural and supernatural. The divine presence is disclosed in such things as rational truth, artistic beauty, and moral goodness. However, most do not carry it to the extreme of pantheism. Sin is seen as imperfection, ignorance and immaturity. These "hindrances" can be overcome by persuasion and education. Their removal is seen as salvation. Jesus Christ is a molding and redeeming force in humanity and the supreme example for mankind to follow (3, p. 631).

Dispensationalism: It describes the unfolding of the program of God in human history. The world is seen as a household administered by God in connection
with several stages of revelation that mark different economies in the outworking of his total program. Dispensational theology grows out of a consistent use of the hermeneutical principle of normal and plain interpretation of the Bible (3, p. 321).

Millennialism: The period of time, described in the Bible as a thousand years, when all of mankind's yearnings for an ideal society characterized by peace, freedom, material prosperity, and the rule of righteousness will be realized. Christ will literally set up his kingdom on earth. This is in contrast to the "amillennial" position, or "no Millennium," which states that Christ is reigning now, in the hearts of men from heaven. . . . Any reference to a new earth and life is seen by the amillennial position to be a reference to eternal existence in heaven, not on the earth (3, p. 714).
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CHAPTER II

THE FOUNDING OF DALLAS THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Dallas Theological Seminary officially began on September 30, 1924. It opened under the name of the Evangelical Theological College. The Mission Statement of the school was to train evangelical pastors and teachers, and the school was denominationally unaffiliated. The First Annual Announcement listed four resident faculty members, and several non-resident lecturers in English Bible (4, p. 4). Enrollment for the first semester included thirteen students, and the college met in a rented apartment building in South Dallas (4, p. 8).

When Dr. Walvoord arrived on campus in the fall of 1931, the school had grown to eight faculty members and eighty students. The school was an independent, nondenominational seminary, financed entirely by the unsolicited gifts of voluntary donors. Students from several Protestant denominations enrolled despite receiving no financial remuneration typically given by denominations for students attending their theological seminaries. John F. Walvoord was drawn by the reputation of the founders and by the conservative theological emphasis of the school (7, p. 8).

Before continuing a study of John F. Walvoord, it is necessary to take a look at the religious context which created the need for a school such as Dallas Theological
Seminary. The seminary was founded in 1924, at the height of the Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy. The basic controversy between the two sides of the religious issue was a disagreement over the use of science as it was applied to traditionally held views of Protestant Christianity. From the more traditional viewpoint, the controversy was a reaction against changes in theology, which was seen as a revolt by modern theologians away from concepts of biblical beliefs and interpretations held since the beginning of Christianity and reaffirmed at the time of the Reformation.

From the Modernist viewpoint, it was necessary in light of science and reason to apply methods of critical thought to the study of the Bible and the history of religious dogma. This led away from viewing the Bible as coming directly from God, but rather developing in an evolutionary pattern through the centuries. Modernists placed more emphasis on the "spiritual and ethical" side of Christianity and less on historic dogma and creeds (11, p. 713).

Dollar, in his book *History of Fundamentalism in America* states that:

... American fundamentalists have never felt they had a special obligation to continue the truths and the traditions of the Reformation, but have put foremost their purpose to restore every truth and discipline of the apostles (9, p. 4).

While this statement is significant in tracing traditional Protestant roots back to the first century, the discussion here will be limited to the writings of the Reformers.
The impact of the Reformation was significant on the religious life in America, and the beliefs of these men were instrumental in early American religious dogma. John Calvin, in his book *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, argued against elevating medieval and Renaissance natural theology, with its assumptions about reason, to a place equal to the Bible. He argued against the Roman Catholic Church elevating the traditions of the church to a place equal to Scripture, and he argued against the idea that the church gives authority to Scripture. He insisted that the Scriptures have divine authority intrinsic to all that they speak about. He called people "fanatics" who looked to themselves for guidance often in total disregard to the Scriptures. He said:

... mingled vanity and pride appear in this, that when miserable men do seek after God, instead of ascending higher than themselves, as they ought to do, they measure him by their own carnal stupidity, and, neglecting solid inquiry, fly off to indulge their curiosity in vain speculation. Hence, they do not conceive of him in the character in which he is manifested, but imagine him to be whatever their own rashness has devised. This abyss standing open, they cannot move one footstep without rushing headlong to destruction. With such an idea of God, nothing which they may attempt to offer in the way of worship or obedience can have any value in his sight, because it is not him they worship, but, instead of him, dreams and figments of their own heart (6, p. 46).

Calvin goes on to discuss the necessity of Scripture for the knowledge of God and discusses its divine authority. Rational arguments may strengthen biblical authority, but they cannot of themselves convince us of it. Calvin believed
that the true, God-given faith is confidence based on the
promises of God in Scripture (6, p. 462), and he argues that
the church's teachings should always be subjected to what the
Bible says (6, p. 389). In his commentary on individual
books of the Bible, Calvin states the following in his dis-
cussion of II Timothy 3:16 ("All Scripture is inspired by God
and is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction,
for training in righteousness . . ."): 

. . . He [Paul] commends the Scripture, first, on
account of its authority, and second, on account of
the usefulness that springs from it. In order to
uphold the authority of Scripture, he declares it
to be divinely inspired (divinitus inspiratam); for
if it be so, it is beyond all controversy that men
should receive it with reverence. . . . Whoever
then wishes to profit in the Scriptures, let him
first of all lay down as a settled point this, that
the Law and the Prophets are not teaching (doctrinam)
delivered by the will of men, but dictated (dictatam)
by the Holy Spirit. . . . Moses and the Prophets did
not utter at random what we have from their hand, but,
since they spoke by divine impulse, they confidently
and fearlessly testified that, as was actually the
case, it was the mouth of the Lord that spoke. . . .
We owe to the Scripture the same reverence which we
owe to God, because it has proceeded from him alone,
and has nothing of man mixed with it (5, pp. 248-249).

The Methodist heritage began with John Wesley and his
personal ministry based upon his views of Scripture:

. . . The Scripture, therefore, of the Old Testament
and the New Testament is a most solid and precious
system of divine truth. Every part thereof is worthy
of God; and all together are one entire body, wherein
is no defect, no excess. It is the fountain of
heavenly wisdom, which they who are able to taste
prefer to all writings of men, however wise or
learned or holy (20, p. v).

Because of their zeal concerning spiritual things and
their devotion to regular Bible study and prayer, the Wesleys
began a movement within the Anglican Church, which has become known today as "Methodism." John Wesley says in the book *The Works of John Wesley*, "But they [made it] their one desire and design to be downright Bible-Christians, taking the Bible as interpreted by the primitive church and our own, for their whole and sole rule" (21, 8:348).

Concerning the place of reason in the life of a Christian, Wesley spoke the following in a sermon entitled, "The Case of Reason Impartially Considered":

. . . It is a reason (assisted by the Holy Ghost) which enables us to understand what Holy Scriptures declare concerning the being and attributes of God. . . . Let reason do all that reason can. Employ it as far as it will go. But at the same time, acknowledge it is utterly incapable of giving either faith, or hope, or love; and, consequently, of producing either real virtue, or substantial happiness. Expect these from a higher source, even from the Father of the Spirits of all flesh. Seek, and receive them, not as your own acquisition; but as the gift of God (21, 6:354, 360).

Wilber T. Dayton, former president of Houghton College, explains that the infallible Scriptures held the central place in Wesley's faith and ministry, not because he lacked commitment to reason, scientific method, or the values of research, but because there was a higher and more reliable source of knowledge and power than the wisdom and works of man (12, p. 240).

Martin Luther, whose radical work led to the beginning of the "Reformation," had this to say about Scripture:

. . . I beg and faithfully warn every pious Christian not to stumble at the simplicity of language and the stories that will often meet him there [in Scripture]. He should not doubt that however simple they may seem,
these are the very words, deeds, judgments, and history
of the high majesty and wisdom of God. . . . Think of
Scripture as the loftiest and noblest of holy things,
as the richest lode, which will never be mined out,
so that you may find the divine wisdom which God places
before you in such foolish and ordinary form. He does
this in order to squelch all pride (12, p. 113).

Luther, in his unique style, also said, "It is cursed
unbelief and odious flesh which will not permit us to see
and know that God speaks to us in the Scriptures . . . but
tells us that it is the work of . . . some other mere man
who has not created heaven and earth" (12, 117).

The Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy was an attempt
by conservative Protestants to hold on to the Apostolic and
Reformation heritage which was theirs. In 1926, William
Adams Brown, professor of theology at Union Theological
Seminary in New York, reviewed the changes taking place in
contemporary Protestantism. He studied the changes which
were taking place in theological education in America and
noted that scientific and intellectual changes had profoundly
affected theological thought and education. He character-
ized these changes as "four great waves of change: Physical
Science, Historical Criticism, the New Sociology, and the
New Psychology" (12, pp. 372-373).

The first wave he described is centered on the impact
of the theory of evolution upon the intellectual life of
the times, which often called into question the biblical
record itself. Many theologians in America were "modern-
izing" Christianity by applying the theory of evolution to
every area of theological thought.
Brown listed the second wave as the theory of evolution applied to the origins of the Bible, or "Higher Criticism." Historical authorship and dating were rejected or modified, which resulted in a naturalistic Bible replacing a supernatural one. Brown stated that in 1926, "...Today for the greatest number of teachers in our seminaries, the critical method is accepted as a matter of course" (2, p. 372).

The third wave was listed as the "New Sociology." This was a movement to place responsibility for the development of the individual upon society. Brown stated that, "... as there is no such thing as an isolated individual, so men began to see there can be no such thing as an isolated salvation. In sin and salvation alike, we are members of one another" (2, p. 372).

The fourth wave of change he called the "New Psychology." It restated the nature of man's inner subjective religious experience in terms of philosophy and science:

... Psychology pressed one step further back and attempted to write the natural history of life itself. ... Into this citadel of religion, where the soul stands face to face with God, comes the scientist with his dissecting knife to explain not only the beliefs of religion but its emotions and aspirations. ... The clear-cut dualism between natural and supernatural has been hopelessly discredited for multitudes of people (2, p. 373).

Julius S. Bixler, Professor of Divinity at Harvard University, noted that "... contemporary thinkers agree with [William] James that religion has its roots in the earth (1, p. 161). As a result of these modern thoughts,
the Bible was no longer viewed as the inspired word of God. The history it revealed was defective. The authority it held as being from the mouth of God was discarded. The New Message was one of the Kingdom of God on earth, in a society where everyone imitated the model life of Jesus Christ. The significance of Jesus Christ was no longer found in his redemptive sacrifice but rather in his ethical teachings which were applied to correcting social ills. Religious experience itself was brought into conformity with the new psychology and the supernatural elements of Christianity vanished into naturalism.

Conservative theologians and preachers believed that this modernist movement was heresy. They formed the Fundamentalist movement in an attempt to perpetuate the traditional evangelical and confessional teachings of their respective denominations.

Courtland Myers, pastor of Tremont Temple in Boston, spoke at a Bible Conference on May 28, 1918, and said:

. . . The abomination of abominations in the modern religious world is that ripe, rank, rampant, rotten new theology made in Germany . . . [which has] torn [the Bible] to shreds and trampled it beneath their feet like mere scraps of paper, thus substituting for real Christianity and the principles of the Gospel of the Son of God the law of survival of the fittest with the result now manifest on our world the tidal wave of barbarism, savagery, and immorality (9, p. 159).

In Brown's article entitled, "A Century of Theological Education," he listed four significant religious movements in the 1920s. These were, The Social Gospel, Christian Unity,
Religious Education, and Fundamentalism. Fundamentalism became the religious context from which Dallas Theological Seminary was founded. The primary vehicle for expressing the beliefs of this group of people in America was known as the Bible Conference movement. This movement revolved around a series of meetings held in a church or conference center, with one or more speakers lecturing on various topics. The most popular speakers were those which gave expository Bible messages or prophetic messages primarily from a Fundamentalist and premillennial point of view (2, pp. 372-373).

By 1919, the Bible Conference movement and itinerant Bible teachers began to see their work taking hold and they met together for a conference, which they called the International Conference on Christian Fundamentals. Six thousand people from forty-six states and several foreign countries registered. Anglicans, Congregationalists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists all joined in the conference. Among the leaders and speakers were W. H. Griffith Thomas, A. B. Winchester, and L. S. Chafer, who together would later join forces to begin Dallas Theological Seminary. The conference resulted in a doctrinal statement that represented a consensus of opinion from those attending. The five main features of the statement were (1) the inerrancy of Scripture; (2) the deity of Christ; (3) the virgin birth of Christ; (4) Christ's substitutionary atonement; and (5) the physical resurrection and return of Christ (18, p. 5).
Perhaps the most influential publication that represented the viewpoint of the Fundamentalist Movement was the series of volumes entitled *The Fundamentals*. The work consisted of ninety articles on various theological subjects, and represented the best and most complete statement of their beliefs. The publication had a wide circulation among clergy and laity, and according to Stewart Cole, "... was instrumental in coordinating the diverse interests of conservative Christianity into a corporate movement" (8, p. 229).

In later meetings of the "World's Christian Fundamentals Association" (as the organized Fundamentalist movement was officially known) discussion focused on the need for a seminary to meet the educational needs of future ministers. At the 1923 meeting of the Association in Fort Worth, Texas, the convention stated that one of the greatest needs of the day was the establishment of an evangelical and premillennial seminary, located in the central United States, and if possible associated with some established and thoroughly orthodox college or university.

The following year, 1924, an evangelical and premillennial theological seminary was founded in Dallas. It was called The Evangelical Theological College. It arose within the Fundamentalist movement, but was not an officially recognized part of it. The school prospered and grew and in July, 1936, changed its name to Dallas Theological Seminary.
On May 21, 1922, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, a Baptist minister and professor at Union Theological Seminary, spoke concerning the battle he saw forming in many denominations. He delivered a sermon at New York Presbyterian Church, which he titled, "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" This sermon set the battle lines for the Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy and established Union Seminary as the leading Modernist institution (11, p. 713).

On January 3, 1924, the Christian Century published an article attempting to distinguish the two sides of the issue. It was titled, "Fundamentalism and Modernism: Two Religions." It stated that Christianity according to Fundamentalism was one religion and Christianity according to Modernism was another. The article went on to state:

. . . The God of the Fundamentalists is one God; the God of the Modernists another. The Christ of the Fundamentalists is one Christ; the Christ of the Modernists is another; the Bible of the Fundamentalists is one Bible; the Bible of the Modernists another. The church, the kingdom, the salvation, the consummation of all things . . . these are one thing to the Fundamentalist and another to the Modernist (10, p. 7).

August H. Strong, president and for forty years Professor of Systematic Theology at Rochester Theological Seminary, in 1918 (his 80th year) evaluated the orthodoxy of seminary education. He came from a conservative perspective and noted the effect of modernism in American seminaries:

. . . What is the effect of this method of higher criticism and the new theology upon our theological
seminaries? It is to deprive the gospel message of all definiteness, and to make professors and students disseminators of doubts. Many a professor . . . having no system of truth to teach . . . becomes a mere lecturer on the history of doctrine. Having no key in Christ to the unity of Scripture, he becomes a critic of what he is pleased to call its fragments. Ask him if he believes in the pre-existence, deity, virgin birth, miracles, atoning death, physical resurrection, omnipresence and omnipotence of Christ, and he denies your right to require of him any statement of his own beliefs. He does not conceive it to be his duty to furnish his students with any fixed conclusions as to doctrine. . . . The theological seminaries of almost all our denominations are becoming so infected with grievous error that they are not so much organs of Christ as they are organs of Antichrist (16, pp. 189-191).

Howard J. Cowling, President of Carleton College, Minnesota, wrote that in twenty-eight of America's leading churches, they had not sent one man into the ministry in the twenty-five years from 1895 until 1920 (17, p. 3). Seminary education, and education at all levels was changing in America. Men were no longer interested in serving as pastors and educational institutions were abandoning their original missions.

Higher education in America began as an effort by laymen to train young men for the ministry. Evidence of the mission of Harvard University at its founding in 1636, can be seen written on the gateway to the campus:

After God had carried vs safe to New England & wee had builded ovr hovses provided necessaries for ovr livelihood reard convenient places for Gods worship and settled the civill government one of the next things wee longed for and looked after was to advance learning and perpetvate it to posterity dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the chrurches when ovr present ministers shall lie in the dvst (sic).
Original courses at Harvard included mathematics, logic, and rhetoric, as well as Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and the "Divinity Subjects." By the end of the 1700s, not all students were required to take Divinity subjects, and by 1819, the Divinity school was established as a distinct department in the school (13, p. 23). Agriculture, industry and expanding technologies became the focal points of American higher education in the 1800s.

Two studies, written in 1924 and 1934, left little doubt among Fundamentalists that something had to be done concerning the education of its ministers. In 1924, Robert L. Kelly wrote that until 1870, most programs in Protestant seminaries were basically alike. Theology was systematized and students studied supporting subjects such as Greek, Hebrew, English Bible, Church History, and Pastoral Theology. But by 1924, Protestant denominations, and particularly those of Arminian persuasion (mostly Methodist), had experienced "maximum change" and were "swinging freely in the direction of the new curriculum materials." The program of study at schools of interdenominational practice such as Harvard, Yale, the University of Chicago and Vanderbilt had experienced radical changes in the curriculum, including prescribed courses. The Reformed (mostly Presbyterian) and Lutheran schools, while experiencing some change, tended to hold on to some traditions of the past (13, pp. 61-102).

William Brown wrote that prior to the turn of the century:
... the Bible was regarded as an inerrant book, the vehicle of divine revelation which systematic theology formulated on the basis of results reached by exegesis. Men might differ in convictions as to what the Bible taught. They were one in the conviction that what the Bible taught was true (3, p. 160).

Kelly found that those seminaries which were not changing so radically were those which did not "ground either method of results on naturalistic premises." Seminaries were shifting to a new theological curriculum to the same degree to which they held to naturalistic presuppositions. The curriculum changes were away from "exegetical theology to practical theology, and from prescribed work to elective work" (14, p. 28).

The educational philosophy in American seminaries could best be described as Modernistic with new-styled theology prevailing, resulting in a socially oriented gospel. This philosophy was described by Henry B. Robbins, Professor of Religious Education at Rochester Theological Seminary. He called for a "thoroughgoing reorganization" of seminary curriculum and methods which conformed to the new Modernistic worldview:

Especially does the seminary need a more accurate knowledge of those psychological and sociological principles which condition all constructive effort in modern society. The minister needs ... a more scientific grasp of ... contemporary life, for the humanistic approach to the world is also the scientific approach (15, p. 31).

Kelly asked the question, "What was happening in the personal spiritual life of the ministerial student?" He said:
... The spirit of consecration and Christian zeal is in danger of evaporating in an atmosphere dominated by the intellectual and technical studies, and that the development of the inner life of prospective ministers is a fundamental element in their education.... Certainly the minister must have first-hand knowledge of God and the Book (13, pp 58-60).

William Brown agreed that the loss of religious devotion in the life of a seminary student had profound implications for a life of religious service, and as a safeguard against vices and moral problems. Though he was in favor of the curriculum changes taking place in most seminaries, he recognized that students were not leaving as prepared as they once had been for a life of ministry.

Concerning the faculty at modernistic seminaries, Kelly noted that the executive officer of one seminary reported that his faculty members were "presumably Christian gentlemen." Another man reported he was "not interested" in the discussion of the spiritual life. Another man asked why a seminary should concern itself with such matters (36, p. 5).

... We note the disturbing fact that... students have apparently abandoned the practice of private devotion altogether. With what heart one may ask, can those who do not pray in private hope to lift their fellows to God in public worship (3, p. 163)?

By 1921, a radical departure was evident in the curriculum of America's seminaries. Practical theology was leading the list of hours required, while exegetical theology was now leading only in the amount of total hours offered. Kelly noted, "... The theoretical has given place to the laboratory and 'scientific' method" (13, p. 68).
These changes were having a negative effect on the placement of seminary graduates. Churches were leaning away from hiring seminary graduates and were more and more hiring men and women who were graduating from a number of different Bible Colleges that began during this time.

While Brown was not a Fundamentalist, and he was in favor of most of the changes taking place in theological education, he related two convictions about the education of ministers. First, he felt that the Old and New Testaments were God's authoritative revelation and were of supreme importance for individuals and for society. Because of this, he felt it was important that ministers have some grasp of the original texts in which the Scriptures were written (Hebrew and Greek). Second, he felt that the Scriptures contained a consistent and authoritative system of doctrine covering the most important things a man ought to believe concerning God and the most important duties which God requires of man (13, p. 119). The problem with leaders of theological education in America, however, was that few of them were heeding the voices of men like Brown. They were abandoning the original languages and even the study of English Bible as required curriculum, and they were no longer emphasizing Christian doctrine.

In summary, Modernist theologicans placed an emphasis on new scientific methods of learning and desired to "modernize" Christianity. This new Protestantism was non-authoritarian
naturalistic and humanistic. The message of the new religion was that by following the ethical teachings of Jesus, society could be built up into a "kingdom of God on earth." The Fundamentalists, on the other hand, based their Protestantism on the biblical record and upon the writings of the Reformers. They felt they were facing heresy and they sought to send their young men and women to seminaries which were not radically changing either their curriculum or other forms of ministerial training. A seminary was established at this time which would provide the education many felt ministers must have to lead churches effectively. This seminary was founded in Dallas, Texas, and was called The Evangelical Theological College.
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CHAPTER THREE

THE EARLY YEARS OF DALLAS THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Three individuals were the focus of the energy required to begin Dallas Theological Seminary: Dr. A. B. Winchester, a Presbyterian minister from Toronto, Canada; Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas, an Anglican minister, author, and Bible Conference speaker; and Dr. Lewis S. Chafer, pastor of the Scofield Memorial Church of Dallas and a Bible Conference speaker.

In 1887, Alexander B. Winchester went as a missionary to China under the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (Congregational U.S.A.). His Presbyterian denomination in Canada had no mission work in China. He served for two years until he had a nervous breakdown and was forced to return home. He then began serving under the Canadian Presbyterian Mission Board, where he worked with Chinese in British Columbia. In 1901 he became pastor of Knox Church, the oldest Presbyterian Church in Toronto, where he served for twenty years. In 1921 he resigned to minister at Bible Conferences in Canada and the United States. Following the 1919 Philadelphia Conference on Christian Fundamentals, Winchester became interested in developing a new school, and offered his support to Lewis Sperry Chafer (26, pp. 51-59). Winchester was one of the first teachers
when the Evangelical Theological College opened in 1924. He served on the staff of visiting lecturers in English Bible until 1931. "He brought to the seminary a valuable combination of missionary experience and vision and a mature pastoral experience of over twenty years" (26, p. 51). He served as a member of the Board of the new school until his death in 1943.

Another Fundamental Protestant and a prominent figure in the Bible Conference movement was W. H. Griffith Thomas. He was familiar with the controversies raging in American theological circles and was also desiring to develop a new seminary. Thomas was a native of Great Britain, who studied at Oxford University from 1889-1895. He served for nine years as vicar of St. Pauls, Portman Square, London, and for the next five years (1905-1910) served in the Principalship of Wycliffe Hall, at the Oxford Evangelical Theological College. He left this position to become Principal at Wycliffe College, Toronto. While in Canada he became active in the Bible Conference movement in America. In 1919 he moved to Philadelphia where he lived until his death in June, 1924, just four months before The Evangelical Theological College (Dallas Theological Seminary) opened (26, pp. 63-69).

Dr. James M. Gray, president of Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, said that Thomas was prepared for the Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy from his years as an Anglican pastor and Professor at Oxford. He was widely read and very
articulate in defending fundamentalist views of Scripture against arguments from higher criticism (22, p. 395).

Lewis Sperry Chafer was the person who was primarily responsible for the founding of the Evangelical Theological College in Dallas. Chafer was born in Rock Creek, Ohio, in February, 1871. His father, Thomas F. Chafer, graduated from Auburn Theological Seminary in 1864, and became the Congregational minister in Rock Creek. His mother, Lois Sperry Chafer, was the daughter of a Welsh Wesleyan lay preacher, Asa Sperry (24, p. 3).

When Chafer was eleven, his father died of tuberculosis, leaving a family of three children. He assumed responsibility for the work on their farm until age fourteen, when he enrolled in the New Lyme Institute to prepare for college. It was at this time that he recorded a religious experience he called "conversion," while attending meetings of an evangelist.

Dr. Chafer was very talented in music, which led him to Oberlin College, where he spent one year in the preparatory school and two years in the conservatory. This period was all of the higher education he would receive. Following the completion of his work at Oberlin, Chafer traveled for seven years as an evangelistic singer. While at Oberlin College, he met Ella L. Case, and they were married in 1896.

By 1900, Chafer had become a preacher, being ordained by the Council of Congregational Ministers in the First
Congregational Church of Buffalo, New York. Following his ordination, he became pastor of a church in Lewiston, New York. The pastorate was too confining, and he desired to return to his evangelistic ministry, but he went now as the speaker rather than the music director.

Dr. Chafer traveled with a group of twenty-five evangelists, touring the larger cities of the United States. He was able to see first hand the tactics and techniques used by professional evangelists and became convinced that their methods were not biblical. His written reaction to the methods used by these evangelists was printed in the book True Evangelism, published in 1911. He did not use tricks like many other evangelists did, such as protracted pleas, superficial mechanics of thought suggestion and other misleading techniques. His approach was to give a biblical message and then "... a true decision must depend upon the will of the individual." (16, p. 118). He emphasized the importance of the work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion experience.

In 1903, he moved to East Northfield, Massachusetts, to undertake the work of song leading for the summer Bible Conferences. At this time he transferred his ministerial affiliation from the Congregational Church to the Presbyterian Church and joined the Presbytery of Troy, New York. Three years later he was asked to serve on staff with Mt. Hermon School for Boys, where he taught music and Bible until 1909.
While at the Northfield Conference, Dr. Chafer met Dr. C. I. Scofield (who later edited the Scofield Reference Bible). Scofield was the pastor of the First Congregational Church in Dallas, Texas. He invited Chafer to hold a series of evangelistic meetings at his church. After the close of these meetings, Scofield told Chafer that he did not consider him an evangelist, but rather a Bible teacher. From then on, Chafer devoted himself to a mastery of the Bible.

The vision and challenge of expository Bible teaching which Dr. Chafer received from working at the Northfield Conference Center and his later work with the Mt. Hermon School for Boys, set in motion his desire to begin a seminary. After leaving Mt. Hermon in 1916, and moving to New Jersey, he became a traveling speaker, visiting various Bible Conferences across the country. His speaking included seminary lectures such as those at Union Theological Seminary (Southern Presbyterian) in Richmond, Virginia. According to the Sunday School Times, Chafer was becoming "... among the most eagerly sought Bible teachers in the United States (20, p. 525).

While an itinerant Bible teacher, Dr. Chafer wrote six books: Satan (1909); True Evangelism (1911); The Kingdom in History and Prophecy (1915); Salvation (1916); He That is Spiritual (1918); and Grace (1922). Following the founding of the seminary he published Major Bible Themes (1926); The Ephesians Letter (1935); Systematic Theology in eight volumes (1948); and Dispensationalism (1951).
In 1922, Dr. Chafer came to Dallas, Texas, to hold a Bible Conference for Dr. William M. Anderson, Jr., at the First Presbyterian Church. Later in the same year he came back to Dallas to preach at the First Congregational Church (now Scofield Memorial Church) until the end of the year. At a congregational meeting on April 9, 1923, the church voted to ask him to become their pastor, and Chafer accepted. While serving as pastor of the First Congregational Church, Chafer was elected Executive Secretary of the Central American Mission, headquartered in Dallas (which was begun by C. I. Scofield while pastoring the First Congregational Church) (25, p. 3).

Dr. Chafer was an ordained Presbyterian minister, and moved his membership to the Dallas Presbytery of the Southern Presbyterian Church. At that time, his plans for a new seminary were developing, and when he moved to Dallas, this became the site of the new school. Between 1919 and 1923, Chafer traveled as a Bible Conference speaker as well as pastoring and leading the mission work. During his travels he often asked seminary graduates two questions: "Now that you have an experience of real service following your seminary course, do you feel that anything was seriously lacking in the preparation? If you had the shaping of a curriculum for theological students, what would you include" (28, p. 9)?

Dr. Chafer found that the "uniform regret" among these pastors was the lack of training in practical knowledge of
the Bible, the lack of training in how to preach, and the lack of training in how to have a personal spiritual life. Chafer wrote that seminaries had failed to provide "a knowledge of the Bible itself with a system of study which when followed in later years, would be ceaselessly unfolding the riches of divine grace. . . ." (10, p.2).

Dr. Chafer later wrote:

My contact with hundreds of sincere pastors and the giving of special courses of lectures in at least three of America's more important theological seminaries gave me an unusual insight into the existing conditions in the field of theological discipline which . . . crystallized into a deep conviction that courses of ministerial training which ignored the study of the Bible for its spiritual content do not prepare men to preach the Word of God. No account was ever kept of the many preachers who in confidence deplored the fact that the courses of study they pursued gave them no material for preaching (17, n. p.).

Dr. Chafer felt that a seminary was needed in America which would ensure a knowledge of the Bible, study of the original biblical languages of Hebrew and Greek, to equip students to do "independent exegetical study of the Word of God," and to give them a desire for and an understanding of "spiritual life" which was not taught in other seminaries at the time (10, pp. 2-3).

During November, 1921, the first meeting was held which led directly to the founding of The Evangelical Theological College. L. S. Chafer, A. B. Winchester, B. B. Sutcliffe, and W. P. White were participating in a Bible Conference in Portland, Oregon, and discussed establishing a new seminary. On March 7, 1922, Chafer, Griffith Thomas
and Winchester spent the day in conference and prayer about beginning a new school while in Atlanta, Georgia, at a conference. The meeting resulted in a mutual commitment of the men to begin a seminary, and they agreed on the basic distinctives and doctrinal basis at that meeting (26, p. 142).

Dr. Chafer avoided having close ties with the Fundamentalist movement of the day. In a letter to Robert Dick Wilson, a professor at Princeton Seminary (and outstanding linguist of the day), he invited Wilson to come to the seminary as guest lecturer. In the letter he stated:

... As a culmination of several years of prayer and preparation which seem to have been under the leading of the Spirit of God, a number of the best known Bible teachers of this country, quite independent of the Fundamentalist movement, are establishing a new Theological Seminary here in Dallas ... and the aim is to make it of the very highest class in every particular (13).

The founders of the seminary were concerned that the Fundamentalist Association was becoming eccentric, making "frenzied appeals for fund," and some of its leaders were making extreme charges that alienated many fundamentalist people. While they recognized that the seminary would be "fundamental," they did not want to be tied to any one group. They desired to maintain a constructive testimony of the highest caliber, independent of the organized body of Fundamentalism (26, p. 142).

In 1924, Dr. Chafer agreed to a speaking tour in Europe, traveling to Belgium, Holland, England, and Scotland. After the opening of the seminary that year, he maintained his
position at Scofield Memorial Church in Dallas, as well as the position of Executive Director of the Central American Mission. Before the close of the first school year, he resigned his position with the Mission. Chafer was a small man, and had suffered from tuberculosis. At the end of the first school year, he was "down to 115 pounds with a wool suit on." He wrote to his brother July 7, 1925, that he was exhausted. "... I hope never to be in the same plight for demands on me as last year. It was a killing me" (sic) (11). He did recover from fatigue and took up the ministry again at Scofield Memorial Church, but resigned the pastorate in September, 1926.

With Dr. Chafer's biblical knowledge and ability as a teacher, he was praised by colleagues in the field of theological education. Wilbur Smith, professor at Fuller Theological Seminary, wrote a friend:

... I do not believe there is any man in America today who, in the last ten years, has made such a profound contribution to the theological education of young men, especially in equipping them with a love for the Word of God, and a knowledge of how to properly expound it, as Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer. ... We have in this beloved man ... a master teacher and a pioneer in theological education (27).

The Evangelical Theological College began on September 30, 1924, in a rented building at 1519 Hughes Circle in South Dallas. The speaker for the well attended evening meeting was W. Irving Carroll, a Presbyterian minister from Marshall, Texas, and a member of the faculty and Board. According to the Dallas Morning News, Carroll spoke on
"Three Open Things in the Word of God, the opened Scriptures, the opened understanding of them, and open mouths to speak the truth" (18).

The Board of the Seminary was formed from a "Bible Seminary Committee" of twenty-one men from the First Presbyterian Church of Dallas, November 7, 1923. This group became the official Board of Trustees. Officers of the Board were Dr. Chafer, president; Anderson, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, vice president; W. S. Mosher, president of Mosher Steel Company, treasurer; Rollin T. Chafer, brother of the president, registrar pro tem. This structure was used until December, 1929, when the constitution was amended to transfer the "control from the Board of Trustees to a larger body, named the Board of Incorporate Members." This group was given the responsibility of maintenance, administration and promotion of the College. Chafer later divided the Board into two boards, the Board of Regents, which oversaw the faculty and educational interests of the school, and a Board of Trustees which looked after the property and financial interests (4, pp. 8-9). John F. Walvoord explained in a personal interview that this change was a political move on the part of Chafer, to allow Chafer to maintain control of the new school. Board members primarily from the Presbyterian Church in Dallas were becoming disgruntled with Chafer's handling of financial matters. Chafer refused to make appeals for financial support, which upset the Board. The Board of
Regents became a group of men selected from outside the city of Dallas, and were supporters of Chafer (23).

Faculty for the first year included Dr. Chafer, who taught Systematic Theology; Anderson, who taught Systematic Theology and Homiletics; and Rev. A. H. Perpetro, who taught Old and New Testament exegesis (Professor and Department Chairman of Romance languages at Southwestern University in Georgetown, Texas). In the second semester, Rollin T. Chafer became professor of Hermeneutics (Bible Study) as well as registrar and editor of the seminary publications.

To teach English Bible courses, Dr. Chafer recruited the services of A. C. Gaebelein, editor of Our Hope magazine and Bible teacher; W. H. Griffith Thomas, who died four months before the school opened; A. B. Winchester, Toronto pastor; James M. Gray, Dean of Moody Bible Institute, Chicago; B. B. Sutcliffe, Bible teacher in Portland, Oregon; George E. Guille, also with Moody Bible Institute; W. Irving Carroll, a local pastor; William L. Pettingill, Dean of Philadelphia School of the Bible; William P. White, from Moody Bible Institute; Robert Hall Glover, from Moody Bible Institute; Thomas M. Chalmers, Director of the New York Jewish Evangelistic Society; and Robert D. Wilson, professor at Princeton Theological Seminary. These men were recruited to lecture for a brief period of time each semester, usually for two weeks at a time, which allowed them to return to their respective schools.
According to the First and Second Annual Announcement, the organization of the seminary was divided into nine schools. They were (1) Systematic Theology; (2) Semitic Languages and Old Testament Exegesis; (3) New Testament Literature and Exegesis; (4) Homiletics (preaching); (5) Sacred History; (6) English Bible; (7) Spiritual Life and Service; (8) Apologetics and Hermeneutics; and (9) Practical Theology (2, pp. 7-12). The curriculum required 110 semester hours for graduation. Kelly, in his book Theological Education in America, found that seminaries of the 1920s were giving the greatest emphasis to the more practical areas of the curriculum. But The Evangelical Theological College had reinstated the Bible and language emphasis that other seminaries had abandoned.

Concerning the doctrinal statement of the seminary, the Sunday School Times reported:

. . . The doctrinal statement of this school is a remarkable one; it is to be questioned whether any other existing statement is quite its equal in careful, thoroughgoing, comprehensive, and at the same time truly Scriptural representation of precious truths of the Word of God (20, pp. 535-536).

In describing the doctrinal statement, Rudolf Renfer, Professor of Historical Theology and Missions at the Seminary wrote concerning the doctrinal statement:

. . . Briefly described, the statement is fundamental, Calvinistic, pre-millennial and dispensational. It asserts a belief in the inspiration and inerrancy of Scriptures; the fallen nature of man; the deity of Jesus Christ as the Son of God; the substitutionary death of Christ for the sins of men; and salvation by grace through faith in the sacrifice of Christ.
The belief is further asserted that Jesus Christ will return to the earth and personally reign for a literal Millennium. The statement is fundamental because it is in harmony with "The Fundamentals" generally accepted by the exponents of the conservative movement in American Protestantism. It is Calvinistic because it emphasized features characteristic of Calvinistic theology, such as the sovereignty of God, the sinfulness of men, and the eternal security of the believer. It is premillennial because it asserts that Jesus Christ will return before the millennium to set up His Kingdom. It is dispensational because of the expressed and implied references to historical time periods in God's dealings with man (26, p. 160).

The major tasks confronting Dr. Chafer during the first years of the seminary were to build a library (which was begun by purchasing five thousand volumes of W. H. Griffith Thomas's personal library), finding adequate buildings to house the school, and a financial policy by which the school could successfully operate. The seminary was operated under a unique financial policy. Because no tuition was charged and dormitory rooms were rented free of charge, and being denominationally unrelated, the school had no normal means of support.

...The trustees of the College confidently believe that, in answer to prayer and without personal appeals, the work will be sustained by God through his stewards who appreciate the peculiar aims of this institution. This belief rests upon His word and His favor shown during the first year with its periods of testings (2, p. 17).

The only means of notifying the constituency about financial needs was the Bulletin, with a circulation under two thousand, occasional letters from Dr. Chafer outlining the needs of the school, and brief messages in magazines such as The Sunday School Times, Our Hope, and Revelation.
The first ten years were extremely stressful with the school gradually going into debt, and with unpaid bills and reduced salaries. During the depression years, rumors spread that the school would close. But during those years, the present campus on Swiss Avenue was purchased with gifts from interested people, and by 1934, the school was well on its way as a viable institution.

The Evangelical Theological College built its student body on the reputation of the professors. They were all well-known in the Bible Conference movement and leaders in the Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy. Students were expected to come with the purpose of developing a "high standard of reverent scholarship" and were encouraged to complete a regular classical course from a Christian College (26, p. 182).

Student enrollment began with thirteen students in 1924, coming primarily from the Northern Midwest and the Northwest. By 1928, there were forty students and by 1938, the administration decided to limit the student body to one hundred men. The student body grew despite the lack of financial inducements usually offered ministerial students, the lack of a guaranteed placement upon graduation, and the tough admissions policy.

Dr. Chafer's philosophy of education was that Almighty God was the teacher, the faculty were involved in the process, but it was the student who personally must realize "a personal adjustment to God's mind and will" (15, pp. 11-13). In
addition to regular classes, students were required to attend chapel Tuesday through Friday. Classes were not held on Monday to allow men a day off from their work of preaching on Sunday. Students were required to become personally involved in practical Christian work. They were given opportunity to work in various area churches as pastoral assistants, associate pastors, youth workers, Bible class teachers and preachers.

In October, 1933, Dr. Chafer found a way to publish widely the seminary's theological beliefs. He purchased the oldest theological quarterly in America, Bibliotheca Sacra, founded in 1843. It had been the theological voice of Andover and Oberlin Theological Seminaries, and was acquired from the Pittsburgh-Xenia Seminary.

In a letter dated January 7, 1933, Dr. Chafer expressed concern that the name of the school should be changed. The word "College" had been adopted from the British, a term which meant the same as "Seminary" to them. "Evangelical" reflected the ideals of the founders but many laymen did not understand the term. He wrote, "... Anderson was of the opinion that perhaps the name 'Dallas' might in some way be included in the new name. Moreover he suggested that the term 'Evangelical' is often understood as being a distinctly Luthern word" (1). At the commencement exercises closing the eleventh academic year of the seminary, Dallas Theological Seminary was announced as the new name (18). It was also
decided to change the basic three year Bachelors degree to a four year Master of Theology degree, requiring 130 semester hours beyond the basic A. B. degree. The extra year allowed for an increase in study of the original biblical languages. Three years were required of Hebrew instead of two, and now five years of Greek rather than four were required. One year of Greek was expected to be taken at the undergraduate level before attending seminary. The curriculum was expanded to increase proficiency in Bible exposition. The new curriculum began with the fall semester, 1935.

According to Rollin T. Chafer, with every additional requirement, "... the student body increased in size at the following matriculation." Student body enrollment for 1935 dropped from ninety-one to eighty-five, but increased every year after that (6, p. 3).

By the middle of the 1930s, the original faculty members were losing their health and several had died. Of the original lecturers, only Harry Ironside continued beyond 1936. He served from 1925 until his death in 1951. The second generation of visiting Bible teachers began in 1934 when John G. Mitchell, Bible teacher and pastor of Central Bible Church (and one of the founders of Multnomah School of the Bible) in Portland, Oregon, came to lecture. Mitchell was a member of the first graduating class of the seminary, and by 1986 he was in his middle nineties and still teaching and serving as chairman of the Board at Multnomah School of the Bible.
Other new visiting lecturers were Rev. Roy Aldrich and Carl Armerding. M. A. Stone, a Presbyterian pastor in Dallas joined the faculty along with C. Fred Lincoln. J. T. Spangler took over the New Testament Greek classes, and Everett F. Harrison took the Old Testament Exegesis Department. Henry C. Theissen joined the seminary faculty in New Testament Literature and Exegesis in 1931, and Charles L. Feinberg became Old Testament Department Chairman in 1935.

From 1924 until 1935, Dr. Chafer carried the responsibility of teaching all courses in theology, in addition to his administrative responsibilities, and his extensive itinerant ministries. In 1935, he suffered a severe heart ailment during the summer, while speaking at a Bible Conference in Santa Ana, California. Also at this time, Rollin T. Chafer became ill, and John F. Walvoord served as acting Registrar. In 1936, Walvoord was appointed Registrar and served in this capacity until 1945, when he became Dr. Chafer’s first assistant. This will be examined in detail later in the study (7, p. 3).

From 1931, with the hiring of Theissen, until 1959 when R. A. Renfer wrote his study of Dallas Theological Seminary, the seminary had appointed only its own graduates to the teaching faculty. The one exception to this was the school’s second Vice President, Dr. Norman B. Harrison, appointed as visiting faculty in English Bible. Many graduates had earned degrees from other schools after completing their seminary training and prior to coming back to the seminary to teach.
In a letter to Winchester in 1929, Dr. Chafer discussed the problem of faculty replacement. He felt it was increasingly difficult to find men who held to the basic doctrinal statement of the seminary. By hiring graduates, he felt he would maintain a unity of belief and purpose in the faculty. To Winchester he said, "... I dislike to engage our own graduates but as a matter of fact they are the best prepared men available at the present time" (14). In 1937, Rollin T. Chafer stated the basis for hiring graduates to the faculty:

... Nothing is more desirable in the teaching policy of a school of theology than consistent unity in presenting, in all departments of the curriculum, the beliefs and ideals for which the institution is reputed to stand... To secure this desired unity in presenting all phases of the truth we hold, the more recent additions to our faculty have been selected from amongst men of exceptionally high record in the Graduate School of our own seminary (5, p. 3).

(In the 1986-87 Dallas Theological Seminary catalogue, of the sixty-three resident faculty member, thirty of the men had earned graduate degrees from institutions other than Dallas Theological Seminary, and six of them had no degree from the seminary) (8, pp. 172-187).

In October, 1936, the seminary filed for accreditation with the American Association of Theological Schools which had been formed that year by sixty theological seminaries. The administration felt that its conservative theological position would not hurt its chances for accreditation. However, many seminaries were demanding that curriculum in all schools must be "modernized" as a prerequisite for accreditation. The Christian Century, the influential voice of a
large segment of American Protestantism, desired less Bible in the curriculum and more socially oriented courses to meet perceived needs of the day:

... One of the first projects of the new association is the restudy of the theological curriculum. It is to be hoped that, where it has not already occurred, the traditional Bible-centered curriculum may be replaced by a plan of study more balanced and comprehensive and more relevant to the needs of contemporary life (21, p. 1278).

In February, 1938, it became obvious that the curriculum of the seminary and its policy of hiring faculty only from its alumni were not in harmony with the prevailing accrediting policies, and the seminary withdrew their application. In the spring of 1944, Dallas Theological Seminary received accreditation from the State Education Department of the University of the State of New York. In a letter to the constituency, Dr. Chafer made the announcement that they had received accreditation from the "oldest and largest accrediting agency in the United States" (9).

Horace L. Field, accrediting team member, reported:

By practically living at the seminary for three days ... I acquired the atmosphere of the seminary and I must say I have never found in any institution a more congenial group of men. While not agreeing with some of the extreme views in theology of this group, they are the most earnest, hospitable group of college men and faculty I have met. ... Taking everything into consideration, I feel this seminary is one of the very strongest seminaries scholastically in the country (9).

At this time, the world was at war, and many seminaries were spending more time on political issues than on their curriculum. R. A. Renfer wrote:
The enrollment increased steadily until the year 1941 when World War II demanded the registration of all men within certain age limits. The seminary men cooperated fully, and the Daily Times Herald (Oct. 16, 1940) published a newspaper article with a picture of the students registering. The article contrasted this to the attitude of students in a New York Theological Seminary who would not register because of 'Religious Scruples' (26, p. 230).

At this time, the National Selective Service Director suggested that all schools accelerate their programs, in order to graduate men sooner. From the summer of 1944 until the fall of 1946, the seminary maintained an accelerated schedule. The enrollment for the fall of 1946 included forty-three ex-servicemen among the sixty entering students. The enrollment grew from 101 in 1942 to over 300 by 1953. Facilities at the school were overcrowded with most new students being older and married. The required classes had fifty to sixty students in them in cramped classrooms. Because of the increase in student body size, a building project was begun in 1951 to build a chapel which would seat over five hundred. The building was completed, and dedicated on February 6, 1953. The dedication of the new building was overshadowed by the death of Lewis Sperry Chafer on August 22, 1952, while on a speaking engagement in Seattle, Washington. At the dedication service of the new chapel, John F. Walvoord was inaugurated as the school's second President. He has served the seminary as President until April of 1986, when he turned the presidency over to Donald K. Campbell.

In a letter addressed to Dr. L. P. Eisenhart, Dean of
the Graduate School at Princeton, Dr. Chafer said the follow-
ing about John F. Walvoord: "Having been under my observa-
tion and in close association for a term of year, I believe
that Dr. Walvoord is one of the most competent young men of
the present generation. . . ." (12). The study shall take a
closer look at the life of Dr. John F. Walvoord.
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CHAPTER IV

A HISTORY OF JOHN F. WALVOORD, 1910-1945

John Flipse Walvoord was born in Sheboygan, Wisconsin, on May 1, 1910. Before he was born, his mother had been very ill, and the doctor felt it would endanger her life to carry the child to full term. He strongly recommended that she have an abortion. But, because of her faith in God, and her desire to have the child, she refused. Not only did she give birth to a healthy boy she named John, but she regained her strength as well, and lived to be "just ten days short of 102" (1). John was the third child in the family, having an older sister named Ethel, and a brother named Randall. Ethel became the wife of a Presbyterian minister, and Randall became an electrical engineer. John was to become the second President of Dallas Theological Seminary.

John's father grew up on a small farm in Wisconsin, and though he finished grade school, he chose to work on the farm instead of go to high school. "He must have been at least twenty when he went to high school, perhaps older" (12). After he graduated from high school, he completed a two-year program at Normal School and then began his teaching career. "He was an effective teacher and they promoted him to principal. He had a school noted for its excellence, the Horace Mann School in Sheboygan, Wisconsin" (12).
John's father soon received more recognition and was promoted to superintendent. He remained at that position for five years. During this time he earned a college degree at the University of Wisconsin, graduating with honors. "He was a Christian and he tried to hire Christian teachers, and he wouldn't allow beer at the school dances; and so the liquor interests got together and elected a school board that voted him out. It was pretty dirty" (12).

While in Sheboygan, John joined the First Presbyterian Church, and remembers being awarded a Bible for having memorized the Shorter Catechism. Although he recalled very little about grade school, he mentioned, "Well, it may be hard to believe, but I played violin in the grade school orchestra. Grade school doesn't hold much memory for me" (12). At the age of twelve, he committed himself to daily Bible reading, but did not feel that he was particularly religious.

From Sheboygan, the family moved to Racine, Wisconsin, where John's father became the principal of the Junior High School. John was fifteen, and remembers the church they attended because it had a gymnasium and a large auditorium. At this time he attended a Thursday night Bible study at the Union Tabernacle Church (now called Racine Bible Church). William McCarrell (later pastor of Cicero Bible Church, Cicero, Illinois) presented the Gospel message and John trusted Jesus Christ alone for his salvation. While in this
church, he heard Lewis S. Chafer preach, but because of his youthfulness, he was not particularly impressed by Chafer.

While in high school, John lettered in sports his final three years, including football, basketball and track. He played guard and tackle in football, and threw the discus and heaved the shot in track. He said that in track he did not excell, but, "I got enough points to letter." He was also on the debate squad.

To earn money during the summers, John was employed on various road crews, digging ditches and other manual labor (10). Of his high school teachers, only one stands out in his mind. He was the algebra teacher. "He was trying to write a new textbook on algebra, and after seeing our final exams, he threw the text away. We never learned any algebra." John received the American Legion medal for the best athlete his final year of high school. He says, "There were not many in my class. I graduated in February and there was not much competition" (12).

In 1928, at the age of seventeen, he left home to attend Wheaton College. He played football and track there, but decided not to go out for basketball, although with a height of six foot three inches, he would have been a coach's delight. "I spent the winters on the debating team and glee club, and took my time through school" [but took summer school at the University of Colorado one summer in order to graduate in three and a half years!]. He enjoyed football, but the team
did not always do well. "We won half our games, but scored moral victories in the others! We lost—but we felt good about it!" (12).

... I was President of Sunday evening meetings my Senior year. We averaged two hundred and twenty-five in attendance, out of a student body of five hundred. Some went home for the weekends. We really did a good job. We got all the group together the first hour and divided up into five groups for interaction (13).

John said he learned a lesson from a billboard he saw while in college. It said, "HOW TO AVOID CRITICISM: DO NOTHING, THINK NOTHING, SAY NOTHING." "If you don't do anything, people will leave you alone." Then he went on to say, "No, that isn't entirely true. They'll say you are incompetent. People will attack you for doing almost anything. I went to the Gospels and Christ was attacked more for association than for anything else." Christ associated with sinners (13).

J. Ellwood Evans was John's classmate at Wheaton College. They met at football camp the summer before John began school. Evans was more outgoing than John and got John involved in "Christian Testimony" where they preached in jails, and he also involved him on the Y.M.C.A. Gospel Team which held young people's meetings in the Chicago area. Evans remembers John as being competitive, but with a sense of humor. He said they were always playing tricks on each other, but he declined to elaborate on what these tricks were (11).

John later wrote, "At Wheaton College I was also on the
college debate team that won the Illinois Championship in 1930 and 1931, and Junior College Championship in 1929."
He was president of the College Christian Endeavor, and the Missionary Volunteer Band (19). While at Wheaton he majored in Greek and minored in Latin. One of his teachers, a woman who opposed athletics, graded him down because of his involvement in football. He graduated in 1931, with honors (10).

Because of his Presbyterian background, John decided to attend Princeton Seminary. Dr. Chafer came to speak at the Union Gospel Tabernacle in Racine, Wisconsin at this time and John began to consider attending The Evangelical Theological Seminary in Dallas. This new school is Dallas was attracting many Wheaton students, and about half of the student body at The Evangelical Theological College were Wheaton Alumni. Dr. Buswell, President of Wheaton, recommended that John go to Dallas:

[Buswell] was a fundamentalist, and he knew Princeton wasn't standing for that anymore. He believed in doing a certain amount of fighting, but he always did it as a gentleman. ... He was working on a Ph.D. at the University of Chicago, and he was too conservative for them. He would contend against a professor, but he would do it with candor. I thought a lot of Dr. Buswell. ... This was an important crossroads in my life. You make those decisions and at the time you don't think they're important, but boy, you're at a fork in the road and the road is different after that (12).

At this time, the school in Dallas had eighty students and eight resident professors. Dr. Chafer impressed John as a teacher, as did Henry Thiessen. Thiessen was the Greek
teacher, who began his ministry at the seminary in 1931. He was the only Ph.D. on the faculty, and made the greatest contribution to John's first years. Harry Ironside, visiting lecturer, also made a strong impression:

... I remember I wrote a paper on [The Book of] Esther. He thought it was worth publishing. ... He had a way of flattering you ... but coming from him, the author of so many books--having said that, he was a very good teacher--very deserving!! (12).

At this time, during the depression years, the faculty survived by mortgaging their homes, selling their cars, or by quitting. There was no tuition charged to students, and they only paid one dollar a day for room and board.

... The faculty just didn't get paid. Dr. Chafer did not take a salary at all. He had some book royalties and preached in the summers and made some money. He talked a grocery store into selling him groceries on credit from September until May and then he would pay them off in the summer, and start over. There was a lot of heroism and sacrifice without which the school would not be here today (12).

Many faculty at this time rented apartments close to campus because they could not afford a car. Rent at that time in Dallas was from $24.00 to $40.00 a month.

During the last summer at Wheaton College and during his seminary training, John traveled to rural communities in Nebraska, where he spent the summers leading over forty Vacation Bible Schools:

We ["I"--he went alone] came into a community, usually where there was a Presbyterian Church, and got all the churches together. This was before Vacation Bible School, or Child Evangelism Fellowship and these other things. ... We held two Bible classes in the morning, plus a program that would act out a parable or book
[of the Bible] like Ruth or Esther or the Parable of the Talents. . . . It was very corny, very elementary. No, it wouldn't pass the Christian Education Department here [now] I'm sure. But [it] was effective (12).

John would move into a community and get people from several churches together. He felt his main achievement was a Bible memory program, where children were awarded pins according to how many points they earned. Some of the children would memorize five hundred verses in two weeks. They would spend all afternoon and evening memorizing Scripture and come back the next day and recite them:

. . . Well, back in those days, all you gave them was a little pin, that only cost about 75¢. We had a gold, silver and bronze pin. . . . They would knock themselves out to get them. But it wouldn't work today. This was the depression, you know. You weren't competing with the movies. You didn't have money, you didn't have television. So you were working with kids with idle time, and nothing to do, and the parents were tickled to death to have them busy. It wouldn't work today at all. You have to find a motivator. . . . You couldn't get kids excited about a pin today. The church is much more sophisticated (12).

Donald K. Campbell wrote about one of John's ministries during this time in his seminary career. During one school year, John ministered in the rural setting of Sublet, actually just a schoolhouse surrounded by fields. "The grateful Sunday School superintendent presented John with a love offering for the year's ministry--three dollars and a few cents, raised by the sale of eggs at the Depression price of nine cents a dozen" (1, p. 6).

In the summer of 1930, John owned a car, a 1926 Dodge, which he had purchased for $75.00. While leading a Vacation
Bible School in Scottsbluff, Nebraska, he sold it to a Presbyterian minister for $100.00. In 1931, he bought a 1928 Pontiac. He has loved cars ever since and keeps them running by doing repairs on them himself.

J. Vernon McGee reported the following about John:

When I graduated from college I went to Dallas Seminary just one year, and then I was ordered by my [Presbyterian] denomination at that time to leave Dallas. The next year, the year that John came to the Seminary, I made a trip over to Dallas, and I got acquainted with John at that time. . . . I knew at that time that he was rather outstanding—things you hear from the first year class and that sort of thing. He was an outstanding student (15, p. 9).

J. Ellwood Evans worked at a small rural church which is now Pantego Bible Church, where John would lead singing on Sunday evenings. John often preached at a small country church nearby on Sunday mornings. John was preparing himself for a lifetime of missionary service. John reflected back on this time:

. . . When I was a student at Dallas Seminary, I was a candidate for the mission field. I had been interested in missions during my college days, and my mother had wanted to be a missionary to China. . . . All through seminary, I was thinking of going to China. I wrote what was then China Inland Mission and asked for an application. But as I spread it out in my room up in Stearns Hall and prayed about it, the Lord said very definitely, "Don't send in that application." So I didn't (12).

It was clear to John that God wanted him to do something else, and so he approached Dr. Chafer and asked him for help. Dr. Chafer recommended him to several churches in the Midwest.

. . . The first church I went to didn't seem to show any interest, but I eventually candidated in a church in Wyoming. It was the only church in the whole town
and served some 8,000 people. I went there and discovered it was quite an alive and prosperous church. As a graduate of the Seminary, I thought this was it (16, p. 16C).

But again, as he prayed about the situation, God was very definitely saying, "No." So he turned down the position:

. . . I remembered that Dr. Chafer had invited me a year before during my period of doctoral study, to accept the office of Registrar. I told the Lord that if he wanted me to be Registrar, He should make Dr. Chafer renew the offer. Well, within ten days time, Dr. Chafer renewed the offer. So it seemed very clear that this was what the Lord intended me to do. This time it was a little different proposition. He offered to give me half of the theology department, too. So I accepted, and Dr. Chafer set me apart for this new work about two or three months before I was to graduate from the doctoral program. On the way out, he just mentioned in passing that my salary would be $100.00 a month (16, p. 16C).

. . . Reflecting on that moment years later, I really did not pay much attention, because I knew they could not afford $100.00 a month, and I'd never get it. I was right (1, p. 6).

In 1934, as John finished up two seminary degrees (both a three year seminary degree and the Th.M. degree) he was asked to pastor the Rosen Heights Presbyterian Church in Fort Worth, Texas. In 1936, when he assumed his faculty and Registrar's responsibilities (and completed his doctoral degree), he drove from Fort Worth to Dallas three days a week.

At this time, J. Ellwood Evans was to make a significant impact on John's life. The two of them would ride together when they drove home to the Midwest to visit family on holidays. John would drop Evans off in Geneva, Illinois,
and then drive on home to Racine, Wisconsin. One Christmas holiday, they traveled together and stopped to see Harriet Lundgren, whom Evans was soon to marry. Harriet had a younger sister named Geraldine, who was introduced to John. He accepted an invitation to dinner before continuing on to Racine. But this young lady made such an impact on John that he decided to continue the relationship by mail.

Geraldine was a student at Northern Illinois State, in Decalb, Illinois. She majored in Elementary Education, and did her student teaching back at home in Geneva, thirty miles away. At this time Geraldine remembers both she and John had other "friends" they were dating, but both broke up with these friends and did not date anyone else. Geraldine reported that Dr. Chafer was always trying to set John up with some young girl he met on his itinerant travels, and especially had one young girl in mind from Detroit—but John was never really interested.

John and Geraldine's first date was to a literary society concert at Wheaton College. Geraldine reported that John treated her like a lady—and did not kiss her on that first date. They would see each other three or four times a year when John would be passing by on his way to Racine. After they became engaged, John purchased a lot on Loving Avenue in Fort Worth, and contracted the building of their first home. He would mail samples of wall paper and paint to her for her approval. After a romance of about seven years, they were married at the home of the bride, June 28, 1939.
They spent their honeymoon in Green Bay, Wisconsin, and then moved into their new home on Loving Avenue. John's mother had been living with him in Fort Worth, but moved out and went to live with John's sister, Ethel.

As Pastor of Rosen Heights Presbyterian Church, and holding down the job of Registrar and Professor of Systematic Theology at the seminary, John found other things to do as well. He had a hobby of electricity and used it around the house. He also took a few courses at a nearby college.

John would drive three days a week to Dallas to teach and handle the Registrar's Office—without secretarial help at first. He rode with a man and woman from Fort Worth, both of whom Geraldine described as "non-stop talkers." One day, tired of the endless dialogue, John snapped, "Would you be quiet, I haven't had my devotions yet." They were quiet the rest of the way to Dallas. John had just discovered he had been asked to speak in chapel that morning and needed to collect his thoughts (10).

When John began as pastor, he was told by some people in the congregation that he would not last very long. The church had fired the two previous men, both before they had served a full year. Geraldine said the reason John lasted seventeen years at the church (sixteen years as pastor and one year while they found a replacement) was because of his gift of helping people work together, his love for people, and his openness (10).
Every Tuesday morning, John—and sometimes Geraldine, would get up at 4:00 a.m. and go to KRLD radio station where John would preach for W. A. Hawkins on his Radio Bible Class. John also was on a program in Fort Worth, live, where they had to be at the station at 1:30 a.m. Geraldine would play the organ for the program and John would teach the lesson. The program was later changed to 4:30 a.m., and by then they had a son, John E., who went along. This was now during the Second World War, and John E. was fascinated by the armed guards at the door to the station. John E. Walvoord was born on February 20, 1942.

From 1942 to 1945, John attended college at Texas Christian University in Fort Worth. He earned a Master's Degree in Philosophy, taking additional courses in both French and German. Geraldine remembers that he often took classes on Monday and Friday nights during the school year.

During this time, while John was pastoring the church in Fort Worth, a major storm was developing over the teaching of dispensational theology within the Presbyterian Church. The national leadership was beginning to refuse the ordination of Dallas Seminary graduates in their churches. In 1944 Dr. Chafer said in a letter to J. D. Eggleston (written just one month after Mrs. Chafer died April 17, 1944):

... The Southern Church, as some other denominations, has come to crossroads on this question of being tied to a covenant theology, which closes the Bible completely as is evidenced by the ignorance of our preachers on every hand. ... Perhaps you will remember that it was in my mind when this Seminary was established that
some day I would rebuke the claims that premillennialists had only Bible Institutes and their childish courses, while the postmillennialists had their scholastic seminaries (3).

This would develop into a major battle, which would eventually lead to Dallas Seminary graduates going into other denominations, independent churches, and parachurch organizations. But John was not particularly affected by these disputes. While at the Rosen Heights Presbyterian Church, he was elected Moderator of the Fort Worth Synod of the Presbyterian Church and served as permanent clerk for ten years. The conflict did eventually reach the church, but several years after John resigned. This will be discussed later in the study.

John handled the job of Registrar very professionally. In a letter to Dr. Chafer, October 28, 1944, he listed in detail the changes which he felt needed to be made in the academic development of the school. Up to this time, there was no Academic Dean, with Rollin T. Chafer functioning in this capacity as well as Registrar. John functioned as Academic Dean also. In his letter, John recommended changes in the organization of faculty committees; he discussed problems with the retirement of Dr. Spangler; he discussed the powers of the Board of Regents, and suggested that he might be allowed to teach an elective course in philosophy. He wrote:

... and I have been impressed more than ever recently with the fact that many if not most of our students do not know how to write effectively. I believe our graduates have a tremendous potential force in the field of written ministry. I therefore, propose a two hour
elective course be added to be known as "Written Ministry." It would be in the written field what homiletics is to the sermonic field. I would be willing to teach the course to get it started, in the hope that someone else on the faculty would get interested enough to take it over (17).

John goes on to propose another course in contemporary theology which he would teach, and he discussed the changes in classification of the missions course. He continued:

... I wish to report that I have nineteen enrolled in my class in Calvin's theology. I believe it is the largest elective class in the Seminary except for your two elective theology courses. ... This memorandum has extended to unusual length, but it will probably take less of your valuable time than if I tried to discuss all these things orally. I will try to see you at the first opportunity to learn your decision in the various matters (17).

At this time, John is considering a two-year leave of absence to attempt a Ph.D. in Philosophy from Princeton. He already had received a degree from Wheaton College, a Th.B., a Th.M., and a Th.D. degree from Dallas Theological Seminary and an M.A. from Texas Christian University. In a letter of recommendation to L. P. Eisenhart, Dean of the Graduate School at Princeton, Dr. Chafer wrote:

... As President of Dallas Theological Seminary, an institution which is accredited by the Regents of the University of the State of New York, it is my pleasure to commend to you Dr. John F. Walvoord, Registrar of the Seminary and my associate as teacher in the Department of Systematic Theology. Having been under my observation and in close association for a term of years, I believe that Dr. Walvoord is one of the most competent young men of the present generation. He is proposing to pursue studies in Princeton University leading to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and I commend him to you most highly as being in my estimation unusually worthy of this privilege (4).
Dr. Chafer had been recovering from a serious heart condition during this time, and seemed to be in a state of anxiety when faced with the possibility of John leaving. On February 1, 1945, he wrote to Miner B. Stearns, requesting him to assume John's teaching load for two years. He mentioned that Dr. Nash would be moved "up" to assume the position of Registrar. He wrote:

"... Dr. Walvoord's absence will be for two years. Beyond that I do not know what openings or positions would be available. Naturally, I would expect Dr. Walvoord to resume his permanent work as teacher of theology. At present, he is teaching the first year of Theology I through Theology Proper and the second year of Theology II including Ecclesiology and Eschatology. He has a whole third year of Christology in the fall and Pneumatology in the spring (9)."

Added to Dr. Chafer's difficult circumstances are the requirements placed on the school by the Selective Service Department to speed up all college curriculum, having courses all year around. This was required because of the United States involvement in World War II. He wrote Stearns:

"... We are terribly out of step with the intrusion of the summer term last year. Our plan this summer, since the school does not close until June 9, is to have the fall semester open on July 28. This is to avoid a summer term which we would have to have unless we close up the gap as much as that (9)."

In a letter to Robert O. Fleming in Seattle, April 5, 1945, Dr. Chafer described his heart ailment. "When I came back I had some disturbance of the heart and was thrown back under the doctor's care. It was, he said, some involvement of the scarred tissue that I gained when I had that thrombosis" (5). In the same letter he expressed concern over a
leader of an organization that is causing him a great deal of worry:

... [ ] was in the meeting, but when I began to speak he got up and walked out. He came to Waterloo [Iowa] also, to begin a week's meetings on the day that I was closing my work. We stayed at the same hotel. I saw him at a distance, but gave him no opportunity to slight me. I consider him a very dangerous man. Whether he is mentally unbalanced, I do not know, but he is capable of doing great injury to people without conscience (5).

In a letter to B. J. Heetderks in Boseman, Montana, May 1, 1945 (Dr. Walvoord's thirty-fifth birthday), he wrote:

... Early this spring I developed a complication in my heart. The left side which was injured by the thrombosis of nine years ago developed a weakness and I have been obliged to slow down a good deal, but that is passing and I feel quite normal again. ... Some years ago I used to drive this work, but now it is driving me. It is a painful experience for me to be forever behind in the things that I am called upon to do. In the eight volumes which I am endeavoring to prepare on Systematic Theology, I am over half way through the seventh. It has gone slowly with these weeks of physical limitation (7).

May 25, 1945, Dr. Chafer is hopeful that John might not leave. In a letter to F. Z. Browne, he wrote:

... There is a good deal of movement going on in our faculty situation. Dr. Walvoord had proposed to go to Princeton University for study toward a Ph.D. degree. This would necessitate Dr. Nash moving up and taking the Registrar's work and if he [does] ... someone is going to have to take over the History again. ... Even though it might work out that Dr. Walvoord should not go to Princeton on a leave of absence, the publishing of my work on Theology has reached the point where I am going to have to have that kind of relief from the executive end of the Seminary that only Dr. Walvoord can give. If he goes to Princeton, I shall have to wait over a term of two years for his assistance to make it possible for me to complete the work that I am doing. If he does not go to Princeton, then I can complete the work at once (2).
Concerning the problems which were developing for Dr. Chafer with the Southern Presbyterian Church, he went on to tell Browne:

... You will be interested to know that I have petitioned the General Assembly of our Church personally to rescind the untrue things that they have said in their report regarding my doctrine and to discontinue the circulation of all literature which bears these errors (2).

Concerning the Walvoord's family during this time, Geraldine is pregnant with their second son James. In August 1945, Dr. Chafer asked John to assume a conference ministry for him at Gull Lake Conference Center in Michigan. John did not hesitate to take the opportunity, and Geraldine was in complete agreement. In a letter to Rev. D. J. DePree, August 4, 1945, John wrote:

... As you have probably been informed, Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer will not be able to fill his conference engagement August 11-19. In response to a telegram from Rev. J. Robert Walter who invited Dr. Chafer, I have been asked by Dr. Chafer to substitute for him. I am glad to be of service, though I am very sorry that Dr. Chafer will not be able to go himself. ... I am quite accustomed to assisting Dr. Chafer. Since 1936 I have been his associate in the Theology Department at the Seminary, teaching approximately half of the courses in this Department. As I am also Pastor of the Rosen Heights Presbyterian Church of Fort Worth, I have not traveled as much as if I were free. I have spoken at Winona Lake, at both of the recent New York Prophetic Congresses, at Nashville, El Har, etc. (18).

While at the Gull Lake Conference, John received mail as usual. He began a pattern which has followed him until 1986, of receiving mail and dictating letters on the road. In a letter to his friend, Herbert E. Kann, John wrote:
... With Dr. Chafer sick I have my hands full in the Seminary work. I am teaching 13 hours a week—all the theology and philosophy. I also have to do considerable administrative work as assigned to me by Dr. Chafer. By the way, I have given up the Registrar's Office to Dr. Nash--official announcement will be made soon. I had thought very seriously of going off for graduate study somewhere but it seems to be impossible at least for the present. I finished up a program of study at T.C.U. recently and will get an M.A. for my pains later this month—in philosophy and history. In all I took 63 semester hours there the last three years—some of it had no connection with the M.A. I am through with that now and can confine myself to church and Seminary again (20).

In his correspondence with several people, John revealed a humorous side to him that few of his associates ever saw. He expressed it in his closing remarks to Kann, "I hear you are writing a book on 'Hirohito the AntiChrist.' Send me a copy" (20). This was in response to Kann's letter dated August 8, 1945, where Kann said, "Congratulations on the new little Walvoord [James] . . . It is rumored that you are going to Union [Seminary] in New York for a Ph.D. It seems to me that I did read of Fosdick's retiring" (14).

On September 1, 1945, Dr. Chafer sent out an "Important Notice" to everyone at the Seminary. It said:

By action of the governing board of the Seminary, Dr. John F. Walvoord has been appointed Assistant to the President of the Seminary to undertake and discharge such parts of the executive work belonging to the President as may be assigned to him by Dr. Chafer. Dr. Walvoord is authorized to act as Chairman of the Faculty, Chairman of the Chapel and other public meetings, to act for and represent the President in all routine administrative matters, to represent the office of the President in public as may be necessary, to answer business correspondence addressed to the President, and as far as possible to relieve Dr. Chafer of the load of administrative detail (6).
In a letter to J. Vernon McGee, August 29, 1945, Dr. Chafer wrote:

... I am sorry I have not been more faithful in keeping you informed, but I have made substantial recovery since I came home. I spend practically all the time in bed sleeping. I am not undertaking any outside work whatever, not even in the school. The management of the school has been transferred to Dr. Walvoord who is acting as Assistant to the President by the authority of the Board. At least sixty days of perfect rest has been required of me and I am seeking to comply with that which will take me on to the first of October (8).

Dr. Walvoord reflected back on this period in a personal interview, February 7, 1986:

... Dr. Chafer was a perfectionist personally, but he wasn't an administrator. He was a minister, a man of great vision, but not very good at putting legs under it and getting it accomplished. He didn't like office work. He'd want to go home at 2:00 in the afternoon and leave the letters unanswered. ... I happen to be a person who believes in answering your mail. ... There were some of his letters he wouldn't let me answer. I took out a whole big box of letters that accumulated over a couple of years, but he wouldn't let me answer them. If he'd have let me answer them I would have (12).

Reflecting on the state of the Seminary at this time, Dr. Walvoord noted:

... When I came [as Assistant to the President] the annual budget was $50,000.00 and we were $100,000.00 behind--which is to say we were bankrupt--and in the previous year they'd taken in $36,000.00, so we were $14,000.00 in debt for that year.

... I persuaded Dr. Chafer to send out a newsletter, a President's letter every six weeks or two month. simply stating what was going on, and enclosing an envelope. Within three months of when I started doing that, we began to get enough [to meet the budget but not pay back the debt].

... From 1945 to 1952, when Dr. Chafer died, we didn't retire the debt but we paid the bills in full, and paid the faculty in full for the first time since the school began. ... Since 1955 we have had no overdue debts (12).
With the beginning of the school year, September 1945, John F. Walvoord began a new phase of his career. It was a phase in which he was to prove his administrative ability. In a personal interview, Dr. Walvoord revealed that at this time Lewis S. Chafer had written a letter to the Board of Incorporate Members, naming him as Chafer's successor were he to die. He placed the letter in a sealed envelope under the care of C. Fred Lincoln, the Business Manager. No one saw the letter until the death of Dr. Chafer in August of 1952.
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Dr. John F. Walvoord officially began his duties as the Assistant to the President of Dallas Theological Seminary on September 1, 1945. His responsibilities as announced by Dr. Chafer included (1) handling all of the executive responsibilities of Dr. Chafer in his absence; (2) acting as Chairman of the Faculty; (3) overseeing all Chapel and public meetings held by the Seminary; (4) answering all correspondence coming into the President's Office; (5) representing the President in routine administrative decisions; (6) handling publicity for the Seminary; and (7) teaching and academic advisement (3).

Dr. Walvoord may have felt the new job was a temporary one. He wrote Frank Venn, October 18, 1945 that, "The new work that has been assigned to me is of course, somewhat temporary in its nature but it has a challenging possibility for service" (63). Dr. Walvoord immediately went to work on publicity. He contacted several key Evangelical magazines and advertised the seminary. In a letter to The Sunday School Times, he wrote:

We are attempting to form a constructive program of advertising in your magazine. . . . Our advertising has been greatly limited because we have not felt free to use funds to any large extent for this purpose. . . .
We have in mind an ad involving about two inches, one column, which would appear perhaps once a month or oftener. Could you give us information as to cost (59)?

The same day, September 6, 1945, was, according to Dr. Walvoord, a day to remember. In a letter to Rev. Cullen Story, he said, "I am glad that your wife and baby are well. Our little James is now almost three months old. Last night was a red letter day as he slept through the entire night for the first time" (57). September 25, Dr. Walvoord answered an invitation by the Gull Lake Bible Conference to return the following year for a week of meetings. This was the continuation of what was to become a yearly ministry in Michigan. On the same day, Dr. Walvoord convinced Dr. Chafer to mail out a small half-page information sheet with a return envelope. The letter began with a word of appreciation for those who have supported the school. He went on to say:

... The past year has been one of signal blessing in many evident ways. While seminaries generally throughout the country have had a material decrease in enrollment, Dallas Seminary recorded a new record enrollment of 121 in the school year beginning June, 1944 and ending June, 1945. ... Twenty-four new students were added to rolls who were not present last year. This record has been accomplished in spite of higher entrance standards than ever obtained before and in spite of the difficulty that the fall semester under the accelerated program ... [began] in the middle of the summer (21).

He continued by mentioning that $36,000 was received in the last fiscal year "in unsolicited gifts from living sources." However, "... the amount received was not quite sufficient to meet the increased costs of the accelerated
program" and he asked for continued prayer. Finally, he mentions that two men have returned to the seminary to join the faculty. They were Everett F. Harrison, after completing resident work on a Ph.D. at the University of Pennsylvania, and Charles L. Feinberg, after completing graduate work in archaeology at John Hopkins University.

As Dr. Walvoord mentioned in a personal interview, the school was almost bankrupt at this time, but within three months of sending out letters like this one, the school began to receive enough money to meet its budget. He concluded the letter by saying, "Our resource is faith and prayer and the unfailing faithfulness of our loving Heavenly Father." And then in Dr. Walvoord's typical fashion, he remembers to ask prayer for the man who has led the school since 1924, saying, "We would especially remember in prayer President Chafer as he is now recovering from his illness of last summer."

Dr. Walvoord's brother Randall was being transferred to Dallas at this time, and Dr. Walvoord mentioned to him, "Anyone who thinks that it is easy to rent a house in Dallas should try to do so. We have been leaving no stone unturned to find a house for one of our professors since August 4 and have found nothing at all." He suggested that Randall find help through the company he was working for (64).

While Dr. Chafer is convalescing at home, Dr. Walvoord began to defend Dr. Chafer concerning criticism he was receiving for parts of his book, True Evangelism. Several
evangelists criticized Dr. Chafer in print, and it came to the point that Moody Press, publisher of the book, decided to withdraw it from circulation. In a letter to J. F. Strombeck, October 10, 1945, Dr. Walvoord wrote, "... The enclosed confidential information is being sent to a small group of friends of Dr. Chafer. ... We feel sure that you will join us in the judgment that we can not permit this untimely criticism ... to go unchallenged" (58).

In response to letters such as this one, Dr. Walvoord received this reply from Bert Betteridge:

I have your letter of October 12th and the enclosure of confidential information relative to a revision of Dr. Chafer's book True Evangelism. Thank you very much for sending on this information to me, and I am happy to be able to do my bit toward defeating the attacks of misguided men who perhaps otherwise mean well in the cause of evangelism. I am enclosing a copy of my letter to the director of Moody Press. ... I believe you are wise in not bringing this to the attention of Dr. Chafer. After six years of experience with a stroke patient, I am sure to tell Dr. Chafer of this undeserved attack upon that which is so near and dear to his heart, would only cause him increased suffering and eventually would hasten his death. You are acting most wisely in this matter (1).

Part of Dr. Walvoord's new job as Assistant to the President involved what he describes as "donor letters." These were thank you notes for the financial support of people all across America. To Miss Florence Wheeler, he wrote:

I want to add my personal word of thanks to you in addition to our treasurer's acknowledgment of your gift. Your record indicates that over a long period of time you have been a faithful giver and we want you to know that your offerings have been a real help to us and an encouragement to continue the work (65).
Another aspect of his letter writing was to send a letter immediately to a grieving family when a family member died. October 26, 1945, he sent a letter to Herbert Kann, expressing sympathy over the death of Kann's father. He wrote, "... Having lost my own father some thirteen years ago next month, I can enter into your feeling of sorrow ... Remember us kindly to your mother who, with your father, was so kind to me on the occasion of my visit" (39).

A similar letter was written February 13, 1946, to Howard E. Tucker over the death of his wife in childbirth, and the death of the child. "I was shocked beyond words to have your message of last week that your wife had gone to be with the Lord so suddenly. I enjoyed knowing her so much last summer at Gull Lake and it hardly seems possible that she is now gone on." He then closed the letter by saying, "I am sure that no words of mine could be of any great help to you, but I rest in the fact that the Lord gives comfort to those who have need in proportion to their need" (62).

In the area of publicity, Dr. Walvoord never failed to use every opportunity to represent the seminary. When he found he would be in Chicago on March 20, 1945, he wrote to Wheaton College and requested to speak in a Chapel service. To the President, V. R. Edman, he wrote:

... Your letter reminded me that I had not been to Wheaton officially for some time, and I do not want to lose touch with the student body ... I wonder if it would be possible for me to have the opportunity of speaking in chapel and interviewing students interested in seminary? I do not desire to promote my own ministry but you will understand that it helps to present the
work of the seminary to have the chapel time. We do not want to compete with your own seminary program, but there are always some students who plan to go somewhere else anyway (28).

Occasionally a donor would send in a check to the seminary which would "bounce" when sent for collection. On January 2, 1946, Dr. Walvoord sent a very gracious letter to such a person. He enclosed the returned check, and suggested, "It would be easiest for us if you would send us another check" (35). The check had been a donation for married student housing, which had become the seminary's greatest concern following World War II. The student body changed from primarily single to primarily married students during this time. Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... We desperately need an apartment house for married students located off campus, but near enough to permit the married students to walk. ... This will permit more freedom for the children than is now possible when we are closer together. ... We have approximately forty to fifty married couples in our student body. Without question, our imminent need now is for quarters for [them]. Further, it is almost impossible to get space in Dallas now as the housing shortage is very acute here. Some married students last semester were forced to leave school after not being able to find anything after a month or two of search (35).

January 2, 1946, Dr. Walvoord received a letter from Herbert Kann, which would have caused him to chuckle:

Your epistle from the apostles received and caused me much concern. ... The seminary is kept before our people pretty well both by the high quality of preaching of its present pastor [Kann] and from other alumni. I've got to run Walvoord! I'm not like you—I haven't a church and a school job so that when one doesn't go the folks will think I'm working on the other!!! (8).

Part of Dr. Walvoord's new responsibility was oversight
of the seminary chapel program. On January 8, 1946, he wrote a reply to a request by Rev. R. Howard Gould to speak at the seminary:

... It so happens that the last two weeks of March are the examination week for the winter semester and a week of recess before the spring semester begins. In other words, there will be no classes or chapels during those weeks except by special arrangement. ... I think we could arrange a special chapel even in examination week, but we shall need to know in advance (33).

As chairman of the Faculty, Dr. Walvoord had not only the oversight of them but the task of faculty selection. January 8, he wrote a letter of reply to a Moody Bible Institute professor who was seeking to find a teaching position for his son. Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... The problem of securing a History teacher for the Seminary is an imminent and difficult one. The standards we have set are rather high. ... Your son [ ] does not have any seminary training, and it would be necessary for him to complete a seminary course in order to meet the standards we maintain. We recognize there are exceptional men such as yourself and Dr. Ironside who have been able to do a highly creditable piece of work in seminary instruction without having the formal seminary training as a background. ... I should gather that [ ] does not at present meet our standards (12).

The father was later given a teaching position on the faculty of Dallas Theological Seminary. He served for a brief period of time.

February 23, 1946, Dr. Walvoord also wrote a letter about faculty selection:

... We of course are very particular concerning the qualifications for teachers. Generally speaking, a man is required to have a full-orbed college training
and at least four or more years in seminary, including a specialization with a doctor's degree if possible, in the field of his teaching ministry (20).

In his correspondence, Dr. Walvoord was critically scrutinized by a watching public. In December he had mailed out Christmas cards to the constituency, and the card failed to have a Scripture verse quoted on it. In response to a letter noting this fact, he wrote:

... Thank you for your card of December 19. I heartily agree with you that the Christmas season has been commercialized and that Christians should do all they can to direct attention back to the real meaning of the birth of Christ. I am inclined to agree with you that our Christmas card, which I myself designed and for which I alone was responsible, should have included a Scripture verse in some appropriate place. However, the purpose of the card was to extend our Christian greetings and we included a brief message embodying the thought of the Scriptures even if we did not quote directly from them (26).

Dr. Walvoord often received unsolicited letters seeking to help him in various aspects of his ministry. One mimeographed letter came to him which was titled, "A Suggestion to College Presidents." The letter began, "Every parent who has a child at college knows of the Chapel difficulty. Both college authorities and the home folk would like students to attend Chapel regularly; but how to bring this about?" The letter goes on to suggest that the President ask each student to visit Chapel at some time of his or her own choosing, at least once a week, ". . . and reverently repeat the Lord's Prayer . . . [which] will be satisfactory, provided it is done reverently once every week. We believe it may help solve the problem. At least it can do no harm" (11).
To this letter Dr. Walvoord responded:

... We have found daily Chapel services feasible and successful in our situation and have no need to resort to abandonment of the normal Chapel service. ... There is no substitute for preaching or for congregational worship (51).

Because of the comprehensive nature of the doctrinal statement, as mentioned before, Dr. Walvoord occasionally received requests from churches or organizations to use it for their own purposes. To one such request he replied,

... Our doctrinal statement was copyrighted in order to assure its purity if quoted. If your church desires to make revisions or additions for their own use, we prefer not be be mentioned as confusion will arise as to where the additions and corrections begin and end. We are willing to grant you permission to use our doctrinal statement in any way you see fit with the understanding that our name will not be mentioned in connection with it unless it is used exactly in its present form (25).

Dr. Walvoord was beginning to assume the responsibility for the publication of the seminary quarterly journal, Bibliotheca Sacra. January 17, 1946, he wrote Rev. F. Martyn Cundy in England concerning the issues arriving late in foreign countries:

... Since the publication does not provide enough income to give honorariums for contributed articles, those who write for the magazine do it voluntarily. For this reason, in order to maintain the high standard of articles we have always had, it is sometimes necessary for us to go to press late in the quarter. ... We are trying to improve this as fast as we can and we trust that you will be repaid somewhat for this inconvenience in the value of the periodical to you. It so happened that the two numbers you inquired about were late in being published, and we hope that you have received them by this time (19).

Also involved in this area was the printing of the
seminary Bulletin. In preparing the January edition, Dr. Walvoord had requested a glossy print of Clarence E. Mason, Dean of Philadelphia School of the Bible. On January 26, 1946, Mason wrote:

... I am chagrined that I did not answer your request for a glossy for the Dallas January Bulletin. It so happened that the one I have been using is of rather ancient vintage and I did not send it because I was in the throes of passing through extensive nightmare experiences in the photographers anticipating that I would have something which would pass more for a likeness (10).

Dr. Walvoord never seems to have missed a detail such as sending in a picture or a title for a message he would be giving. Already on January 28, he has received back his picture from the Gull Lake Conference Center where he will be speaking later in the summer. In a thank you note he wrote, "I would appreciate a word from you when the final decision is reached [about the date and topic he is to speak on] as I want to fit into your program and begin planning of the series of messages now, as time affords" (22). On February 5, 1946, he again writes Gull Lake, saying:

... It is entirely satisfactory to me to designate my week as a prophecy week. My approach to prophecy, however, is rather its application to our daily lives—that is, the Scriptural revelation concerning future events has been given by God not as a means of satisfying our curiosity about the future, but to enable us to intelligently adjust our life to God's plan and purpose (23).

Dr. Walvoord was developing the habit of speaking not only at the conference he was asked to lead, but speaking the Sunday before and after the conference in local churches.
He says in his letter to Gull Lake, "... I am already in correspondence with a church in regard to supplying the pulpit August 4 ... and I should give them word soon (23).

One of the areas of responsibility which fell on Dr. Walvoord was that of answering mail from people who were in need of counseling in various areas. One letter sent to a military officer said:

... Some few years ago, I had a close personal friend who had spiritual difficulty almost identical to yours. He was continually looking into his own experience and his own feelings and his own spiritual state with the result in lack of assurance that he was saved. He finally came to the place where he realized he would never find assurance by looking into himself, and he turned his faith and eyes instead to the Lord Jesus Christ. ... I am sure that all of us become dissatisfied at once when we contemplate what we are, but we become completely satisfied when we contemplate the finished work of Jesus Christ (41).

On the mind of Dr. Walvoord was always the pressing need of finances. In a thank you letter for a generous gift to the seminary, he wrote:

... because of greatly increased expenditures due to the wartime accelerated program with three semesters instead of two each year, our income for the fiscal year which closed August 31, 1945 revealed a small [$14,000] deficit for that year. Due to the fact that during the years there were a number of large deficits, the accumulation [$100,000] is a matter of concern. I am sure that you will rejoice with us in the fact that during the months since September 1, 1945 [when Dr. Walvoord became Assistant to the President] God has graciously sent in a larger supply of gifts from living sources than ever before received in a similar period of time for the general fund. ... Our financial policy has been to pay salaries in accordance with need, that those who needed full salary would often receive it, while others who had outside income, as in the case of Dr. Chafer, would forego a portion of their salary due (50).
He goes on in the letter to explain just what this man's generous gift did for the seminary, and how they were worthy of his continued support:

... Your contribution was sufficient to meet all the operating expenses of the Seminary for one month [$1,000]. ... It may be of interest to you to know that while most Seminaries estimate their annual cost per student at $1,000.00 or more, our figures indicate that it is something less than $500.00 per student. As a businessman would put it, we feel we are producing a better product at less than half the cost of our competitors (50).

Dr. Walvoord handled all correspondence with Board members and kept them fully informed about the finances and academic concerns of the school. As Secretary to the Board of Regents, he was involved with the selection of new Board members, and with handling the yearly signing of the doctrinal statement. In a letter to Frank Gaebelein, February 11, 1946, he wrote:

... We are very happy to have your letter to Dr. Chafer in which you graciously accepted the appointment by our Board of Incorporate Members to a place on that Board and also on the Board of Regents. We felt that there was no one to our knowledge better qualified to take the place left by your father than yourself. ... Our constitution requires that Board members sign our doctrinal statement each year. I am enclosing the necessary form for your signature and also a copy of the doctrinal statement (31).

Dr. Chafer sat on the Commission on Institutions in the National Association of Evangelicals. On February 13, 1946, Dr. Walvoord wrote to them saying, "Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, our President, has asked me to represent the Seminary at this meeting" (54). It became his regular practice to represent the seminary at most of such gatherings in Dr. Chafer's absence.
Once he knew he was going to the meeting, he wrote Dr. Edman at Wheaton College and asked to cancel the previously scheduled chapel service and asked Dr. Edman, "Since our correspondence, I have been invited to speak for a week at the Carrollton Presbyterian Church in New Orleans. . . ." He continued saying, "It now appears that I will need to come north to attend the convention at the National Association of Evangelicals beginning April 27. I wonder if it will be possible to [re]schedule me for chapel on April 25" (28).

Another aspect of the financial dealings of the seminary involved the cost of printing various letters and catalogues, in addition to Bibliotheca Sacra. Millet the Printer Company in Dallas handled the printing. A letter Dr. Walvoord wrote to them revealed how the bills were often paid:

. . . We are deeply grateful for your continued interest in the Seminary as manifested in your contribution . . . to apply against printing bills for the current year. This assistance is a great help to us in meeting this expense and we appreciate your desire to contribute (47).

In a letter to Mrs. Gerald Williams, February 22, 1946, Dr. Walvoord answered several theological questions. He concluded a lengthy letter by suggesting various books she might purchase, and then he said:

. . . After exploring the field and receiving a graduate degree in philosophy, I can truly say that the study of all that the scholastic world has to offer in liberal theology or in philosophy as opposed to Christian faith has only confirmed my former belief that liberalism has nothing to offer and that both reason and faith support conservative theology (66).

Dr. Walvoord was busy writing for various magazines when
his seminary and church duties permitted it. In a letter to
Kenneth Taylor, then editor of HIS magazine, he wrote:

. . . Thanks for the copies of the April issue of
HIS and for your letter of March 4 and the enclosed
check. I appreciate your word that the article is
helpful. It had not occurred to me that you paid
your contributors, and in this case I do not desire
to profit by the contribution financially. Accordin-
gly I am returning the check signed over to you.
. . . I have profound admiration for your gift in
journalism [and] I know God is using you in this
particular field of service (60).

The week of March 11 was an exciting week for Dr. and
Mrs. Walvoord. They were just about to take their first
plane ride:

. . . Sunday I am going to New Orleans, Louisiana,
for a week's meetings at the Carrollton Presbyterian
Church. . . . It is my first trip to New Orleans and
my first trip by plane as we are going by air and
Geraldine is going with me. For the first time since
the children came, we are leaving them with some
friends while we have the week in New Orleans (24).

The same day he wrote an interesting letter to Herbert
Kann in Minneapolis:

"Very Reverend and Doctor,"

Nail the hatches down. According to latest plans, I
expect to be at the N.A.E. convention beginning April
27. . . . Unofficially, I will be representing Fort
Worth Presbytery in the investigation of the orthodoxy
of Oliver Church [Kann's].

All kidding aside I hope you will have a little
time for fellowship. I will of course have to give
an official report to your mother and father-in-love
and I thought you should have due warning to put every-
thing in order [Kann's in-laws were the Tadlocks,
members of Dr. Walvoord's church in Fort Worth] (37).

Herbert Kann returned a letter to Dr. Walvoord, saying:

. . . I wonder if you have any fundamental sermons
left in your barrel that will be suitable to proclaim
from the Oliver pulpit? . . . I believe that if I
threatened to resign, the Session would agree to per-
mitting you to speak for a Sunday morning message. . . .
However, I would like to know if you would be avail-
able, and we will bring the matter before the Women's
Social Union (9).

Kann goes on to express serious concern over the impact
of the N.A.E. meeting in Minneapolis. He is concerned
because though he would support the N.A.E. personally, the
Presbyterian Churches were leaning toward the Federal Council
of Churches. He said that as a Presbyterian minister trying
to battle in his own Presbytery, "... how far will I get
with the liberal group when they hurl back at me the charge
that the depth of my scholarship is to be measured by the
Pentecostalism of the N.A.E?" Many who had recently joined
the N.A.E. were from Pentecostal groups. He felt that the
"conservative Christian public" was guided more by its emo-
tions than the Word of God and he felt he had to walk a
tightrope between the conservatives and liberals.

In response to his letter, Dr. Walvoord wrote:

. . . After your session's experience with preachers
from Fort Worth Presbytery [meaning Kann] I am not
sure they will want to hear me. . . . I am glad to
note that you always consult the Women's Social
Union in your ecclesiastical decisions (38).

Concerning the coming National Association of Evangeli-
cals meeting, Dr. Walvoord wrote:

. . . Now in regard to N.A.E., I am of course aware
of the same problems as you see. The Dallas Seminary
as an institution does not belong to the organization,
but professors as individuals do. I will attend it
not as a voting delegate but only as a visitor. As I
am not acquainted with many of its leaders, I thought
it would be profitable for me and the Seminary to have
this contact. . . . While the Pentecostal element creates something of a problem, I do not think this has seriously involved the usefulness of the N.A.E. After all, we have more in common with the Pentecostal group than some of our own Presbyterian brethren. I think the Pentecostal Church as a group is becoming more sane in its interpretations (38).

As became his regular style, Dr. Walvoord sent a thank you letter to his hosts upon arriving in Dallas from a speaking engagement. March 20 he wrote Mr. and Mrs. George Carpenter in New Orleans, who had entertained them:

. . . Mrs. Walvoord and I want to thank you for your gracious hospitality and Christian fellowship while we were in New Orleans. We took back with us a most pleasant memory of our afternoon spent with you, and we look forward to seeing you again next year (15).

Back on campus at the seminary, Dr. Walvoord was also gracious in thanking the Women's Auxiliary for their help at the seminary. The group held regular meetings and were active in donating furniture, plants, curtains, and other things to make it more beautiful. The group had not been in existence for a while and on March 29, 1946, he sent a letter to Mrs. E. F. Harrison, faculty wife, saying:

. . . The Women's Auxiliary performed an important function through the years in helping the Seminary, and it is now planned to revive and reorganize this organization and hold regular meetings. While membership is composed largely of those outside the Seminary family, the wives of members of the faculty and members of the boards are urged to attend and support its work. I have been asked to extend this invitation to you (36).

Each year the Seminary has a week-long guest lecturer for the "Griffith Thomas Memorial Lectures." As Chairman of the Chapel program, it became Dr. Walvoord's responsibility to handle selection of the speaker and make all
arrangements necessary. In 1946, Charles T. Fritsch was coming from Princeton Seminary. Dr. Walvoord wrote him:

... After years of consideration of the problem, we finally have decided to hold our Griffith Thomas lectures in our Seminary chapel instead of holding them downtown in a Church. Meetings in the downtown area have been found too inconvenient for the student body with the result that some of them did not attend. By holding them in our chapel we hope to have full attendance without any inconvenience. The chief drawback will be limited space.

Dr. Walvoord wanted the guest speaker to be as comfortable as possible and to know exactly what was expected of him. He continued:

... We do not attempt to make the program formal and a regular street suit would be suitable for the morning hours, though a black suit would be preferable for evening. It will probably be too warm for heavy winter suits and I suggest that lighter weight suits be used if convenient.

Concerning the fees paid for these special lectures, Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... The usual provision for the lectureship includes an honorarium of $200.00 and all expenses. If you will give us the amount of your round trip plane ticket, we shall be glad to send you a check. We do not have any outside engagements scheduled for you, though you are free to speak at your own pleasure in response to any invitations extended.

In answering correspondence, a letter came to Dr. Walvoord, asking how to avoid giving money to support causes with which the giver may not approve. He replied:

... I believe it is impossible to avoid all connection with the ungodly world. Certainly everything we buy probably has resulted in a profit to someone or some business of which we do not approve, and it is also true in investments that it is impossible to find a business which is wholly Christ-like in all its attitudes and transactions. My own opinion is
that it is wrong for a Christian to invest in a business which by its very nature he cannot approve of from a moral standpoint. . . . On the other hand, we cannot expect perfection and if we are to make investments at all, we must choose between the lesser of evils. . . . It is probably contrary to God's plan for most Christians that they pile up wealth . . . beyond such immediate needs and provision for the future as may apply in any given case. It is rather God's will for us to put surplus funds to work in Christian enterprise (46).

Dr. Walvoord was teaching at the seminary during this time, and has not only his own load but most of Dr. Chafer's classes as well because of Dr. Chafer's convalescing at home. In addition, he is supervising the writing of several doctoral dissertations. To one such student he wrote very matter-of-factly about what he thought of the work:

. . . I have not had time to read your dissertation word for word, but have gone through it sufficiently to see the problems that we face in its completion. I am sorry you have not made any attempt to follow the instructions given. . . . I see no other way out than to return the dissertation to you and to have you make the necessary corrections after carefully studying the form book (43).

Dr. Walvoord mentions problems with footnotes, with the table of contents, chapter divisions, no page numbers, improper quotations, and then says, "I note frequent misspellings, some of them typographical, but it indicates that you have not read your own work." He goes on to mention incorrect punctuation, the use of colloquial expression, etc. He concludes, saying, "I am very sorry that you did not work with me as you progressed in the dissertation as we could have avoided this last minute rush" (43).

In a memorandum to Charles Nash, April 3, 1946, Dr.
Walvoord listed three men who had turned in the Th.M. thesis work on time, and eight which had not. He listed the various reasons for the delay and the date each paper could be expected. These men were fourth year students, writing in the area of Systematic Theology, which was Dr. Walvoord's specific responsibility.

In connection with the Gull Lake conference coming up in August, Dr. Walvoord had more invitations to speak both before the conference and after it. On April 19, he wrote P.J. Zondervan in Michigan, thanking him for an invitation to speak, but explaining why he had to turn down the request. He was already scheduled to speak at the Kalamazoo Youth for Christ rally just prior to his prophetic conference at Gull Lake. He suggested that Dr. Zondervan find another speaker (52).

On April 11, 1946, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Rev. Paul Guinness in London, England, saying, "Dr. Chafer is busy now on the finishing touches for his series of theological volumes which will number eight or nine books of five hundred pages each. We are just now sending the second volume to the printer" (34).

On April 22, Dr. Chafer answered a letter for a request to speak at Erieside Conference in Ohio. He said, "I am just getting back somewhat on my feet from a stroke that took me last June while in California." He has not been traveling and has spent most of the time in bed. He continued,
"... it is with some hesitation that I undertake to lay out a schedule of unusual work for the summer, but I should like very much to visit Erieside if the Lord wills" (4).

To Grayson Carroll, Dr. Chafer wrote:

... I am now back to where I can do some of my school work and am returning to the public platform. I shall be passing through St. Louis on my way to Harrisburg, Pennsylvania [for a conference] ... and I should like very much to have you look me over. ... I do not recognize any new symptoms whatever in connection with the prostrate trouble (2).

On May 9, Dr. Walvoord reported to Charles Nash about the interviews he made while on campus at Wheaton College. About one of those interviews he wrote:

... Mr. Howard Hendricks conferred with me about the possibility of attending one year at Wheaton Seminary before transferring here. He was attracted to this by the fact that he had a scholarship affording free tuition. I pointed out to him he would probably lose most of his credits because of difficulty of articulation of the two courses, though the credits themselves are acceptable. I also pointed out that it would be actually cheaper for him to attend school here than at Wheaton. He said he would probably enroll here (53).

May 23, 1946, Dr. Walvoord sent a thank you letter to Dr. and Mrs. Kenneth Geiser, his hosts in Wheaton. In the letter he mentions, "I am sorry I cannot be with the re-gathering of the '31 class [at Wheaton]. I have been gone so much this spring that I cannot afford to be absent from either my church or my classes again" (52). Later in the month, he was involved in planning a reception for the seminary, placing advertising in various magazines including Wheaton's Tower annual, and organizing material for the next issue of the Bulletin. In a letter to Harry A. Ironside,
he asked for a picture of Ironside for a special feature to be placed in *Bibliotheca Sacra* on board members. Dr. Walvoord was actively involved in Child Evangelism Fellowship as one of their board members, and has been involved throughout his career.

In addition to these added responsibilities, he was in charge of the planning for graduation exercises. The featured speaker for 1946 was Charles F. Ball, of the Bethany Collegiate Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia. He wrote to Dr. Ball, "... We have had a good deal of cool weather so far this spring and summer, but I do not claim any control over that situation." He continued, "We will look for the topic of your address of July 1. ... Usually the Commencement addresses run from thirty to forty-five minutes, though we have had them shorter and longer" (13).

June 19, he wrote to Dr. Chafer, saying, "I am enclosing some mail that came which I judge is personal. ... I thought you might be interested in the letter we are sending out to those who have not renewed *Bibliotheca Sacra*." He goes on to say, "... I am enclosing a sample and also the business reply envelope which we enclosed with their name stamped in the space indicated. We trust this will encourage them to renew" (16). Dr. Chafer was in California, again back in health, resuming his itinerant ministry. Dr. Walvoord is planning his own summer ministry. He found out he was not needed at the Kalamazoo Youth for Christ meeting and
wrote to Dr. Zondervan about his previous request for a speaker. Dr. Walvoord wrote, "... I have another invitation to speak that evening at the Youth for Christ meeting in Marshall, but I thought it would be fair to you to inform you of the change in plan first" (67).

On July 2, 1946, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Dr. Chafer about the problems which had developed the year before concerning his book *True Evangelism*. He felt that Dr. Chafer was strong enough physically to handle the information which was now over a year old. He wrote:

... Last summer while you were ill, a group of evangelists met at Winona Lake under the sponsorship of John R. Rice. ... At the suggestion of [Rice] they took up the argument which he had with you about your book *True Evangelism*, and as a result sent a memorial to Moody Press requesting they withdraw it from publication. Because the evangelists put considerable pressure on Moody Press ... they thought best to write you asking whether you would be willing to revise certain portions of the book to which they had taken exception. In their letter they recognized that you were not well and they indicated they realized you probably could not do it.

As you were sick, nothing could be done about it. Moody Press came to the conclusion [after Dr. Walvoord mailed out confidential information to several people] that there was nothing in your book ... to justify it being withdrawn from circulation, and therefore made a public statement to this effect. ... I thought the matter was closed and for this reason did not hurry in telling you about it (17).

However, the matter was not closed, and in the June 21, issue of the *Sword of the Lord*, John R. Rice published his entire correspondence with Moody Press, including a long review of the book *True Evangelism*. Dr. Walvoord wrote, "In my judgment [it] is totally unfair and uncalled for. ...
I trust that you will not be unduly concerned about this as it is not worth any exercise of mind or heart (17).

In a personal interview, Dr. Walvoord explained that this attack on Dr. Chafer and his book began in the Sword of the Lord. Dr. Chafer, who had been an evangelist, encouraged prayer for the salvation of people and discouraged tricks of any kind. He felt people were led to faith in Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit and by nothing else. Dr. Chafer did not believe in "altar calls" or protracted pleas, but would pray after he finished a sermon and would invite those who wished to be counseled to come to a room adjacent to the auditorium. Dr. Walvoord remembered a meeting where two hundred people crammed into a small room for counseling. He said:

... I am not much of a controversialist, but I thought I had to do something. Moody Press took the book off the shelves but wouldn't admit they had done it. They said it was out of stock—we couldn't even get copies for our own use.... So I picked out 100 evangelical leaders and wrote them a letter and explained what had happened, that John R. Rice had encouraged these evangelists to sign this petition and the evangelists had not even read the book.... I ask them to write Moody Press and tell them what they thought of the book.... I talked to Mr. Mosher, a heavy contributor of Moody, who used to be chairman of our board until he moved to Houston.... He wrote Moody Press a three line letter telling them where to get off! Suddenly the book was available again (7).

At this point, John R. Rice turned his attention to Moody Bible Institute and began criticizing them. "They estimated that they lost at least $50,000 due to that controversy." Dr. Chafer never responded to John R. Rice. "He wanted to once but [Dr. Walvoord] took him out of it. Finally Bob
Jones Sr. and Harry Ironside went to John R. Rice and asked him to lay off, but he wouldn't." The result was that the book had been selling 300 copies a year but now was selling 6,000. "No one ever wrote the Seminary. I didn't get one letter from anybody. Normally in a controversy like that you get a barrage of letters." The controversy went on for many years, but finally, "... John R. Rice ran out of steam. It is hard to carry on a controversy if no one answers you." He ran out of steam and it got to the point that his son-in-law came to visit Dr. Walvoord and said they wanted to correct the problem. They put out a two-page advertisement about how great Dallas Theological Seminary was (7).

With many Bible Conferences going on around the country in the 1940s, Dr. Walvoord contacted many of them and sent them literature advertising the seminary. He said in one letter, "We shall appreciate very much your kindness in placing our literature before the friends who come to the Great Smoky Mountain Bible Conference" (14). He seems intent on placing literature anywhere there might be a prospective student or a new donor.

At this time, Dr. Walvoord received a letter regarding the use of the Scofield Reference Bible. A concerned Christian wanted to know if it was a Bible Dr. Walvoord could recommend without reservation. He assured the man that he could. He wrote, "The Scofield Bible continues to outsell all other annotated Bibles in spite of prejudice and opposition to its
plain and Scriptural teachings" (40). Dr. Walvoord was soon to begin a series of yearly meetings as a member of the Scofield Bible Revision Committee, and apparently later will initiate the revision.

On July 19, twenty-three men graduated from the seminary. On July 10, one week before graduation, Dr. Walvoord received a letter from the doctoral student mentioned earlier. The student wondered if he had been approved for graduation. Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... I am sorry I left you in suspense about your work. I am glad to say your work was acceptable and as far as I know there is no hinderance to your receiving the degree next Tuesday. ... There will be three other candidates for the Doctor's degree this commencement, the largest number we have had for many years (44).

Occasionally Dr. Walvoord went to great lengths to protect a student enrolled in the seminary. One student was working in a Presbyterian Church in the Northeast, and was having trouble being ordained because of his training from Dallas Seminary. The man was in the ministry, but was not properly classified by the Selective Service. Dr. Walvoord wrote, "... We received a letter from your draft board last week asking whether you were ordained. In talking to [ ], I found that you were not ... but thought it best to tell the draft board ... that they should contact you" (42). As it turned out, the young man was ordained by his Presbyterian Church when the Selective Service contacted him a short time later. The man thanked Dr. Walvoord for his help.
During this time, Dr. Walvoord was involved in a radio ministry. Often requests came for information about one of his messages. He wrote to Mrs. M. L. Maynard, "... I am pleased to give you the twelve essentials of Justification as I gave them on the radio." In closing the letter he suggested Harry Ironside's books on Acts and Romans for her further study (45).

In the summer of 1946, Dr. Walvoord traveled to the Northwest as well as to other parts of the country. In a letter to John G. Mitchell, he said, "I should love to be with you for a few days after August 25 when I am scheduled to be at Central Bible Church [Mitchell's]. However, we are driving and I think we shall need the time to get back to Texas and make preparations for the next Sunday." He continued, "... I will also have not only my own wife and child, but my mother and sister-in-law who plan to meet us in Portland for the return journey" (48).

Over the summer, finances had dwindled at the seminary. In a thank you letter to Ira T. Moore, Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... On Monday night at the Board meeting, Dr. Lincoln was asked what our treasury balance was and he informed the Board that our balance was low in our General Fund. We directed our prayer particularly to the end that God would send in the funds. That evening after returning home, and giving the matter further thought, I was deeply concerned that the funds would come in soon, and spent some time especially in prayer to this end and asked the Lord to send us $1,000 on Tuesday, the next day. While we did not receive your check on Tuesday, it was mailed on that day and I feel it was a very definite answer to prayer.

The Lord certainly gives us many tokens along the way, not only that it is His will for our work to go on,
but also of His own power in providing through His stewards our temporal needs (49).

While in charge of advertising, Dr. Walvoord was asked by the Dallas Morning News about placing an ad in their paper. He replied, "We feel that because of the character of our work, local advertising is of practically no benefit. Therefore, we do not wish to be included in your Educational Issue this time" (56).

At the Gull Lake Conference, Dr. Walvoord continued his correspondence and his contacts with the school. He wrote to Dewey Duncan, Dr. Chafer's secretary:

... I have received some mail, but I am still looking for the Bulletin page proofs. ... I am all out of stationary. ... If you send me more letters requiring correspondence send along the stationary to go with it. How about donor letters? ... I am enjoying the conference here. The people are very kind. I hear that Dr. Chafer arrived and spoke at Erieside after I left. ... We plan to leave for the west coast very early Tuesday. ... Dr. E. C. Raue at Everett [Washington] has our itinerary in route and the places where we will stop each night--in case there is any emergency and need to get in touch with us (27).

Dr. Chafer wrote to Dr. Walvoord on August 28, 1946, from the Hotel Santa Ana, in Santa Ana, California. His handwriting is so poor that the letter is impossible to read. He may have written it on a train while traveling (5).

On September 13, 1946, Dr. Walvoord turned down a request from Richard Seume to speak at his church in Houston. "I should possibly explain why I could not come. ... In the last six months I have been absent from my pulpit in Rosen Heights nine Sundays and while the people have been patient, I must declare a moratorium on being absent" (55).
Dr. Walvoord also got back to work at the seminary. In a letter to Dr. Chafer, he suggested changes in faculty status for Charles Nash and changes in the procedures of the Board of Regents. He suggested that it would be possible to "abandon annual elections" of faculty members and relieve the Board of this duty (18).

Dr. Walvoord received a letter of criticism from an alumni about the seminary philosophy of education. The alumni felt the curriculum was not sufficiently broad to cover diverse theological perspectives. Dr. Walvoord responded:

... I am teaching this fall an elective course of two hours in Theology of Crisis, which is ... Barthianism. ... I also teach another course in Theological Systems in which we cover thirty major theological systems including ancient, medieval, and modern from Augustine down to the latest work and include Jewish, Roman Catholic, Unitarian and Arminian theologies. ... I also teach another elective course on modern theology in which we survey the original writings of seventy-five contemporary theologians, practically all liberal, including Barth and Brunner. ... In regard to emphasis on methods, we do not attempt to follow the modernistic approach of over-emphasis. We offer courses in addition to our required work in Expository Preaching, Public Speaking and Reading, liturgics, Missionary Principles and Practices, Religious Education and other courses (61).

The letter he is responding to criticized the faculty selection policy of the school as well as the curriculum. To this he responded, "The issue is this: Who is available who could do better work and who would consider a call to the faculty? It is a very difficult thing to find anyone who is qualified for the exacting work that we want to do here" (61).
Concerning an objection with teaching too much Hebrew language courses (three years were required at this time), Dr. Walvoord responded, "I must say that I do not agree with you that we emphasize too much Hebrew . . . the modern mind often will not pay the price for scholarship. I find . . . that students who have difficulty with Hebrew are carrying too large a load of outside work" (61).

At this time, Dr. Chafer's Systematic Theology is about ready for publication and Dr. Walvoord has been contacted by Moody Press and Eerdmans for the job of printing it. To Ken Taylor, he wrote:

... I must say that it is his [Dr. Chafer's] own desire that the Seminary publish it and he has his heart set upon it for sentimental reasons if none other. There are some factors . . . which would give us pause in extending to either Moody Press or Eerdmans such a privilege (61).

The reasons he listed for not choosing Moody Press concerned the issue of Dr. Chafer's book True Evangelism. "Wouldn't it be an interesting spectacle, if we gave them permission to publish Dr. Chafer's theology, for some pressure group to persuade them to do with the theology what they did with True Evangelism?" Concerning Eerdmans, he said, "As Eerdmans characteristically is opposed to premillennialism, we are hesitant about letting them have the publishing of the books." He closed the letter saying, "You will be interested in the fact that I have been approached for republication of my own book by Eerdmans, and that a French translation of it has already been made. I hope to rewrite it" (61).
During the first year of Dr. Walvoord's new position, his wife Geraldine was active as well:

... In spite of ever increasing pressures on her time and talents, Geraldine continued to establish her priorities and, in the midst of it all, radiate an inner calm and assurance that showed the rewards of good stewardship and dependence on the Lord. ... Geraldine initiated many traditions at Dallas Seminary which continue to this day [1986]. Each year she hosted a faculty wife's luncheon to introduce new faculty wives. Likewise, she organized monthly wives luncheons throughout the school year and presided at the times of prayer and business meetings that followed each luncheon (68, p. 14).

The first year as Assistant to the President was very rewarding for Dr. Walvoord. He worked very hard and handled exceptionally well all of the duties assigned to him by Dr. Chafer. He initiated many changes in the educational and administrative areas of the seminary, and remained in complete loyalty to Dr. Chafer. According to Mrs. Walvoord, before the death of Mrs. Lewis Sperry Chafer, she had said to Geraldine, "We are training John to be the next President of Dallas Seminary." (6).
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When Dr. John F. Walvoord began his new position as the Assistant to the President on September 1, 1945, he was given responsibility over seven areas. These were:

1. Handling all of the executive responsibilities in the absence of Dr. Lewis S. Chafer.
2. Acting as Chairman of the Faculty.
3. Overseeing all Chapel and public meetings of the Seminary.
4. Answering correspondence coming into the President's Office.
5. Representing the President in routine administrative decisions.
6. Handling all of the publicity work of the Seminary.
7. Teaching as Associate Professor of Systematic Theology, and other academic advisement (7).

Dr. Walvoord continued as Assistant to the President from 1945 until the death of Lewis S. Chafer in August, 1952. This chapter will look at each of these seven areas and note significant events and routine responsibilities that Dr. Walvoord handled. This chapter will also follow the progressive decline in relationships between Dallas Theological Seminary and the Presbyterian Church.
Executive Responsibilities

On November 18, 1946, Dr. Walvoord wrote a letter which described the state of the seminary at that time. It was in response to an inquiry about the financial affairs and facilities of the school. He wrote:

. . . Our present financial outlay is approximately $1400.00 a week and, as we depend entirely on free will offerings, and have comparatively no income from endowment or trust funds, we look to the Lord week by week that this need might be met. . . . At the present time our balance is very small in this fund, around $200.00. . . . Next to the General Fund, our great burden is for expanded facilities, particularly to house our married students. . . . We are facing a new epoch in our Seminary life and a larger student body than we ever contemplated in the founding of the Seminary. Our classrooms are crowded and our single men's dormitory is completely full (119).

This letter did motivate the person to give. On November 26, 1946, Dr. Walvoord wrote a letter of thanks, saying, "I hardly know how to thank you for your generous gift to the Seminary . . . it is a great help to us coming, as it does, at this time when we need it especially."

In a letter December 3, 1946, Dr. Walvoord wrote:

. . . In regard to our own course of study we do not charge tuition. The board bill runs approximately one dollar a day for single men. It is entirely possible, at least at present, for young men to work their way through, as there are many opportunities for employment in Dallas, and expenses are very low (73).

On February 4, 1947, Dr. Walvoord received a letter from a missionary who had written him, explaining that he had inadvertently taken one of the Seminary's coat hangers while staying in the Seminary Guest Room. Dr. Walvoord wrote,
"It was entirely unnecessary to pay for the coat hanger you took with you. I believe the current market value is two or three cents. We will accept your check, however, as a gift to the Seminary" (110).

On May 12, 1947, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Richard Seume, who was now pastoring in New Jersey:

... The Lord has blessed us in many ways here and has moved the hearts of stewards to give. Through a combination of gifts from living donors and several small estates, we have been able to meet current expenses without difficulty for the last two years and have been able to pay off something on back accounts (170).

August 18, 1947, the seminary was ready to purchase the married student housing they were in need of. In a letter from C. Fred Lincoln, addressed to Dr. Walvoord, who was away on a speaking engagement, he wrote, "We have concluded the contract for the purchase of the apartment building. The matter will now go into the hands of the title company" (37). Dr. Lincoln went on to note that the seminary had just received $36,000 from an estate in St. Louis. However, he stated, "This is less than I had hoped and I have not had time to go over the final accounting which they provided us with the remittance" (37).

In January and February 1949, Dr. Walvoord was asked to handle royalty problems Dr. Chafer was having with Moody Press. Moody Press wanted to decrease the royalties due Dr. Chafer from fifteen percent to ten percent. In a letter to them, Dr. Walvoord said, "Dr. Chafer ... feels he is
entitled to continue receiving the fifteen percent royalties. In view of the downward trend in book costs, this will probably be easier for you in the future than during the past two years" (184). With Dr. Walvoord's intervention, and through a long series of letters, the problem was resolved favorably for Dr. Chafer.

Because of the seminary broadcasts over KVTT radio in Dallas, Dr. Walvoord wrote a letter of concern to C. Fred Linclon who was on a speaking engagement in Florida. Dr. Walvoord wanted to purchase equipment for the studio. "The Faculty felt unwilling to presume upon your authority as business manager to authorize this purchase, but . . . we want your approval before anything is done" (136). On February 2, 1950, the recorder had been purchased and Dr. Walvoord again wrote Dr. Lincoln who was still in Florida. In this letter he mentioned that he had personally authorized an expenditure at the seminary. "While I hated to do it without your permission, I thought the expenditure was not sufficiently large to hesitate and therefore . . . [I] got in touch with our regular piano tuner" (137). Little things like this around campus were a constant irritation to Dr. Walvoord, but other administrators were not concerned about such detail.

October 12, 1950, Dr. Walvoord wrote Dr. Lincoln to ask him about publicity of their plans for seminary expansion:

... I am presuming that our plans for the new building and addition will not be completed in time to include them in the brochure. ... We should get
something in the mail ... by November 15 to give a
tangible basis of financial support to the expansion
program on the part of those who distribute large
gifts at Christmas time through their corporations or
business interests (138).

January 3, 1951, all faculty members received a $25.00
raise in the monthly cost-of-living bonus each received.
This raised everyone's bonus to $75.00 a month except J. H.
Bennetch, C. Fred Lincoln, Charles Nash and Dr. Walvoord who
each received a $100 a month bonus. Dr. Chafer was not list-
ed because he took no salary from the school. Dr. Walvoord
wrote Dr. Lincoln:

... It is understood that the payment of the bonus
shall be subject to prior claim of payment of regular
bills and salaries and maintenance of the scale of
payments of other obligations. The bonus shall be
cumulative during the year and if the Seminary is
unable to pay the bonus in full to each member of the
faculty by December 31, 1951, the unpaid balance of
the bonus shall be cancelled (139).

January 4, 1951, the seminary was to begin their expan-
sion program. In a letter to Dr. Frank E. Gaebelein at the
Stony Brook School, Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... Much of the board meeting was routine, but a
matter of great importance, I believe, was the ap-
proval by the board of the chapel building as the
first project in our building program. We have in
hand approximately $28,000.00 received toward this
building. We hope, if the war does not hinder us,
that we shall be able to build before long (105).

January 31, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote Mrs. R. H. Harris:

... God has enabled us to pay in full our salary
obligations which had been in partial arrears for
several months. Our building fund has now increased
to approximately $30,000 and we are hoping ... to
begin work on a much needed Chapel. ... We have
just started our second semester with a substantial
increase in enrollment ... of 227 (114).
February 13, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote Dr. Lincoln in Florida about the board meeting he had missed:

... The exterior sketch which they felt was best is the one with the narrow tower. ... We have not changed the floor plan as you saw it except to add a toilet room next to the kitchen in the faculty section for faculty use. ... I personally also feel that the platform area of the Chapel needs to be given a good deal of thought so that it will be functional as well as beautiful. ... The Board feels that we should present as a goal the entire [amount] ... and at the same time to make it plain that we do not need all this amount to begin actual construction. Mr. Davis estimates that with $60,000 we could enclose the Chapel aspect and would need another $20,000 to finish the interior (140).

February 27, 1951, Dr. Walvoord again wrote Dr. Lincoln:

... I should appreciate it very much if you would confer with Dr. Chafer ... [about] whether I should represent the Seminary at the two conferences in April. The conference of the National Education Association will be held April 2-4 in Chicago ... [and] the National Association of Evangelicals to be held April 10-13. ... It is possible that it may be feasible to arrange meetings between the two conferences to avoid the cost of the two trips as the time span between them is only five days (141).

March 8, 1951, Dr. Walvoord received a letter from Ralph McDonald of the National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the Department of Education, which said, "We are pleased to learn you are planning to participate in the sixth annual conference. ... It seems likely that the study-group deliberations will have significant bearing upon higher education developments" (38).

May 10, 1951, the Chapel fund had grown to $49,000 (75). By August 15, the fund grew substantially and Dr. Walvoord wrote J. F. Strombeck:
The Board of Trustees meeting this week approved a preliminary plan for the Chapel which includes seating space for 500 and provision for the addition later of a balcony seating over 200. Also provided are a half dozen offices for faculty, a radio studio, and radio control room. The revised estimate of the cost is that the structure as it now is planned will cost $100,000. We are informed that it will take about two months to complete the construction plans. Banning difficulty from the government we should be able to begin building within three months (179).

At this time also, the seminary is negotiating for the use of the Gaylord Apartments on Live Oak Street, for use as married student housing. "The deal is too complicated to expound in a letter but in a word it will provide the much needed expansion for care of our married students" (179).

August 31, 1951, Dr. Walvoord sent a memorandum regarding air conditioning to C. Fred Lincoln. In the memorandum he discussed at length the possibilities of installing the air conditioning in the new Chapel, and installing window units in Davidson Hall.

October 24, 1951, Mrs. Harry Ironside offered to purchase an organ for the new Chapel, and provided almost $7,000 for its purchase and installation. In a letter to her, Dr. Walvoord thanked her for her support and mentioned that, "We have made application to the proper authorities for allocation of scarce materials needed in its construction. If all goes well, construction can begin soon after January 1" (121).

To Mrs. W. S. Mosher, Dr. Walvoord wrote, "Everything
is going nicely here in the school, but we are so held up with the government not yet giving us permission to begin the building of our Chapel" (151).

December 24, 1951, William Millet contacted Dr. Walvoord to tell him about a contractor who would be willing to build the Chapel at his cost plus overhead. "... because he is interested in the Seminary. His firm has at present some $15,000,000 in government building contracts and no doubt he would be able to get strategic materials by one device or another" (42).

The Chapel was completed just months after the death of Dr. Chafer in August, 1952. It was dedicated at the inauguration of Dr. Walvoord as the second President of the Seminary.

Chairman of the Faculty

On October 18, 1946, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Dr. Chafer telling him about faculty feelings concerning the Griffith Thomas lectures. Dr. Chafer was in Minneapolis for a series of meetings. "After a considerable discussion, the faculty feels the first choice for the Griffith Thomas Lectures should be Dr. Harold Ockenga and the second choice would be Dr. Harry Hager." He continued by saying, "I thought possibly you would want to write the letter yourself and send it on to Dewey [Duncan, his secretary] for transcription" (80).

On November 12, 1946, Dr. Walvoord received the following letter from Harold Ockenga, who had been scheduled for commencement that week [with the accelerated program].
"I regret that it is impossible to come for commencement. All flights out of Boston were cancelled for November 11th and there was no hope of obtaining a passage on the 12th" (49). Dr. Walvoord made sure speakers arrived on time after this experience, asking them to come a day early and come by train. They were then free to fly back home.

Not only was Dr. Walvoord concerned about speakers for the Lecture series and for Commencement, but he was also actively involved in hiring faculty. In January, 1947, he was concerned over the details of hiring Dr. Carl Armerding. In a letter to Dr. Chafer, he wrote, "... The result of this would be a teaching load of six class hours the first semester and five class hours the second semester. This would allow him to offer elective work" (78).

February 4, 1947, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Harold Ockenga, who had mailed in his title for the upcoming Griffith Thomas Lectures. Dr. Walvoord included details about the time and location of the meetings and concluded, "... We look forward also to the Chapel messages [given in the mornings] on the Holy Spirit. This happens to be a particular specialty of my own. ... I have sent you a copy of my own book with my compliments" (157).

February 18, 1947, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Carl Armerding:

... I am personally very happy to have word that you have accepted the invitation to become Professor of Practical Theology and Associate Professor of Bible beginning in the fall, 1947. ... I do not want to embarrass you in your position at Moody. ...
Could you let me know when we can release to the public information regarding your coming? (66).

February 26, 1947, Charles Nash gave notice of his resignation as Professor of Practical Theology, but expressed his desire to remain as Professor of Historical Theology and as Registrar (46). No mention was made of how the hiring of Dr. Armerding affected his decision.

Dr. Walvoord was respected at other schools, and on February 27, 1947, received a letter from Carl F. H. Henry at Wheaton College, requesting help in finding appropriate speakers for the Jonathan Blanchard Lectures at Wheaton:

... Do you happen to know of names which would appropriately fit on the list that we desire from which the Directors will make their selection? I am turning to you because of the academic role in which you are now serving. ... Quite obviously we wish a more academic type of lecturer than has characterized the typical evangelical seminary. We are definitely not interested in anything on the level of Bible Institute apologetics (25).

As the school year came to a close in 1947, Dr. Walvoord made his report to Charles Nash, the Registrar. He made note that he filed the wrong number of credits for one student, and reported, "I find that his syllabus is not satisfactory, and I will take the matter up with him for later report to you" (15).

On July 11, 1947, he wrote a letter to Merrill Unger, who wanted permission to publish his doctoral dissertation. "It is the policy, however, of the Seminary to grant the privilege for the author to publish his dissertation provided it is published without alteration and due recognition is
given the fact that it was originally a dissertation." He closed by mentioning, "Any royalties that might accrue would be payable to the author" (188).

In a letter to Merrill C. Tenney at Wheaton College, Dr. Walvoord gave a recommendation for Dr. Unger. "Since leaving Dallas Seminary with our highest degree, Dr. Unger has completed his Ph.D. work at John Hopkins University" (185). He went on in the letter to note that one of the present students, S. Lewis Johnson, was being retained as an instructor. "... He is more mature than most of our students having had a business career before entering seminary, and he shows promise of being one of the real finds from a teaching standpoint" (185).

Some students were not so lucky to have been "mature" when they went through seminary, and as a result were denied admission to the doctoral program because of their former academic record. On July 29, 1947, Dr. Walvoord wrote to a man in the pastorate who wanted to come back and take the doctoral program:

... The Credits Committee felt you needed more experience before you could profit by further study and any action on my part would need to presume they were wrong. ... It is always difficult for us to deny students who have been with us for four years the privilege of additional study. What is not commonly known, however, is that we reject a great many of them, and your situation is not a bit unusual (169).

On October 21, 1947, the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents voted to elect John A. Witmer as Instructor in the Department of Systematic Theology and S. Lewis Johnson
to be Instructor in the Department of New Testament Literature and Exegesis. They were to be paid $2400 for the year, plus $25.00 a month toward rental of living quarters (134). Other changes were taking place also. On November 17, 1947, Arnold Ehlert, the librarian, resigned (16). On January 2, 1948, Dr. Chafer received a letter from Charles Feinberg, stating his resignation (18). In a letter to Dr. Chafer, he recommended that Merrill Unger be hired to take his place.

Dr. Chafer responded to Dr. Feinberg's letter:

. . . I have your heart-breaking letter this morning, and because I love you as I do I dread so much to have you make a mistake at a time like this. You have not seen me personally. . . . Perhaps it is something that can be readjusted. . . . I shall hope to have a word from you personally on this or in writing. . . . Please be prepared to tell me exactly why you desire to leave us (4).

On January 16, 1948, Dr. Walvoord wrote Dr. Feinberg, who had moved to California to teach at the Bible Institute of Los Angeles (BIOLA). He wrote:

. . . The Board of Regents has asked me to present to you their urgent request to reconsider your resignation from the faculty of the Seminary. We already have the resignation of Dr. Arnold Ehlert, and Dr. Carl Armerding and we deplore further changes in the faculty. . . . The Board authorized an increase in your salary to $4,000.00 a year subject to your withdrawal of your resignation. . . . None of the other faculty members were raised in salary. We find it very hard to go on with the thought of giving you up (97).

March 16, 1948, Dr. Walvoord received a letter from the Dallas Alumni Association in Wheaton, Illinois. In the letter, the Seminary was criticized for "hiring only Dallas graduates as teachers." Dr. Walvoord responded immediately:
... It is my personal opinion that the criticism is not well founded. In the first place we have no such policy. We have attempted to secure several men recently who have not attended Dallas Seminary, but in every case our efforts met with failure. In the second place we have been criticized for the supposed failure to secure available scholars to teach on our staff. The catch is that we do not know of any such scholars. Personally I am very pleased whenever our alumni write me calling attention to suitable teaching talent (52).

In the letter, Dr. Walvoord wrote that Ehlert went to Fuller Seminary as Librarian "at a much higher salary." Armerding was going to Wheaton College, "which will enable him to be with his family." In a personal interview, Dr. Walvoord described his feelings at this time:

... We only had twelve faculty and we lose three of them. That is twenty-five percent of the faculty. We've never had that happen before or since. ... Fuller Seminary started then, and they hired Harrison and Ehlert. ... Fuller paid about twice what we were paying. I thought the end of the world had come. They were our best teachers. ... But it was interesting how God moved. We put James Rand in as librarian and he served for many years. ... I learned then that when a person leaves the school, the Lord has a plan, another person. I have watched it happen again and again. The Lord is ahead of us (27).

Another letter of criticism came from an alumni on April 5, 1948 (54). Dr. Walvoord again responded immediately:

... We have had recently several of our alumni write making recommendations for our faculty. I have been astounded at their lack of judgment. Most of the men recommended were not in doctrinal harmony with our situation here. It seems that some of our alumni do not realize the importance of having men on the faculty who are premillennial and would be content with a sort of indefinite conservatism (167).

On April 14, 1948, Dr. Walvoord wrote J. Ellwood Evans,
"You were appointed today to the position of Professor of Practical Theology and Assistant Professor of English Bible by the Board of Regents. Immediate announcement will be made." Evan's salary was fixed at the rate of $7.50 per class hour for twelve weeks each semester, which, with an eight hour schedule, would amount to $60.00 a week. "You are also to be paid your traveling expenses from Tulsa and return and your entertainment in Dallas" (96).

By April 21, 1948, Dr. Walvoord was getting upset with all of the letters he was receiving concerning recent faculty appointments. He wrote:

... I must confess I am somewhat out of patience with the type of criticism contained in your letter, especially as you seem to think there is some weight to it. We all recognize that Dallas is not perfect, but there is no point in you or the other alumni exercising yourselves about it in the way indicated in your letter (190).

He went on to discuss at length the hiring policies and the training required of faculty. He then responded to criticism about the Chapel program, saying, "... The Chapel is not, strictly speaking, a personal matter. We do not attempt to legislate private devotions or the private spiritual life of students." He went on to defend the Chapel program, saying, "We feel, however, that Chapel attendance is essential to student activities and we would not knowingly tolerate a student in our student body who was unwilling to attend Chapel willingly" (190).

In this particular case, it seems from the letters, that
many of these alumni would have been delighted if they had been asked to serve on the faculty—but they had not. Dr. Walvoord seems to be upset also over the alumni acting as advertising representatives. He said in one letter, "... Some of the alumni in the area of Wheaton have been critical of your own activities in representing the Seminary. I don't quite agree with them, but they feel that you have been overzealous" (190).

On August 9, 1948, Dr. Walvoord wrote about his view of the American Association of Theological Schools:

... You will understand that many of the requirements of the Association are very reasonable and just and we have followed some of their suggestions as, for instance, in our pre-seminary curriculum for college students. The difficulty is that their formulas for evaluating the worth of a seminary leave out what we consider essential discipline, that is, spiritual life and Biblical emphasis, and conservative theology (164).

As was mentioned earlier, when the seminary was trying for accreditation by the Association, often their requirements demanded a radical change in curriculum. This would force the seminary to abandon the very things for which the institution was founded. Dr. Walvoord continued:

Full conformity to the standards of the Association which is composed largely of liberal seminaries, would mean that we would have to submit to standards devised without consideration of our particular point of view. At present this seems ill advised. ... To submit ... would be to destroy the purpose of our founding (164).

November 16, 1948, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Rev. Clarence E. Mason, Dean of Philadelphia School of the Bible, who was coming to speak at the Spring Commencement. He wrote:
. . . Inasmuch as we have had some sad experience in the matter of having Commencement speakers fly to Dallas, we should prefer to have you come by train for the engagement, but it is entirely satisfactory to return by plane. . . . The primary factor is that we would be assured of your presence. At a recent Commencement, our speaker cancelled on twenty-four hours notice because he was unable to get a plane on account of weather conditions (145).

On March 4, 1949, Dr. Walvoord wrote Charles Feinberg in California:

. . . All appointments in recent years have apparently met with more success than even I anticipated, and we are grateful to God that, as He has led our former teachers elsewhere, He has always provided someone to take their place. . . . Ellwood [Evans] seems to be doing an unusually fine job in Homiletics, judging from all reports I can get (99).

In May, 1949, Dr. Walvoord received a letter from Bob Jones, founder of Bob Jones University, in which he criticized the seminary for accepting accreditation from the University of New York. In the letter he remarked that Dallas has "at least one faculty member . . . who has been critical in his attitude toward [Bob Jones University]." He asked Dr. Walvoord to investigate it, saying, "We never did want to offer seminary work in our School of Religion. We could have filled Dallas Seminary . . . " (29). Bob Jones heard a report that Dallas would not accept his students into the seminary. Dr. Walvoord wrote back reassuring him that they did accept students from Bob Jones University (126).

July 19, 1949, Dr. Walvoord responded to a letter from Carl F. H. Henry, asking him to contribute an article for a book Henry was editing. The article would come from Dr.
Walvoord's book on the Holy Spirit. He concluded his reply saying, "... I appreciate your kind invitation to visit Fuller Seminary. ... I agree heartily that the most cordial relations should exist between sound fundamental seminaries and I pray God's blessing frequently on your work in Fuller" (118). This was in response to Henry's letter, June 29, 1949, in which Henry said:

... It would be most unfortunate if the line some men are taking, to drive a clear division between Fuller Seminary and Dallas, were to succeed. The schools have far more in common than in difference, and our evangelical cause as a whole is weakened when men are permitted to forget that (26).

While Dr. Walvoord had a positive attitude toward the new seminary, Dr. Chafer himself was a little more critical, especially since Dallas lost some men to the school. He wrote his friend Erling Olsen:

I don't suppose you saw in the bulletin that the Fuller Seminary library issued some months ago. ... I think you will be surprised at the attitude of our mutual friend, Wilbur Smith. It seems strange and not understandable to me that he should say in the face of the publishing of my standard work on theology that the thing that is needed today more than anything else is a comprehensive work on Systematic Theology. ... It is a new thing which has great significance—attempting to teach philosophy instead of theology. That is exactly what [one professor] is doing. One young fellow enrolled in Fuller Seminary reported he was asked by a friend: "What did you learn in your first year of theology?" His answer was, "We had a wonderful year. We have learned that we could know God (11).

Dr. Chafer went on to say:

Philosophy at best is the mind of man while theology is the mind of God. ... There have been a number of things arising of late that shows that these friends in
Pasadena are setting up a rivalry between their institution and Dallas Seminary (11).

May 6, 1950, in a letter to E. M. Wetmore, Dr. Walvoord wrote a response to criticism about preaching courses at the seminary:

... We have been requiring during their first two years that the students do practical work each week, but have not specifically required them to preach as we felt in their early years that this was premature. ... The faculty passed at its last meeting a new provision requiring third and fourth year men to preach at least once a month during their third and fourth years. This will mean that any graduate will have preached at least twenty sermons ... prior to graduation. ... The preaching work in our curriculum, which we call homiletics, has suffered somewhat because we have changed professors three times in the last four years (194).

On October 6, 1950, Dr. Walvoord wrote W. E. Hawkins, who had the Radio Revival program in Dallas, about allowing men to be excused from Saturday classes. Hawkins had asked that they be excused to participate in his ministries:

... Our difficulty is that we have this year eliminated practically all prescribed courses from the afternoon in order to permit the many men who have to earn their way through school to work ... [and] that by re-arranging the Saturday schedule somewhat we could release a considerable portion of the student body, even if some of them had to remain in class (116).

July 17, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Rev. Howard Hendricks about the possibility of him coming as a teaching assistant for the fall semester. He wrote:

... In keeping with our recent interview, we wish to enter into an arrangement with you for the school year 1951-1952 for your services as a teaching fellow in the Department of Practical Theology. ... We are assuming that this can be arranged for one day a week and that also on the same day you can arrange your classes in the graduate school [Th.D.].
Dr. Walvoord went on to describe the financial arrangement with Mr. Hendricks:

In consideration of your services you will be given a teaching scholarship of $320.00 for the school year, payable $10.00 a week. We realize this financial remuneration is not much, but at least it will take care of your expenses and provide some small compensation (117).

On August 15, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote a memorandum to Charles Nash, reporting on the Administrative Committee meeting. They considered the needs of single men and established three principles. (1) Single, regular students could be assured of some kind of housing, probably having one or more roommates; (2) special students would have to vacate seminary apartments to make room for regular students if space was needed; and (3) the Registrar would handle the details (154).

August 16, 1951, Dr. Chafer received a letter from William J. Jones, Editor of the American Sunday School Union, which said:

... For some weeks I have been wanting to write you and express my delight at the ministry of Dr. Lewis Johnson of the Dallas faculty. ... In my judgment in spirit and in deep desire to be a diligent student of the Word of God and a faithful scholar in the strict sense of the term, Dr. Johnson is high ranking (30).

September 19, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Mr. and Mrs. S. Lewis Johnson Sr., in Charleston, South Carolina:

... Each day we are more thankful for the contribution that your son, Lewis, is making to the Seminary. It is our opinion that he is rapidly becoming one of the outstanding Bible scholars and teachers of our country and he is filling a large place in the life and ministry of the Seminary (124).
At this time, Black students were not attending most colleges in America. Not every school would accept them. In a letter August 28, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... We appreciate very much your point of view regarding Negro students. Until a few years ago I believe it was illegal in Texas for a school like ours to admit Negro students, and that this has been made possible only recently. We have never had, as far as I know, an application from an American Negro considered by our faculty. If such an application were received, I am sure it would be considered on its merits (74).

On the letter to Dr. Walvoord, the Registrar had attached a note saying, "There was a recent notice in the news that S.M.U. [Southern Methodist University] School of Theology had admitted a Negro. . . . She [who had written this letter to Dr. Walvoord] of course would not be eligible for admission here because she is a woman" (15).

To Ernest Pickering, President of the Dallas student body, Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... The faculty has approved the publication of the annual. . . . May I say that the faculty, in consideration of the matter, is particularly concerned that the school annual should in every way reflect a true Christian testimony and the high level of educational work which is our objective in Dallas Seminary (165).

December 14, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote a letter of recommendation to a church in California:

... Rev. Howard Hendricks . . . is twenty-seven years of age, married, and has three children. He is a graduate of Wheaton College . . . and is at present completing his resident work for the Doctor's degree and would be free to leave his work and undertake a full-time pastorate. He has had a very good scholastic record with an average grade of A. . . . Mr. Hendricks is a man of unusual ability and has the capacity to direct the work of a church . . . seldom found in young men (174).
December 17, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Charles Nash, the Registrar, saying:

... I received a letter on December 15 from Dr. Merrill C. Tenney of Wheaton College, pleading for my intervention in the problem at Wheaton regarding the Bible major. I felt I had to answer him directly. ... It is my personal opinion in the matter that it is more important for us to soothe the feelings of Wheaton than it is to maintain the educational principle involved. I have therefore attempted to write a placating letter (155).

The letter he wrote to Dr. Tenney was three pages long, and discussed at length why Dallas Seminary would prefer Wheaton men to get a liberal education, rather than concentrate on Bible and Theology at the undergraduate level. They would get these subjects in depth once they arrived at Dallas Seminary. Dr. Walvoord felt there was no need to be repetitious (186).

Dr. Walvoord received another letter critical of the seminary's educational philosophy from the director of Intervarsity Christian Fellowship. In the letter, the Director said, "I have never been persuaded that the acquisition of knowledge can be determined merely by hours ... or by courses taken." He went on to ask the question, "Why is the completeness of a man's training to be estimated merely on the basis of the number of years he spends in an institution?" (64).

Dr. Walvoord responded:

... As far as educational theory is concerned, no doubt the idea that a person should be able to complete a course of training as fast as possible is justified. Practically, however, we find this impossible.
The point is that our work is advanced and not easy. In our own experience in seminary when you and I were enrolled, it was fairly easy to complete four years of work in three as I and a number of others did. . . . I would judge that there is fifty per-cent more content and requirement in a semester's work now than there was twenty years ago. Even brilliant students have had difficulty in carrying more than the regular number of courses. . . . A good number of our students who are earning their way through are spreading the four-year course over five years because they have found it impossible to carry a full load (191).

Dr. Walvoord went on to explain that the number four was not a magical number of years for a seminary education, but having arrived at an ideal curriculum, they found it was impossible to do the work in less than four years. He said, "As long as we can secure students who are willing to submit to an extensive program of study we see no reason for offering a shortcut. The more brilliant the student the greater is the challenge to go on to do not only the Master's work but the Doctor's work." He continued:

It is the slow student who will never be able to take a place of leadership who should be provided a shortened and simpler curriculum. While it is true the brilliant student can cover up his ignorance and lack of training better than others, it is also true that he misses the opportunity that could be his to increase greatly his effectiveness and leadership (191).

Public Meetings

On October 1, 1946, Dr. Walvoord sent a special word of thanks to John Koontz, treasurer of the student body for a special offering they had taken:

While it is impossible to thank the individuals who make these gifts, we want you and them to know that we deeply appreciate the thoughtfulness, love, and
sacrifice involved and the gifts that are received from time to time are great encouragements to us far beyond their material help (131).

Dr. Walvoord sent a memorandum to Glenn Campbell, a student, asking for ushers for the Griffith Thomas lecture series at Scofield Church. "Please give me on Friday the names of the students so that I will know who they are. You should inform the students yourself, and tell them which night they serve" (76).

October 2, 1950, he sent a note of thanks to Mrs. M. I. Oliver, President of the Ladies Auxiliary of Dallas, thanking her for the "splendid help in arranging the decorations at the faculty reception. It was exceedingly well done and was a real help." He goes on to express his thanks for their help through the years, and asked them to pray "that not only the physical aspect of the Seminary may be cared for but that the larger spiritual challenge may be met with increased power by the grace of God" (160).

Dr. Harry Ironside, very popular Bible lecturer at the seminary, died early in 1951. Dr. Walvoord was in charge of handling the memorial service. He wrote John G. Mitchell at Central Bible Church in Portland, Oregon, "In connection with Dr. Roper [at Scofield Memorial Church], we are planning a memorial service for Dr. H. A. Ironside to be held Wednesday evening, February 14, at Scofield Church. We want you to be the main speaker" (150).

Also asked to speak are Rev. Martin Massinger about the written ministry of Dr. Ironside; Dr. Harlin J. Roper about
his preaching and missionary ministry; Dr. Henderson Fox about his ministry to Blacks; Dr. J. Ellwood Evans about his scholarship and teaching; and Dr. W. E. Hawkins about his radio ministry. Dr. Walvoord noted at the end of the letter that Blacks would be seated in the balcony which was reserved for them.

Dr. John G. Mitchell was a regular speaker at seminary lectures. For his series at Dallas Seminary in 1951, the seminary decided to broadcast them over radio in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. Dr. Mitchell wrote Dr. Walvoord:

... With respect to the lectures this month, I do not see why it would affect the teaching of the Word in the classroom by having it broadcast. I agree with you ... the people of God ought to be told the truth and become established in the things of Christ. There is so much ignorance of the Word of God in the South that I believe every avenue ought to be utilized. ... It is true that one may be a little hampered in teaching in the classroom with the broadcast in mind ... [but] it ought not to affect the freedom and liberty of teaching the Word of God (44).

Dr. Mitchell closed the letter as usual by saying, "May we come to you in all the fullness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ and filled unto all the fullness of God."

Certainly Dr. Mitchell has been the favorite Bible lecturer for the last fifty years.

March 6, 1951, Dr. Walvoord was planning a special birthday party for Dr. Chafer. He wrote to Alden A. Gannett at the Dallas Bible Institute, saying:

In regards to the President's birthday banquet on Thursday, at which you are to be the toastmaster, the faculty has considered the problem of permission for pictures to be taken at the banquet. ... We
have been besieged with camera fans, including several members of the faculty, who want to record the event (106).

March 30, 1951, Dr. Walvoord received a letter from the representative of the Presbyterian Minister's Fund who had been on campus selling life insurance. Walter Gray wrote, "It would be difficult if not impossible to find another Seminary where we are afforded such graciousness and warm hospitality as we are at your Seminary. The last two days have been a delightful experience for me" (21).

April 25, 1951, Ray C. Stedman wrote Dr. Walvoord from Palo Alto, California, where Dr. Walvoord will be preaching in the June Bible Conference:

... In view of this visit of three of the Dallas faculty to this area, I wondered if this wouldn't be a good opportunity to gather the alumni and former students in to meet with you for a dinner party. ... In talking with some of the former Dallas men around here I have discovered that they have a sort of "the glory has departed from Israel" attitude about Dallas and I would like to show them differently (57).

In addition to the Mt. Hermon and simultaneous Palo Alto Conference, and this alumni meeting, Dr. Walvoord spoke at the following meetings during the summer of 1951:

May 13, 20, 27, June 3, 10 at Rosen Heights Presbyterian Church.
May 15, at Scofield Memorial Church in Dallas.
May 25, at the Wheaton College Chapel in Illinois.
June 17, at Calvary Baptist Church, San Francisco, a.m.
June 17, at Peninsula Bible Fellowship in Palo Alto, p.m.
June 18-23, at the Dallas Seminary Mt. Hermon Conference, featuring several seminary professors.
July 1-8, at the First Presbyterian Church, Snohomish, Washington.
July 7-16, at America's Keswick in New Jersey.
July 20-24, at Erieside Conference in Cleveland, Ohio.
July 22, at the Tenth Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia.
July 23, at St. Lukes Lutheran Church in New York City.
July 25-29, at Erieside Bible Conference, Cleveland, Ohio.
August 26, at the Amarillo Bible Church, Amarillo, Texas.
August 27-September 1, at Gulf Bible Conference in Mississippi.

August 20, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote C. Fred Lincoln at the seminary, reminding him of the convocation, September 17, 1951, at 8:00. He requested that, "In preparation for those programs we should like of course to have the Seminary campus to look as nice as possible, and we shall need the overhead lighting, a piano, public address equipment and chairs" (142).

While this aspect of Dr. Walvoord's responsibility was very routine, he handled them efficiently and with courtesy. No where in the correspondence does he seem to be ruffled, except the one time when the Commencement speaker cancelled on twenty-four hours notice.

**Correspondence**

Dr. Walvoord was invited to speak at the First Presbyterian Church in Galveston, Texas, in October 1946. But he wrote them, "I thought it unwise to attempt the meeting myself as I am pastor of Rosen Heights Presbyterian Church of Fort Worth and have already been gone ten Sundays this year. I found that Dr. Everett Harrison was available" (125).

On October 31, 1946, Dr. Walvoord responded to a letter which was written to a faculty member. It asked several questions about Premillennialism and Amillennialism (28).
He wrote to the person saying:

The real issue between premillennialists and amillennialists is the issue of whether the Church inherits the promises given to Israel. It is my opinion after careful study that the word Israel is never used anywhere in the Bible to include Gentiles and that it is never used of the Church corporeal though groups of Christians who are Jewish in the flesh are referred to as the Israel of God. This is the real issue and, while [the book Prophecy and the Church] takes note of it, he spends most of his time in his book on non-essentials which confuse the issue and do not determine the argument (123).

Occasionally a letter would come to the President's Office which would be lost in the files. Dr. Walvoord responded to such a letter November 1, 1946, saying, "Your order for Seminary Sunday was inadvertently filed with alumni news items and was not discovered until yesterday. I am sorry that this happened, but am glad that you are the only one who suffered this inconvenience" (193). Seminary Sunday was a publicity event where the seminary sent literature to hundreds of churches to distribute on a particular Sunday each year. This practice has continued to the present.

On November 5, 1946, Dr. Walvoord responded to a letter from a professor at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, saying:

In regard to your question concerning the authority of the Bible, my opinion is that one who says, "the Bible is not our authority but Christ" is not stating the orthodox doctrine. We all recognize that Christ is a final authority, but we recognize the Holy Spirit also and inasmuch as the whole of the Bible we believe is verbally inspired, the statement of Paul or Peter or the Psalmist . . . has the very authority of God and therefore is not greater or less than the authority of Christ.
Dr. Walvoord closed the discussion by saying, "There is a lot of loose thinking in theology born of the belief that a God of love will not deal in righteous wrath with wicked people. . . . We cannot accept parts of the Bible and reject other parts" (159).

In a letter to Dr. Walvoord, November 14, 1946, Herbert Kann quotes Kenneth G. Neigh, Vice President of McCormick Seminary:

In the Middle-west alone, we are losing some 50 more Presbyterian ministers per year than the seminaries serving that area are producing. The heart of Protestant Christianity in the middle-west rises or falls with the Presbyterian Church. We may lose the battle for the souls of people because of sheer lack of numbers (31).

Kann goes on to say, "I pointed out the fact that the Presbyterian Church is at the place where she must look for ministers beyond the supply of our own denominational Seminaries." In his usual colorful style, Kann closes the letter saying, "Now Frisky [a nickname he has given Dr. Walvoord], I have enough troubles at home without you taking what I have given you here to publish to the world under my name and the name of my church" (31). The problems which Dallas Theological Seminary faced with the Presbyterian Church were coming to a climax, as shall be discussed later in this chapter.

On November 18, 1946, Dr. Walvoord replied to a letter from a prospective student. In the letter, he stated, "I note that you are choosing a very difficult line of study. In Greek, you know, they expect candidates to be able to translate
and exegete at sight any portion of the New Testament and explain any [Greek] forms. It is a large task" (156). Students who majored in New Testament knew the original language and the Greek New Testament very well when they finished Dallas Seminary!

The seminary was constantly receiving requests for recommendations to various pastoral positions. In the typical letter of recommendation, Dr. Walvoord would recommend two or three men, give their academic background, their work experience and a brief view of their family or other pertinent information. After a strong recommendation for Rudolph Renfro for a position, Dr. Walvoord mentions a second choice:

I would like to make still a further suggestion for you to consider. . . . He is a younger man than I think you are seeking. I am referring to Cyril I. Reid, who is now serving as an Assistant Pastor of the First Baptist Church of Riverside, California, which is a very large church. He graduated from here in November, 1945. . . . He is married and has two children. He is thirty-one years of age. He has a very pleasing personality and is excellent at conducting a song service. . . . I have not heard him preach recently, but I am sure that he would be able to develop along that line (103).

For one particular graduate, the Archives revealed that Dr. Walvoord wrote five personal letters and nine letters of recommendation between February 18 and November 18, 1947. This seemed to be more than typical.

In another letter of recommendation, he qualified it with this statement:

. . . One of the reasons why I hesitated giving you his name before is that it has been intimated to me that his wife might not fit into your situation.
I have been told that she has extreme views of separation from the world. I very much hesitate to say this as I have no real knowledge of her or her attitude and I may be entirely wrong. She is a fine Christian woman in any case, I am sure. I would suggest, however, in your case that if you seriously consider him you invite him to bring his wife along (104).

One of these letters was from a man who wanted a pastor who would work for $150 a month. Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... It is difficult, as you know, to find men who are willing to begin a work on a salary of $150 a month in these days. ... I would, however, like to suggest that you get in touch with Rev. M. H. Hall. ... He is of the type that is given to pioneer missionary work and wants a difficult field. He has the courage and faith to tackle a hard situation and at the same time is a man that is easy to work with (122).

Often, in the selection of a pastor, Dr. Walvoord was informed of the details involved in the process. An individual in Florida wrote:

... I am just advised this morning that a pulpit committee which is perhaps not functioning too aggressively or competently, reached the conclusion that while the more spiritual element of the church strongly favored calling Mr. [ ] on the strength of your recommendation, yet a less spiritual group was so undecided about it as to lead to the view that active opposition to Mr. [ ] would develop. ... I am personally much concerned, and apprehensive that this church may be approaching very serious difficulties in the perpetuation of the fundamentalist testimony it was organized to maintain in this community (34).

His fears were realized when he wrote back to Dr. Walvoord a short time later:

... I did not personally meet the man whom the church called. He is [ ], and a graduate, I believe, of McCormick Theological Seminary. He was called at a salary of $3000.00 plus manse, and we have no manse. Many in the church are seeking to acquire a
manse on greatly inflated prices. . . . But the church has a bad record with all financial institutions including the Church Board, from which they have borrowed money in the past. . . . Thank you again most earnestly for your attitude of helpfulness (35).

While Harry Ironside was living, he was pastor of Moody Church in Chicago. He wrote to Dr. Walvoord, inviting him to speak at his church on August 17, 1947. August 17 was already booked up for Dr. Walvoord, as he was scheduled to speak at the Calvary Church of Kalamazoo. He wrote them asking if they would mind cancelling the engagement, saying, "... You will understand the special privilege that is mine in having this opportunity to speak in the Moody Church, and I would greatly appreciate it if you would explain the situation to the Calvary Church, thanking them for their very kind offer" (109). As usual, he was way ahead of schedule, with the dates set in March.

In March of 1947 he also received a letter from Herbert Kann in Minneapolis, asking for recommendations for an assistant pastor. He wrote, "I have a woman that is doing a passable job but with the salary I can pay, between $175-200 a month, I feel I can get better service out of a man" (33).

April 4, 1947, Dr. Walvoord replied:

I wish I could do something for you in the matter of recommending a good assistant pastor, but the facts are that there are none obtainable. The type of man that would be good is usually good enough to secure his own church, and usually at a higher salary. The type of man that cannot secure his own church in these days is not the type that you want (128).
Dr. Walvoord concluded the letter with the jab, "Give my regards to your wife, who I understand writes all your sermons and keeps you straight" (128).

On August 12, 1947, Kann replied with, "The Tadlocks [from Fort Worth] were with us last Sunday, recuperating from some of their recent preaching they had been listening to [Walvoord's]" (33).

Sometimes Dr. Walvoord was criticized by seminary alumni because he recommended more than one man for a church position, and the one that did not get the job would be upset. Such was the case in April, 1947. Dr. Walvoord replied to him:

... we do not follow any hard and fast rule on the matter of recommending people to churches. Our idea is that we want to place the people in touch with the available men that are suitable. ... From your point of view no doubt it would be preferable to be the only one recommended ... [but] if a church tries one of our men and for some reason does not call him, they hardly ever inform us of this fact ... and take a man who is not one of our graduates (94).

However, in this case, the other candidate was very grateful, and relayed the procedures to Dr. Walvoord. When the church he was pastoring at the time found out that another church was interested in him, he wrote that, "My people here have raised the salary to the same as the Denver Church" (198). July 16, 1947, Dr. Walvoord wrote the man who would not get the position saying, "[ ] has written saying that the Church in Denver has called him. I am unable to explain why they invited him." Dr. Walvoord went on to
assure the losing candidate that he would continue to try to find him another church to pastor. "... There are no disappointments in God's plan for our life. ... I have recommended you to various churches" (95).

Another criticism came to Dr. Walvoord from the Duluth, Minnesota Presbytery. "Do you have any young men who are available for a field in this Presbytery? ... We like your boys because they seem to know the Gospel. But they do not stick very long in a place" (23). In a later letter, the same man wrote:

... Don't you think a man ought to finish one task before he leaves it for one that looks easier and bigger? ... Your men have the reputation up here of being unsettled. We think you could instill a little more of the stick-to-it spirit in them while they are there. ... We have had several disappointing experiences with Dallas men. We have been strong advocates of your school. But frankly, we are losing some of our real enthusiasm. ... We need schools like yours to train men who are sound in the faith (24).

June 26, 1947, the man wrote again, saying, "Some of the finest men I know in the ministry are from your school and I have held your school in high regard. Human frailties show up in all of us. ... Our Presbytery has ordained quite a number of Dallas men. ... The need in desperate."

Another area of concern for Dr. Walvoord was criticism still being generated by the evangelists who had opposed the book True Evangelism. May 29, 1947, W. S. Mosher wrote to Dr. Walvoord:
The evangelists that signed the resolution at Winona Lake two years ago ought to be gentlemen and correct the harm they have done. Also, the same men that were associated with Dr. Rice in signing that, should ask [him] to withdraw his statements that were made in the Sword of the Lord June 21st, 1946, in which he greatly criticized the Moody Institute. . . . My humble opinion is that evangelists should show some indications of being Christian (45).

This correspondence was to continue for several years. Finally, John R. Rice gave up the controversy because it was costing him so many friends.

On July 16, 1947, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Ken Taylor about an article explaining the founding of Fuller Theological Seminary in California:

I thought it was fine of you and the Times to give the Fuller Seminary a boost. The Lord knows we need more such Christian Institutions. There are some factors about it that raise a question in my mind. . . . It seems that their ideal is to combine the best elements of Westminster, Faith and Princeton in a new type of institution. They will have some hard lessons to learn as we have through the years on what constitutes a good curriculum. . . . I anticipate that we will lose a few students to Fuller's Seminary, but personally I do not regret this as we have at present almost an unwieldy student body with fifty percent overload according to our present equipment (182).

September 12, 1947, Dr. Walvoord wrote to William Pass Jr., that "... we are ... watching with interest the beginning of Fuller Seminary. ... I feel there is plenty of room for more schools of conservative theology as most of the existing schools are over-crowded. ... The new seminary does not seem to have affected our enrollment" (161).

August 27, 1947, Dr. Walvoord reported to Bob Thieme about his recent trip to Chicago:
We had a lovely time at Gull Lake at the Bible Conference where Geraldine and John went along. Also we enjoyed the Sunday at Moody Church, which is quite an experience homiletically. Now we are taking off about ten days without any work or preaching except for a few necessary letters like this one (129).

September 12, 1947, Dr. Walvoord wrote a letter in response to Herbert Kann in Minnesota:

... You will be interested in the fact that last Sunday the Session took the step of appointing a committee to look for an architect... I am hoping in a few years we will have a new church building... Last Sunday was my first in the pulpit since I came back and it was good to see the Tadlocks again. They are now recuperating from the preaching they heard in Minnesota. I hope by Christmas they will be back where they were when I left (129).

As a Board member of Child Evangelism Fellowship, Dr. Walvoord received correspondence about various issues. September 25, 1947 he received a letter which said, "... If you cannot be present [at the Board meeting] please fill out the proxy which is enclosed and send it to us air mail... Our time is limited so please cooperate by giving word to us at the earliest possible moment" (51).

In corresponding with a family who had just lost their daughter in death, Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... It seems it has pleased the Lord to bring affliction in the lives of a number of the men who have been so closely related to our seminary. It is not for us to understand all the dealings of God with us, but it is a wonderful comfort to know that God is exceedingly kind and that all of these hard things which come to us are infinitely wise from the viewpoint of eternity (130).

Dr. Walvoord was always joking with J. Ellwood Evans, his brother-in-law, and April 26, 1948, Evans wrote, "I was
unable to get you a private car for next Sunday night [for a trip to see Evans]. You will have to be content with a lower berth. If necessary you can hang your feet out the window" (17).

At this time, Dr. Chafer was very tired, and had been invited to speak on the "Harrisburg [Pennsylvania] Circuit." April 9, 1948, he wrote, "... you may be looking for a substitute teacher in case I am unable to be there. ... It really is a rather large undertaking to speak some twenty times in ten days, visiting four different cities, but I have always been able to do it" (2). April 22, 1948, he wrote William H. Davidson again:

... I have in mind to suggest Dr. John F. Walvoord who is my associate. ... He is a much stronger platform man now than when you had him there before for he has been growing and gaining experience. In fact, he is a man who I am sure you will all want to know better. ... I am confident he is the best that we could suggest from here. I do not think that Dr. Feinberg could be secured and I am hardly inclined to recommend him.

On June 7, 1948, Dr. Walvoord noted, "Dr. Chafer continues to be confined to his home and I do not know whether he will be able to go to California as he hopes or not" (115). On September 30, J. Vernon McGee wrote Dr. Walvoord:

... Would you likewise convey a message to Dr. Chafer for me? I wrote him recently relative to a call to the Church of the Open Door. Will you tell him that I have accepted the call and will go there January 1st. I appreciate very much his advice (39).

Dr. Chafer responded to J. Vernon McGee himself, saying,
Word has reached us of your acceptance of the pastorate of the Church of the Open Door. . . . You are moving up to one of the most important pulpits in the United States and in the world. . . . I remind you that though the audience may be very much larger, it is still composed of individuals who have their personal needs the same as in a smaller church (9).

Dr. Chafer closes the letter by making reference to his health. "I have made steady return to usual strength in the past few weeks and am now teaching my courses in the Seminary" (9). In December of 1948, Dr. Chafer wrote Erling C. Olsen, his friend in New York:

There has been a good deal of agitation in various parts of the country, all of which is more or less amusing to me, in an attempt to try to select my successor. The fact is the clothes in which I am to be laid away have not yet been selected. . . . As long as I have strength I have no intention either of dying or retiring from the present situation. . . . There is, in my estimation, only one man equipped to succeed me in the important service which God has committed to me. I think the Board members have a full understanding of my wishes in that matter and will, of course, be responsible for whatever action is taken in case I am removed (10).

However, Dr. Chafer neglected to mention the name of the person he had in mind to succeed him. Mr. Olsen wrote to one of the alumni representatives, saying:

... I am sure the Board of Incorporate members will receive your resolution with thanks. I concur fully in the necessity for a strong man to be Dr. Chafer's successor when the need arises. I have a man in mind who meets all the requirements. In fact, I know of none other who has. I trust the Lord will lead both the Board and this gentleman when the occasion presents itself. . . . Let us remember Dr. Chafer has surprised many men, many times by his great recuperative physical powers. What a grand soul he has been and continues to be (50).
Dr. Walvoord wrote Robert Rayburn, the secretary of the Alumni Association of the Chicago area, concerning Dr. Chafer and the finding of someone to replace him:

... I believe it is the opinion of the Board of the seminary that formal consideration of a successor to President Chafer is at this time premature. In the event the office of President becomes vacant the constitution provides temporary machinery for the leadership of the work. Undoubtedly the Board will take its time in selecting a successor and there will be opportunity for any expression of opinion on the matter that may be desired. I believe that Dr. Chafer should continue as President as long as he lives. ... The matter has never been discussed in the Board meetings (168).

As for his feelings about taking the Presidency, he continued:

... It should be kept clearly in mind that as far as I am personally concerned, my present office arises from the immediate necessity of helping Dr. Chafer and that it is just that and no more. When the time comes for the Board to select a new President it will be perfectly free in its choice and able to consider all suitable nominations (168).

The Alumni Association had presented a resolution to Dr. Chafer and the Seminary Board, which stated:

After a very lengthy discussion ... "We the members ... with thanks to ... Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer ... yet realizing the infirmity of his age and the approach of the day when he will no longer be able to serve in his present capacity, and moreover realizing the strategic position of the Seminary in these days and the importance of its ministry in the Christian world, respectfully request the Board ... that a strong, nationally known evangelical leader of proved executive ability be called in as President of the Seminary when the necessity for a successor for Dr. Chafer arises" (53).

In his letter to Robert Rayburn, mentioned above, Dr. Walvoord wrote his feeling about this resolution and about
the finding of a replacement for Dr. Chafer. He did not appreciate the implications the resolution made about the competency of the Board of the seminary:

... I think we all agree that it is desirable, as you state in your resolution, to have a man of proved executive ability and one who is already known as an evangelical leader. Much more important than this, however, is the fact that he must be a man of God, a man of faith, and a man of prayer. The position is one of great responsibility and, for the most part, a thankless task. The salary is relatively small and there will undoubtedly be sacrifices in the future as there have been in the past which would discourage anyone who does not have the same faith and vision of Dr. Chafer.

He continued by saying,

... I believe, with Dr. Chafer, that when the need for a successor arises God will have a man fitted for the responsibility and that God can give the Board, which has the responsibility for choosing a new President, the guidance and divine wisdom that will be needed... I feel that on the whole it would be wise for the alumni to avoid any public statements of resolution which would in any way reflect on the ability of these men or to pre-judge their future actions (168).

According to Dr. Walvoord, in an interview on February 7, 1986, the man the group was proposing to be the next President was Dr. John G. Mitchell, then pastor of Central Bible Church in Portland, Oregon. Dr. Mitchell was a well-known Bible teacher and popular Bible lecturer at the seminary as has been mentioned before. He was also in the first graduating class of the seminary.

After this flurry of interest in finding a replacement for Dr. Chafer, his health was strengthened, and no more mention is made of it in the Archives. He himself never mentioned the subject again in any letter available for this study.
March 19, 1949, Dr. Chafer wrote to Rev. William H. Davidson, who handled the scheduling for the Harrisburg Circuit Bible Conference, saying, "There is complete understanding between Dr. Walvoord and myself about one or the other of us going. . . . He is, in my estimation, the most highly taught in theological things of any young man in our country today" (3). At this time Dr. Walvoord would have been thirty-eight years old.

November 22, 1949, Dr. Walvoord stepped aside to allow Dr. Chafer to again go on the Circuit. He wrote:

". . . Dr. Chafer is, as you know, in much better health and is fully able to travel and minister in public again even though he is not entirely strong. I believe he is much stronger now than he has been for five years and probably is in better health than he was the last time he went over the Circuit. I believe it would mean a great deal to Dr. Chafer to be invited to go around the Circuit once more and meet his old friends again. . . . This will automatically cancel the arrangement with me. . . . I will try to hold myself open for the period which Dr. Chafer selects and in the event of sudden illness on his part could be his substitute if you desire (88)."

This was the arrangement which was made, and Dr. Walvoord wrote to them on January 3, 1950, saying, "Dr. Chafer is able physically to do the necessary Bible teaching work, but he still has some difficulty in climbing stairs." He asked them for some special consideration for Dr. Chafer. "I have been wondering whether there is any possible way that hotel reservations could be made for him . . . to avoid the climb. . . . I do not believe Dr. Chafer himself would have said anything about it" (89).
November 23, 1949, Dr. Chafer wrote George W. Reiley in Pennsylvania, giving us a great deal of insight into this man who had led the seminary for so many years. He wrote:

... I too, belong to a past generation. In February I shall celebrate my seventy-ninth birthday also. In the past year I did not have much hope of going on much longer, but I have been so increased in strength and revived in answer to the prayers of multitudes of people for me that I am doing about the usual amount of work now and traveling as I have always done. ... I am quite alone living in my home [since the death of his wife]. ... I, too, live in memories as I think most older people do. It is exceedingly hard for me to awaken to the fact that I am as old as I am. I have so much ambition to go on and to accomplish things that I cannot give much thought to [at] my age (13).

In a letter to Wilbur Smith at Fuller Seminary, January 6, 1950, he may give some insight into why his strength had been renewed. He wrote:

... If men such as I knew in my younger days like [W. H. Griffith] Thomas, Pierson, [C. I.] Scofield, and Brookes were here for a little time now and could understand the world situation they would not sleep for excitement over conditions in the world today. We looked forward to all of this in the early days and now it is upon us (14).

This excitement, and perhaps the reason for the renewed strength, undoubtably was because of the establishment of the nation of Israel in the land of Palestine as prophesied in the Scriptures. These men were all students of prophecy, and the establishment of the nation of Israel was a key element of dispensational theology. It gave credence to their understanding that God had a special place for Israel and that this "Age of Grace" would soon end in the rapture of the Church, followed by a time of great tribulation on earth.
January 31, 1951, Dr. Walvoord recommended Ray Stedman for the pastorate of a new Bible Church which was beginning in the Palo Alto area of California. He said in a letter that Stedman had manifested unusual ability in his work at the seminary, both as a student and as a leader in the student body. He continued, "... He is a man of mature judgment and he has organizing ability and the type of initiative needed in carrying on a work such as you are beginning" (176).

March 15, 1949, Dr. Walvoord had been involved in helping the J. Ellwood Evans family get settled in their new home in Dallas. He had written, "They are having a housewarming for the faculty this week. I have been helping them get settled by doing various odd chores of electrical wiring and the necessary plumbing to install their Bendix washer" (162). Dr. Walvoord had a hobby of doing electrical wiring and working with appliances. He had maintained this hobby throughout his career.

In March of 1950, Dr. Walvoord wrote a letter to the General Manager of Safeway Stores, Inc., in Dallas:

... I understand that the Safeway Stores of Dallas are considering the plan of keeping their stores open on Sunday. As a regular customer of the Safeway Stores for many years, I protest this infringement on the rights of your employees to have their Sundays off to attend the Churches of their choice. I personally believe it is poor business to have a store open seven days a week (107).

April 27, 1950, Dr. Walvoord made a recommendation for Bob Thieme, who was being considered at Berachah Church in Houston:
Mr. Thieme is well known to me as he was a member of my church in Fort Worth for three years during his service in the air corps. I believe that Mr. Thieme has the qualities of leadership. [to be] a fine preacher, a careful student of the Word of God, and [he] works hard at whatever he does (102).

May 24, 1950, Dr. Walvoord wrote J. F. Strombeck, "I am snowed under with too much to do." This was the first indication that his busy schedule was tiring him out. He went on to list several thoughts about a manuscript Mr. Strombeck was writing and had sent to him for an evaluation. He closed the letter saying, "Feel perfectly free to ignore any of my suggestions" (178).

In a letter June 13, 1950, Dr. Walvoord wrote more about his busy pace and problems he was beginning to have with his health:

... I plan to move to Dallas this fall and give my full time to the work of the Seminary. I have found the double duties are getting to be too much for my strength. I expect to stay with the church at least doing the preaching until they get another minister (180).

June 14, 1950, he wrote Dewey Duncan in Dallas:

... Could you call Dr. Underwood at the Dallas Medical and Surgical Clinic and have him arrange for me a clinical test for Tuesday morning. He asked me to come back about this time for another blood test. ... Could you call Dr. Voorhis. ... I cannot come between 1:30 and 3:30 as this is reserved for radio recordings.

P.S. I am enclosing some grade reports for the Registrar (91).

In spite of his declining health, Dr. Walvoord worked on as usual. August 4, 1950, he was thinking about two
books he planned to write. One was a series of articles on premillennialism, published quarterly in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and the second one in the area of Christology. He wrote, "A matter of more immediate importance is the republication of my book on the Holy Spirit. . . . I desire to revise it particularly in the early parts in an attempt to make it more readable" (197). He goes on to say, "... I'm giving up my church in Fort Worth and moving to Dallas and am engaged in building a home. If Van Kampen is interested in publishing it, it is possible we can work it out."

At this time, the Walvoord's received an invitation to visit Reinhardt Bible Church in Dallas. They did visit and have been members of the church for over thirty-five years. In a letter written by Charlie Sharp, it said, "At some time, when it is convenient for you, we would be glad to have you occupy the pulpit for Sunday services" (56). Although he occasionally preached in the church, he would become "just another member."

September 28, 1950, Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... We are building a home out in the Casa Linda section of Dallas. . . . We hope it will be finished in three or four weeks and as soon as we can sell our home in Fort Worth we will move. It is going to be a great relief to have my work restricted and to be able to give more careful thought to the duties that fall on me at the Seminary (85).

He went on to describe his work at the seminary:

... In particular I want to work with the graduate students who are majoring in theology more than I have in the past. One of the innovations is that I am having a class this year in which all the theology
major students are enrolled. . . . We have our largest enrollment [at the Seminary] . . . around 215 . . . a token of God's blessing on us that in spite of denominational pressures and the obstacles placed in the way of men who want to train here that the men continue to come in larger numbers than ever (85).

He ended the letter by describing their new home:

... We are very happy about our new home. It is larger than we really should have built, but we need a room and bath extra for Mrs. Walvoord's mother who is living with us and probably will continue to for the rest of her life. We are having four bedrooms plus the usual other rooms. . . . It certainly costs a mint to build now, but I believe the Lord will provide for it (85).

October 27, he wrote to the Memphis Furniture Manufacturing Company:

Thank you for your telegram of yesterday regarding the rug order. I had not expected it to be delivered until December and for this reason had not made provision for it. In fact, we have not moved in at the address given. . . . Send the bill at 2215 Loving Avenue. . . . We will be at this address for another two weeks (149).

December 4, 1950, he received a letter from Howard Voss:

... I am happy to know that you have moved to Dallas and will be giving more undivided attention to the Seminary. It certainly needs your guiding hand in days such as these. I assure you that I appreciate something of the difficulty in which you find yourself as you endeavor to improve the program at D.T.S. I trust that your health is much improved this year (63).

December 5, 1950, Dr. Walvoord wrote Mrs. H. G. Mac-Murchy, saying, "We finally moved into our home in Dallas and are still getting settled" (144). December 19, he wrote Paul Davidson in Brazil, "We finally moved. . . . I am still supplying the church in Fort Worth, going over on
Wednesdays and Sundays, until they get a Pastor" (86). This ministry was to last for another full year as the church sought his replacement.

December 30, 1950, Dr. Walvoord wrote Rev. Philip H. Austin, explaining the church in Fort Worth, and asked him to consider candidating for the position:

. . . In regard to your inquiry concerning Rosen Heights Presbyterian Church, may I say I resigned effective October 1, and am continuing to supply the pulpit until a successor is found. The church is in a healthy condition and is definitely premillennial and conservative, and they are seeking a man of that type.

I believe under the peculiar circumstances of the local situation that Presbytery will allow them to secure a Dallas graduate. The church does not have a manse, but has a substantial building fund of over $20,000 toward a new building. . . . The church is greatly in need of pastoral work as I have had to neglect this aspect as I was giving only part of my time. . . . It has been my policy not to make a specific recommendation regarding my successor (163).

January 23, 1951, Dr. Chafer wrote a letter to a man in San Bernardino, California, about the man's concern over a new group that was beginning in the area. The group is not named but Dr. Chafer encouraged him to "just quietly go on stating the truth. Dr. C. I. Scofield said to me once, 'NEVER DESCEND TO CONTROVERSY. You have no time or strength for it. Give out the positive truth. There is nothing that can stand in front of it' " (12). This was the philosophy of Dr. Chafer and it became the philosophy of Dr. Walvoord as well.

A letter addressed to Dr. Walvoord, January 31, 1951 said:
... I want you to know how I thank God for the Dallas Theological Seminary. As I travel around the country I meet your graduates from time to time and I find that they are strong expositors of the Word and that they carry on a splendid and instructive ministry and consequently are a real recommendation to the school from which they graduated (55).

May 21, 1951, Dr. Walvoord answered a letter concerning the differences between dispensational and covenant theology and their respective teachings about grace and works:

... It is my personal opinion that the dispensations of Scripture are not definite ways of salvation, but are definite rules of life suited to the measure of revelation God gave to that dispensation. ... I trust that this letter will be of some help to you, but I recognize that the problems involved are exceedingly difficult and the greatest of theological minds are not agreed as to how all of these things should be solved (100).

He continued by explaining that the key distinctions which must be kept in mind are the programs of God for the Gentiles, for the nation of Israel, and for the Church, with each having its literal fulfillment. He closed by saying that when we maintain the obvious dispensational teachings of Scripture, "... we have a far more accurate and Biblical approach than that offered by the so-called Covenant theologians who attempt to put all truth for all ages in the same mold and wipe out these distinctions" (100).

In June, 1951, Dr. Walvoord was involved in trying to get probation for a prisoner at Huntsville Prison. In a letter to the prisoner, whose parents were from his church in Fort Worth, Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... We certainly are sorry about it and we will be praying for you and your parents. ... I am so
glad that you are determined when your sentence is finished to begin over and be the kind of man I know you can be. . . . It is wonderful to know that all our sins can be forgiven by the Lord when we trust in Jesus Christ. I hope also that you will confess your sins to God and go straight before the Lord, and then ask Him for strength to lead a faithful life wherever you are (112).

September 4, 1951, Dr. Walvoord received a reply from Alan B. Haley, District Attorney for Wichita County, Texas, which said, "This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 28, 1951 concerning [the man in prison]. Your interest is appreciated and every consideration will be given" (22). No further correspondence concerning this situation or its outcome was available in the Archives.

As mentioned before, Dr. Walvoord was concerned about the placement of graduates in various churches. Sometimes these men were not placed because of the way they presented themselves to the church which was considering them. July 27, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote one such man:

. . . I am sorry that no opening has come to you from the various places I have suggested. I find that your letters in response to their inquiries do not give a good impression. One of the churches forwarded your letter to them to me and, while they did not say so, it was clear that they were not impressed. In the first place, your letter happened to be quite untidy with ink blots and crossed out words and some words misspelled. . . . Let me know what I can do further for you and keep me informed of any change (111).

Another letter, written the same day, expressed sympathy for the death of a student at the seminary. It was addressed to the student's wife:
The faculty meeting in regular session today has asked me to convey to you our sincere sympathy in the loss of your husband. He was a valued student and one with whom I personally have worked a great deal in radio ministry. His home going was a shock to us all.

He closed the letter by saying:

. . . we do trust that the Lord in His own way will give you comfort and rest in the will of God in your life, and while we cannot understand why one so promising should be cut off at the threshold of life's opportunities, we can rest in God's wisdom and love that these things are by divine appointment and in keeping with His purpose (113).

August 28, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Professor George E. Ladd, at Fuller Seminary, who had requested information concerning the dispensational teachings for Darby:

. . . I am not able to answer specifically your question concerning the origin of Darby's interpretation of the Kingdom of Heaven and Kingdom of God, and do not have any sources of research on that subject which are not also open to you. It is my opinion that historical origin of the interpretation is not as significant as some would make it. . . . I have been much distressed by what I would call immature judgment both for and against the definition of the terms. . . . It is my opinion, and it is no more than an opinion, that both Darby and Kelly derived their ideas . . . from their personal Bible study rather than from previous occurrence of this idea in doctrinal history (132).

October 3, 1951, Dr. Walvoord expressed concern about his family, now living in Dallas. His two sons had both experienced difficulty as a result of the move from Fort Worth:

. . . We appreciate your prayers for James. We have him in a private school where he is getting personal attention, and he seems to be responding well. . . . We have John [E.] in a Christian school in Dallas this year which is doing very much for him
both spiritually and educationally. His problem was that he skipped a grade last year when he transferred from Fort Worth to Dallas and really should not have done so. Under the special attention he is now getting, however, he is doing fine work and it seems that he has bridged the gap. His mother works with him every day which is responsible for a big part of the improvement (177).

October 15, 1951, Dr. Walvoord is finally relieved as pastor of Rosen Heights Presbyterian Church. He wrote Rev. Russell Stewart of Craigmont, Idaho:

... As far as Rosen Heights is concerned, the matter was simply that I have too much to do and resigned. I was under no pressure either from Presbytery or the Church. They have called a man by the name of Briggs from Princeton Seminary. It so happens he is a protege of Dr. Barnhouse, is very definitely premillennial and expositional in his ministry, and is very friendly to me and to the Seminary. In fact, he is much more outspoken, I understand, in his denunciation of modernism, than I ever have been (175).

December 8, 1951, Dr. Walvoord received a letter from John E. Mitchell, Jr., a businessman in Dallas:

... Also, we all here in the Mitchell Company greatly appreciate the Dallas Seminary, the men on the faculty and the men in the student body. I think any person watching these Seminary boys at work here in our plant and observing their contacts with the other men would quickly come to the conclusion that the Seminary must be a pretty fine institution (43).

Routine Administrative Decisions

February 18, 1947, Dr. Walvoord sent a letter to one of the Women's Auxiliary members. In the letter he described plans to allow the women to redecorate a lounge and the guest rooms, including blinds and drapes. He wrote:
. . . In addition to these immediate needs we felt that there should be a long-range plan worked out with the help of an expert, particularly in the matter for the equipment for the lounge. We had in mind securing a competent person who could confer both with the Auxiliary Committee and the Administrative Committee of the Seminary. . . . The Seminary will pay the fee (166).

To the letter he added a memorandum to C. Fred Lincoln, which said "Is this O.K.? I neglected to have a copy made for you, if you want to have your secretary copy it."

In September, 1947, Dr. Walvoord sent a memorandum to Dr. Lincoln which said, "I am informed that the pianos in the chapel and in the lounge are badly in need of being tuned. It would be nice if we could get them tuned before Friday in order to have them for the reception" (133).

September 30, 1947, Dr. Walvoord wrote Dr. Chafer, "In regard to our mailing of the Annual Report of the Seminary, it seems advisable to include at the same time an announcement of the Day of Prayer, October 23, to avoid circularizing the same list twice within three weeks" (79).

On October 11, 1947, the letter which was mailed out announcing the Day of Prayer said, ". . . As you read the Report, I am certain you will realize the need for prayer and find time to pray for us on the Day of Prayer which is Thursday, October 23" (5).

March 26, 1948, Dr. Walvoord was called upon to discipline two students who wrote a one-page newsletter which they called, "The Corruption Weekly." Needless to say, the March 23, 1948 edition was the first and last issue! In the
paper, the men used humor, sprinkled with sarcasm to poke fun at various people and classes at the seminary. It described students sleeping in Hebrew class, and described the "Fellowship" socials for single men as an opportunity to meet single women. The newsletter closed with a "Lost and Found" note: "Lost. One Davis Greek Grammar. If the person who finds this book will please return it, the owner will reward him substantially with a bust on the nose" (59).

March 26, 1946, Dr. Walvoord wrote Dr. Feinberg on campus, requesting him to speak to the student body about the newsletter. He listed five concerns, some of which were:

. . . that the faculty is seriously concerned about the sheet distributed . . . [and] deplores its character as a serious offense . . . [and wants] all copies immediately destroyed . . . [and] the men responsible are asked to confess their part in it . . . [and] the faculty will act upon information as it now has and such as it may be able to secure (98).

In a letter to Carl Armerding, Dr. Walvoord reported the results of the investigation. "We were disposed to take rather harsh action against them, but due to the fact that they confessed freely and without restraint and apparently were unaware of the seriousness of what they were doing, we were led to withhold more serious punishment." He ended the letter by saying, " . . . They shall however, continue on probation for the rest of the semester" (66). It might be noted that both Armerding and Feinberg resigned from the seminary at the end of the school year. It is not known if this event had any bearing upon their decision.
In a personal interview, Dr. Walvoord commented, "If you are a Christian you should not be ridiculing the people who are serving you. . . . The editor of the newsletter is now the Dean of a College!" (27).

March 30, 1948, Dr. Walvoord wrote a lengthy letter to Merrill Unger, requesting him to consider joining the faculty. He described the position, the work load and salary structure. He said, " . . . all of us have been tempted at times to consider offers from other work than what we were doing at the time. . . . It would leave us in a very serious situation if you could not accept our invitation." He concluded the letter, saying, " . . . We need you very much here and we feel that we can assure you a large place of service on our faculty" (189).

Dr. Unger was very popular at Gordon College and they tried desperately to keep him. They offered not only changes in salary but an expanded department and higher degree programs. Unger wrote, " . . . If I come to Dallas, I shall be coming with a substantial reduction in salary." He then closed the letter by saying, " . . . I have made no definite commitments which would bind me to stay on at Gordon next year. The matter lies wholly with me" (62). He later did accept the position at Dallas Theological Seminary.

In a letter to Dr. Lincoln, January 9, 1950, Dr. Walvoord wrote the salary schedule for the coming year. Every faculty member received $3,300 for the year plus "cost of living bonus," usually amounting to $50.00 a month. However
Dr. Lincoln was highest paid at $3,900 and Dr. Walvoord was lowest at $2,400 "plus travel expenses from and to Fort Worth" (135).

December 5, 1950, Dr. Walvoord responded to an insurance agent who wanted to provide group coverage for the seminary. He turned down the request by the Minister's Life and Casualty Union to provide the service. Payment schedules for a student were about $20.00 twice a year for major medical coverage with childbirth and surgical riders included (90).

Publicity

October 9, 1946, Dr. Walvoord received a letter from Ken Tayor, the News Editor of the new magazine Christian Life and Times. He wrote, "Will you please write us from time to time as important developments take place in your work? News received before the 20th of the month will be the material out of which the next issue's news analysis will be woven" (181).

October 15, 1946, Dr. Walvoord gave a memorandum to Dr. John H. Bennetch, who was in charge of Bibliotheca Sacra:

I have been authorized to do some promotion work for Bibliotheca Sacra by means of letters and also our next Bulletin. Could you give me a brief outline of some of the upcoming attractions for 1947. We have in mind offering three numbers for $1.00 as an introductory subscription, and are investigating the possibility of offering Mr. Strombeck's books again as a premium (69).

In his reply, Bennetch wrote, "There is nothing planned
outside the continuation of the various series now running."
He then added a note in closing, "... Departmental heads,
you know, are supposed to find the material for Bib. Sac.
in toto. When they don't (and often they don't) I am hard
pressed, much less able to plan for the year to come" (1).

October 25, 1946, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Dr. Chafer
about his plans for Bibliotheca Sacra. "... it seemed
wise at this time to make a special offer to new subscribers
... in the form of an additional quarterly copy free as an
inducement to subscribe at this time" (77). One request for
the quarterly and for additional literature came from Finland
about which Dr. Walvoord received a memorandum from Dr.
Lincoln, saying, "I am informed by the National Bank of Com-
merce that, as Finland is under the political and financial
influence of Russia, it is impossible to remit funds from
that land, although arrangements now exist for moneys to be
sent to Finland" (36).

Once the Griffith Thomas Lecture's were complete,
Bibliotheca Sacra would publish them. On March 29, 1947,
Dr. Walvoord wrote Harold Ockenga:

We appreciate very much your excellent lectures in
our midst. ... We now are wondering about the
publication of this material. ... They should
be approximately three to four thousand words each.
We are receiving requests for information regarding
the publication of the whole series. I am informed
by Dr. John Bennett, Associate Editor, that he
would like to begin the series with the April-June
number. This would require the first article to be
in our hands not later than April 15 (158).
In the summer of 1947, the seminary sent out a quartet, which traveled the East Coast representing the school. Dr. Walvoord received a letter from an upset pastor who had not been scheduled in the tour. The pastor wrote:

... I am somewhat surprised that I was informed at so late a time about your meetings in the New Jersey area, since I was a member of the first quartet of our Seminary, besides being the first student to come to Dallas from the East. I must say Princeton Theological Seminary is more considerate when it comes to such engagements (20).

Dr. Walvoord wasted no time in replying to this:

... The quartet which is going on the trip has, until recently been connected with the Radio Revival. Due to the necessity of cutting expenses the Radio Revival discontinued the relationship the latter part of March, and it then became possible for us to work out a brief tour for them... This forced us to rather arbitrary methods of planning the trip. We had to establish quotas of days for each locality... It so happened that we had a number of replies promptly from the New Jersey area, and by the time your letter was received, they already had their quota of meetings (101).

In May of 1947, Dr. Walvoord discussed the possibility of hiring the Jewell F. Stevens Company in Chicago to officially handle the advertising and promotion for the seminary. On June 17, Stevens wrote, "We should be very happy indeed to serve your school in the capacity of advertising agents, and will be glad to discuss this with your Registrar or Director of Public Relations, if you will refer our letter to the right man" (58). August 1, Dr. Walvoord wrote Ken Taylor, "John Witmer is helping in our publicity work and is well qualified as a journalist. The little tract, 'Dallas is for Different' is one of his first printing jobs" (183).
He went on to mention that Dr. Chafer's eight volume set of *Systematic Theology* was finished and the first two volumes were in their hands. He expected the complete set to be out by January 1, 1948.

January 20, 1948, Dr. Chafer's Theology was completed. Dr. Walvoord wrote Moody Press:

> . . . I am sorry if the allocation of the distribution of the Theology to Van Kampen Press has reflected in any way upon Moody Press. This of course was not the intention. . . . I personally have no opinion in the matter and would have been happy if Moody Press would have been chosen. . . . I have appreciated a great deal the firm stand that Moody Press has taken in support of Dr. Chafer (82).

All references to advertising of the seminary were now being directed to John Witmer. To Wendel Shank, advertising manager of the 1950 *Wheaton Tower*, Dr. Walvoord wrote, "I am enclosing our contract for a half-page advertisement in the 1950 *Tower*. Mr. John A. Witmer will confer with you shortly regarding copy and cuts" (171). The copy showed a picture of the Wheaton men at Dallas Theological Seminary, 1947-48. They included faculty and students and listed Johnson, Woodring, Hendricks, Nyman, Platt, Campbell, Peppgrass, Burtch, Morrison, Conner, Raws, Dr. Walvoord, True, Thalleen, Tisdall, and Witmer. Of these, Walvoord, Witmer, Campbell and Hendricks were on staff or Faculty at the Seminary in 1986. The copy for the 1950 edition read:

> Thorough Preparation is essential to Christian service. Dallas Seminary offers a standard four-year theological course leading to Th.M. with additional courses leading to Th.D; emphasis on
Bible, Theology, Biblical Languages, History, Missions, and Practical Theology; unquestioned loyalty to the Word of God; accredited and approved for veterans (61).

July 5, 1950, Dr. Walvoord wrote Ted Benson in Wheaton about "... planned promotion and publicity, aimed mostly at giving information and presenting need but without in so many words asking for funds." He stated, "I personally believe that we have come to the point in our history where we need an organized and professional job of public relations and we are not in a position to hire a man full time" (72).

November 15, 1950, a one-page advertisement was mailed out to the constituency. It had two main paragraphs. The first said, "... A fund has been opened to provide for the erection of a new building, which, it is certain, is needed as much as one could ever be." The next paragraph said, "It is never the policy of the Seminary to solicit funds and this is no exception. We wish only to inform our friends of the need" (6). One person mailed his literature back in to Dr. Walvoord, writing over it, "BUT YOU ARE SOLICITING FOR FUNDS," and he signed his name (6).

November 13, 1951, Dr. Walvoord sent a memorandum to Dr. Bennetch saying:

... Facing the problem of the increasing cost of Bibliotheca Sacra, Dr. Chafer has come to the conclusion upon study of the matter that we should reduce the size from its present 128 pages to 96 pages plus cover... We are instituting also [going to offer] ... an introductory six-months subscription at a cost of $1.00. We hope this will attract new subscriptions (7).
Not only did Dr. Walvoord have a full load of teaching in 1946, but he also had a weekly radio broadcast. To Rev. W. H. Jordon, he wrote, "I am regularly on KSKY at 6:30 a.m. on Friday" (127). With so many things on his mind, he still had time to work with students. January 4, 1948, he wrote to Dr. Bennetch, "I have read with interest the dissertation of Mr. [S.L.J.]. I find it on the whole very good though I am not qualified to pass judgment on the technical side of his dissertation." He went on to note a few errors, and then said, "There are a few instances in his dissertation where some might think him not sufficiently courteous to Dr. Chafer. If he were an ordinary student, I would overlook it, but as he is on the faculty, possibly some readers might get the wrong impression." He then listed two specific paragraphs where wording could be changed, and suggested how the sentences could be constructed. He closed, saying, "... the matter is entirely in your hands" (70).

October 21, 1949, Dr. Walvoord wrote Casey Smith, saying:

Dr. Chafer has graded your paper on The New Covenant with an A, and has placed it in the library for filling ... As you will soon be writing your Doctor's dissertation ... I am writing to call these things to your attention (172).

He goes on to list two pages of details to be corrected, and concluded by saying, "While details of departure from the form are not of great importance in a graduate paper, never-the-less ... it confuses other students" (172).
January 24, 1950, Dr. Walvoord mailed back the dissertation of John R. Dunkin for final corrections. He wrote, "I hope you will not have too much difficulty getting your dissertation typed and back here in time. As you know, it is due six weeks from today" (93).

April 7, 1950, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Charles Nash, the Registrar, saying, "I wish to report that D. C. Cotten has seven unexcused absences in Theology 104, and I believe you should talk to him about it" (53). David Cotten, in 1986, was not only a successful pastor but also a member of the official Board of the seminary. Dr. Walvoord commented in a personal interview, that he thought David Cotten would never get anywhere. "He was always late to class and skipped all kinds of classes." But then, "... suddenly when he graduated and began pastoring a church, suddenly he became a very disciplined person, a model for church management" (27).

March 17, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Dewey Duncan:

Enclosed you will find an examination in Theological Systems for Tuesday at 3 p.m., classroom 3. As the examination is very simple, just put it on the board, and erase after it is over. . . . You will have to estimate generally, what the grade should be. . . . It is not necessary to be too meticulous about the grading as the students will not see their papers. We will be able to pick out those who are poor without much trouble (92).

He closed the memorandum saying, "Maybe Mr. Rand and Mr. Witmer [of the Faculty] would like to take the exam just for fun, letting them grade their own."

September 25, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote Paul Davidson:
We have completed our first week of school and have 248 students enrolled. There are 76 new students. I have 78 in my theology class . . . [and] you can imagine trying to get that many students in one of our classrooms. We are hoping somebody will invent a double-deck desk chair.

The Presbyterian Church

March 29, 1947, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Earl Winsor in Wheaton, Illinois, concerning a recommendation for a pastor:

Your attention will probably be called to the fact that Dr. [ ] had a difficulty with Fort Worth Presbytery a year ago in which he was deposed from the Presbyterian ministry. I am fully conversant with the facts of the case and it is my opinion that this should not in any way be considered a hindrance to your considering him . . . . The question resolved into the question of whether he was a loyal Presbyterian and it was judged that he was not. The only real evidence introduced was a series of letters written to the Bible Presbyterian Church inquiring about the possibility of transferring from the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. . . . In these letters he stated that it was his opinion that modernism had come into the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. and he wanted to leave it for this reason. The correspondence was removed from his private files without his knowledge and consent and turned over to the Presbytery by another minister (196).

Dr. Walvoord concluded the letter by saying, "It will serve me best if you will hold as confidential your source of information. . . . I am a Presbyterian minister myself."

This gives a little feel for the conflict which was beginning between the Presbyterian Church and graduates from Dallas Theological Seminary.

On June 3, 1947, Dr. Walvoord received a letter from a United Presbyterian alumni, saying:

The committee on Theological Seminaries brought in a memorial asking the U.P. Church accept into the denomination only students who are graduates of seminaries
belonging to the American Association of Theological Seminaries. . . . Although for the time being this situation has been successfully met--I really fear that in the not too distant future the denominational machine is going to do something to keep interdenomina-
tional graduates out. Our own Seminary is slowing up in the number it graduates. This year there were only seven who graduated. This past year there were 36 ministers lost to the church and only 7 received--and there are 115 vacant churches! There are only 60 students of theology in the [Presbyterian] Seminary (40).

September 15, 1947, Dr. Walvoord received a letter from Burlington, Washington, expressing similar concerns:

. . . A small church in the outskirts of Seattle wanted to call [a Dallas graduate] for their pastor, but the Seattle Presbytery U.S.A. men, as soon as they found out he was from Dallas, closed the door for him into the Presbytery. . . . We will be looking for another Dallas man to take over here in about a year (48).

In a letter of recommendation of possible candidates for a Presbyterian Church, Dr. Walvoord remarked, "... The truth of the matter is that Presbyterian ministers among our graduates who are free to move are few in number . . . and I am hard put to it to find suitable candidates for a number of churches who have written me recently" (146).

December 9, 1947, Dr. Walvoord sent a letter of congratulations to Rev. Richard Cochran, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Myrtle Point, Oregon, saying:

Allow me to congratulate you on being embraced in the great fold of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. It is a great fellowship, if you can take it . . . . There is only one Presbyterian left from the last graduating class who is not placed, and he has a number of openings before him already (83).

On December 15, 1947, Dr. Walvoord received a letter
from a pastor of a large church in Houston. In the letter, the alumni said:

Dr. [ ] of the First Presbyterian Church in Houston has offered to recommend me to the Houston Presbytery through the Session of his church, if I would join it. After licensure by the Presbytery he said he would recommend me as a candidate to some of their good churches in this Presbytery. He reminded me of this: "Of course, you know that our church does not accept the dispensational teaching of the Dallas Theological Seminary. A few years ago our General Assembly took action on that." He added that if I could "play their game" and be happy and congenial in the Presbyterian Church, he'd be happy "to start the ball rolling." He assured me that I could be as conservative as I desired, and that they have some very fine men who are premillennialists. . . . All of this seems to indicate that there must be a certain amount of compromise (60).

In a letter to J. Vernon McGee, Dr. Chafer was thinking of someone who could follow McGee in his position at Lincoln Avenue Church in Pasadena. Chafer wrote:

I do not want to see any other man exposed to the insults of that Presbytery and I think the Church should break away from the Presbytery. . . . It will be a new day of freedom and influence for that Church. . . . These are some of the hardships we are having to endure because of the truth which the great Presbyterian Church has practically rejected for the present time (9).

March 31, 1949, Dr. Chafer wrote about his own personal problems within the Southern Presbyterian Church:

The situation in which we find ourselves is a rather difficult one. I cannot at present move from the Southern Church without involving the Seminary with a challenge that we have changed in some way. . . . Since the action of the Assembly three years ago concerning what I teach, it has been the obligation of the Dallas Presbytery to take me in hand, examine me, and prefer charges against me to put me out, but up to the present nothing has been done (8).
He continued by saying:

Not one step has been taken so far as I know, but I am most unpopular. When I attend the Presbytery meetings, scarcely any of the men go out of their way to speak to me. I should like to get free of the whole thing if I could, but thus far have not been able to take any action in that respect because of my relation to the Seminary. I do not think anyone in the Presbytery wants the job of examining me concerning my theology.

He continued by expressing his feelings about the placement of Dallas Seminary men into the Presbyterian Church:

I do not see how we can go on much longer with the Southern [Presbyterian] Church. I am ready to leave on account of its being in the Federal Council. Union with the Northern Church will be so diluted it will have no spiritual or doctrinal character left (8).

October 18, 1949, Dr. Walvoord wrote Arthur Giles:

. . . We are not unaware of the apostasy in many of the leading denominations and our own stand for the truth has resulted in very active opposition to our work in these denominations. It is our policy, however, not to participate in this controversy.
. . . Our graduates are more and more going into independent work and some have withdrawn from their denominational connections (108).

January 5, 1950, Dr. Walvoord was asked to recommend someone for a pastoral position in a Presbyterian Church. He wrote:

. . . He is however, somewhat uncomfortable in the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., and finds it difficult to move around freely in its churches and for this reason would be willing to transfer to the United Presbyterian Church if there were a suitable opening (147).

April 20, 1950, Dr. Walvoord wrote a letter concerning the Presbyterian Church:
I, too, am concerned regarding our Presbyterian students and graduates and the situation seems to be getting worse instead of better. . . . The General Council of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A issued a letter to all the Presbyteries to be read at the regular stated Presbytery meetings urging them not to ordain any graduates of Fuller or Dallas Seminary on the ground that they are not Presbyterian schools, and further, they should not receive into their Presbyteries ordained ministers who are graduates from this institution even if they are in good standing in the Presbytery from which they come (192).

Dr. Walvoord went on to explain the position of Dallas and Fuller Seminaries and their relation to the Church:

... There can be no question that Dallas and Fuller are not Presbyterian schools and the issue is whether they are the equivalent. We are not now and never have been a member of the American Association of Theological Schools. . . . My observation is that even in connection with denominational schools the Association has required a radical overhauling of curriculums, especially where there was in their judgment undue emphasis on Biblical subjects (192).

September 28, 1950, he wrote:

... It seems that the future of our Seminary is going to be almost entirely outside the field of major denominations. I do not know as yet what is going to occur to my Presbyterian status after I move to Dallas. I am required to have the permission of Dallas Presbytery in order to continue in the work here (85).

November 16, 1950, Dr. Chafer wrote Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse, at the Tenth Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia:

... it is not wise to carry the advertisement of this Seminary in your magazine Eternity. We understand and accept your explanation. . . . So far as the Presbyterian Church is concerned, I doubt if they will ever be otherwise than bitterly opposed to the Dallas Seminary. There has been a great injustice wrought here which the whole church has accepted and more or less defends (68).
September 4, 1951, Dr. Walvoord received a letter from Wayland McGlathery, pastor of the First United Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh. McGlathery wrote:

... I am sure that you are cognizant of the General Assembly ruling of our denomination requiring students of theology to attend schools of equal scholastic standing with our own seminary and of reformed faith. This is causing trouble in various Presbyteries. ... The denominational path for a Dallas Graduate is not an easy one, but if I had to do it all over again I would [still] choose "Dallas." Even though the Lord has placed me in an influential church, I'm still somewhat of a black sheep (41).

Dr. Walvoord replied on September 12, 1951:

... It is perhaps impossible to persuade a person who does not want to see the evidence that Dallas Seminary belongs in general to the Reformed faith. ... The only appreciable variation is the premillennial and dispensational approach. It is my opinion that Dallas Seminary is not the real issue though often the excuse for persecution. The real trouble is that we stand for the Lord and His Word and for the precious truth of the Lord's return. This is the real occasion for difficulty (148).

September 25, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote his friend Paul Davidson in Brazil as a missionary:

... You will be interested in the fact that I am leaving the Presbyterian Church and joining the I.F.C.A. [Independent Fundamental Churches of America]. The situation is such that it is impossible to continue in the Presbyterian Church and work entirely outside of it as I am doing now. I could not see that it would further my personal or the Seminary's interest to continue in the Presbyterian Church. We have practically no Presbyterian students left. Most of them belong to independent denominations (87).

October 15, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote Russell Stewart in Craigmont, Idaho, saying, "The pressure is on everywhere of course in the Presbyterian Church to keep out Fuller and
Dallas men and our days of being able to supply Presbyterian pulpits are beginning to close. Most of our ministry now is among independents."

November 16, 1951, Dr. Walvoord wrote a letter comparing the curriculum of Dallas Seminary to Pittsburgh-Xenia Seminary. He wrote:

... A comparison of the Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary with the Dallas Theological Seminary, reveals the following facts: Our entrance requirements are the same. . . . The Pittsburgh-Xenia course is a standard theological curriculum of three years involving 150 quarter hours which is equivalent to 100 semester hours. Our course of study is planned on the semester-hour basis and we require 130 hours for graduation or thirty percent more in terms of class hours. . . . Our course of study is four years in length. . . . As to content, as far as class hours are concerned, we far exceed the Pittsburgh-Xenia standards in Systematic Theology, Hebrew, Greek, and English Bible. We are approximately the same in Church History and Homiletics and Pastoral Theology. . . . In general there is much similarity between our course . . . and any other standard seminary except that we have the advantage of an additional year (175).

Dr. Walvoord went on to evaluate the position of Dallas graduates in the Presbyterian Church:

... Since 1924, however, there has been a growing controversy between those who are liberal in their theological opinion and those who are often called fundamentalists or conservatives. This has precipitated a battle in most large denominations . . . [and] it has been won by the liberals in the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. . . . The outspoken fundamental voice is rapidly becoming extinct. Along with this controversy, there has been an attempt to exclude those who are fundamental in their doctrinal convictions (175).
The way the Presbyterian Church found to exclude Dallas Theological Seminary graduates was further explained by Dr. Walvoord in another letter:

... As a means to this end the Presbyterian denominations have been insisting in recent years on strict observance of the principle that they will ordain only men from their own seminaries. ... The truth is that all of the Presbyterian branches have for the last hundred years received up to one-third of their ministers from seminaries other than their own. The attempt to change the situation has been comparatively recent (195).

Dr. Walvoord summarized the attitude of Dallas Seminary and his own personal philosophy when he stated at the close of this letter:

The principle under which we operate as a seminary is to maintain our distinctive character as an inter-denominational school. ... We do not take part in denominational controversies. It is our purpose to be a service institution training men for the gospel ministry in whatever area God may lead them (195).

In summary, from September 1, 1945, until the death of Lewis Sperry Chafer on August 22, 1952, Dr. John F. Walvoord very competently handled all of the duties assigned to him by Dr. Chafer. He handled all of the executive responsibilities of the seminary; he acted as Chairman of the Faculty; he oversaw all Chapel and public meetings; he wrote hundreds of letters (of which only a sample have been shown); he represented the President in routine administrative decisions around the campus; he handled publicity work for the seminary; and he taught a full load of course work and advised students. All of this he did three days a week, spending the other days traveling or ministering to his church in Fort Worth.
It is not known for sure that it was Dr. Walvoord whom Lewis Sperry Chafer had in mind as the next President of the seminary, but from the evidence displayed as Assistant to the President, it can be assumed that no one could have stepped in and done a more thorough job.
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August 21, 1952, Dr. Walvoord wrote a letter to Fulton Lytle at the Mt. Hermon Conference Center, in which he expressed concern for the health of Lewis Sperry Chafer. "The last word from Dr. Chafer indicates that his condition is about the same and that he is still taking oxygen, now in the eighth week. It is problematic whether he will be able to come back to Dallas soon" (89). Dr. Chafer was not able to return to Dallas, and died in Seattle, August 22, 1952.

In a personal interview, Dr. Walvoord described the process involved in selecting a replacement for Dr. Chafer. The chairman of the Board of Incorporate Members and one of the principle financial men of the Board offered the job of President to Dr. John G. Mitchell, pastor of Central Bible Church in Portland, Oregon. However, they did so without consulting the official Board. Dr. Walvoord described the situation:

Five or six years before [Dr. Chafer] died [about 1944-1945], he dictated a long letter to a public stenographer. No one knew the contents of it except that he put it in a sealed envelope in the safe; and he told Dr. Lincoln, the secretary, to open it after he died and read it to the Board. Well, in the letter, he went through all the potential candidates that might be available and explained why they wouldn't work. And then he nominated me; and that was amazing because I was as green as grass. . . . Well, I had a book on
the Holy Spirit in 1942, and I got out a few books, but I was unknown. I had done a few Bible Conferences, but I was a nobody. So, when it came time to elect a new President, they of course read this letter. There . . . was an impass with the chairman, and this main guy wanting to elect this fellow [Dr. Mitchell], and the rest of the Board didn't want to cross them, but they felt they should follow Dr. Chafer's advice. I wasn't in the meeting. I was outside cooling my heels for two and a half hours while they debated. A LONG two and a half hours!

The result of the Board meeting was that they elected Dr. Walvoord to be the next President of the Seminary. He explained that both of the men involved in wanting someone else came to him within a year and said he was the best choice. Dr. Walvoord explained that, "... I think the Lord intervened, not because I was President, but because He wanted the institution to be what it is today." Dr. Mitchell, being the godly man that he was, never attacked Dr. Walvoord, but continued to come to the Seminary and minister to the students as a Professor of English Bible. "You look back over the Seminary [history] and there are so many instances like that, that could have just dramatically changed the whole situation." (7).

In a personal interview with Dr. John G. Mitchell, he said:

... Well, one of the committee came to me—there really is nothing to it—he came and asked me if I would consider following Dr. Chafer. I said, "No, I've got my work in Portland." I said John Walvoord is the logical man. So that's all there is to it. I worked here [at Multnomah School of the Bible and Central Bible Church], and it is where I felt God wanted me. It was an honor to be asked in the first place, I was surprised they even asked—but I said that Dr. Walvoord has been working closely with Dr. Chafer and he is the logical man (14).
Dr. Mitchell went on to describe the last few weeks of Dr. Chafer's life and his own involvement with him at the time:

... The problem [developed] because of my close association and relationship with Dr. Chafer. You see, I [preached] the service for Dr. Chafer in Seattle, and in fact went to see Dr. Chafer when he was sick—he had been with me for a week of meetings here, and he had to sit down to teach. He was a sick man. And so I called the man who was up in Seattle who Dr. Chafer was going to stay with and then I put him on a Pullman Car, not a coach. He was a sick man, and I said to be sure and be there to meet him. I didn't know he was going to have an ambulance there to pick him up. He took him to his home, and I went up to see him. Dr. Chafer did talk to me personally about what I thought of the leadership of Dallas Seminary—I don't remember—we just chatted like a father to a son. After he died I had the memorial service for him in Seattle and then went to the service for him down in Dallas, and John Walvoord asked me to do it. But as for the question of the Presidency, there was no question in my mind it was John Walvoord.

Under the title, "Board of Incorporate Members Unanimously Elects Dr. John F. Walvoord President of Seminary," the November-December, 1952 Bulletin went on to say:

... Dr. Walvoord has been associated with Dallas Seminary since 1931, first as a student and then as a faculty member and an administrative officer. This is one of the longest continuous associations with the school represented on the present faculty and staff... Twice while a pastor, Dr. Walvoord served as moderator of the Fort Worth Presbytery... From 1945 until Dr. Chafer's death, Dr. Walvoord served as Assistant to the President. Most of this time he was also Chairman of the Faculty (1, p. 3).

Dr. Walvoord did not slow down his rapid pace. The Bulletin goes on to say that he participated in the Congress on Prophecy at the Calvary Baptist Church in New York City,
November 9-13; he addressed the Philadelphia Prophetic Conference in Bethlehem Presbyterian Church, November 10; he spoke at the First Baptist Church in Bloomfield, New Jersey, November 9; he attended a Gideon Rally in Chatham, Ontario, Canada, November 15; he spoke at the Oxford Street Baptist Church, Woodstock, Ontario, November 16; and he spoke at the Chapel services of the London (Ontario) Bible Institute and Theological Seminary, November 17, 1952. Dr. Walvoord stepped down as Secretary to the Board of Incorporate Members and as Secretary to the Board of Regents, and became Editor of *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Chairman of the Faculty, and Chairman of the Curriculum Committee.

December 2, 1952, Dr. Walvoord received one of many letters of congratulations. "Congratulations concerning your election as President of Dallas Seminary. I feel confident that this was the Lord’s direction, and trust that you shall be peculiarly conscious of the Lord’s guidance in every step that is made" (24).

Dr. Walvoord continued his job much as he had been doing for the last several years. In a letter to J. Vernon McGee, December 11, 1952, he invited McGee to speak at the Mt. Hermon Conference in 1953. Simultaneous Conferences were planned in Palo Alto and San Francisco. He wrote, "... We still need about $25,000 for the Chapel and have not been able to order the seats which are included in that figure" (96). The chapel building was nearing completion.
On December 29-30, 1952, Dr. Walvoord was nominated to be Vice President for the Evangelical Theological Society. His duties included oversight of the program and site location of the 1953 meeting. He handled the details promptly.

In January, 1953, Dr. Walvoord was making final arrangements for the Mt. Hermon Conference. He secured the services of Ted L. Bradley as his music director. Bradley was a faculty member at Multnomah School of the Bible in Portland, Oregon at the time. With the conference set, he turned his attention to the upcoming Chapel dedication and his own installation as the second President of the Seminary. To J. F. Strombeck, he wrote:

... As you will notice by the report I am sending to all the Board members, the dedication of our chapel is set for February 6 [1953]. ... One of the items about which I am particularly concerned is the question of having a defined policy about the expansion fund now that the Chapel is completed. I believe there may be a tendency on the part of some of the board members to want to drop the matter for a while (118).

He went on to discuss the reasons he felt the board might want to keep the fund going. He used the argument that following the completion of the Stearns Hall renovation, it took almost two full years for the board to consider further expansion and then, "... the board voted to establish the fund for the chapel only after they were prodded into it by a donation from the student body" (118). The board felt that the school could not afford to have a building fund because it detracted from the general fund. He continued by saying:
I am hearing the same argument again. It is my opinion that this argument is without basis in fact. . . . Whenever we make an appeal for the expansion fund, most of the offerings came to the general fund and the result is that we get a good deal of money that otherwise would have been untapped (118).

Dr. Walvoord did not want to push the matter too hard, but he did not want the board to be content with building the Chapel and then forgetting about further much needed expansion. He suggested that, "... if the board were willing, we could at least take official action designating the addition to Davidson Hall as the next phase of the expansion fund and make provision so that those who wanted to give ... can do so" (118).

January 17, 1953, Dr. Walvoord wrote John E. Mitchell, Jr., a Dallas businessman and member of the board:

... As you know, the chapel was one of Dr. Chafer's fondest dreams. ... During the early course of its construction he would sit by the hour in his office with his chair facing the window where he could watch every operation. Right up to the time that he went home to be with the Lord he was kept informed of the progress of the Chapel. One of the last conversations I had with him when I visited him in Seattle concerned seating for the Chapel (102).

January 28, Dr. Walvoord sent a memorandum to C. Fred Lincoln, listing thirteen items that needed to be attended to before the dedication of the Chapel. They concerned the flower beds, light fixtures, radiators, a plaque and organ, Dr. Chafer's picture, a piano, furniture, bricks which needed repaired, locks on the doors, matching chairs for the platform, and cleaning the floor in the radio room. "Whatever
can be done to improve the appearance along the sidewall and
curbs parallel to the Chapel should be done before the dedi-
cation" (81). At this time—and for many years to come, the
seminary would have two leaders, neither of which was account-
able to the other—Dr. Walvoord and C. Fred Lincoln.

January 31, 1953, just one week before his inauguration,
Dr. Walvoord was making plans for John G. Mitchell to come
to campus for his Bible lecture series. Dr. Mitchell had
been the person instrumental in developing the idea of visit-
ing Bible lecturers:

... About 1933-34, I went back to Dallas [after
having graduated and moved to Portland, Oregon], as
visiting faculty. We visited for a month--three
classes in the morning and a church meeting at
night--a great life, three or four meetings a day--
but [Dr. Chafer] couldn't get men to come for a
month. So about the third year I was down there,
he wanted me to leave Portland and go down to Dallas
and head the English Bible Department. I said no,
but I said, "Why don't you get men for two weeks,
give them the whole student body and teach the books
of the Bible." We did it in February, and I guess
I went down there for thirty-five or thirty-six
years, every February. And then they stopped that
because the faculty thought we fellows were getting
the best books [of the Bible] and they were left
with the rest (14).

Dr. Walvoord did everything he could to make Dr. Mitchell
welcome at the seminary, and in 1986 they both continued to
have tremendous respect for each other.

J. Vernon McGee said the following concerning the inaugu-
ration of Dr. Walvoord:

... When Dr. Chafer passed from the scene, and
John was mentioned as the next President, I was
opposed to it. But it wasn't that I opposed John
Walvoord. I was FOR Lewis Sperry Chafer. I couldn't
give him up—but he was gone. It took me a little while to get some sense, but when I did, I found out several things. John did a tremendous job, and he was an excellent teacher. My feeling is that he was the man to follow Dr. Chafer as no one else could have. . . . And I want to say that I learned to appreciate his honesty, his integrity, and his candor—he was a man I could have confidence in. Very frankly, I was delighted to call him a friend, a very personal friend (26, p. 9).

Reflecting back on his inauguration, Dr. Walvoord said, "I was prepared, I think, yet also quite overwhelmed in another sense with the responsibility. I was younger [42]—certainly younger than most of the faculty—and it wasn't easy at first" (16).

February 6, 1953, was a combined dedication of the Chapel and inauguration of Dr. Walvoord. In an article in the Bulletin it said, "Chafer Chapel is the first major building constructed on the main seminary campus since the completion of the D. M. Stearns Hall, the Seminary dormitory, in 1929." It went on to say that it was the first building supported entirely by the voluntary contributions of the Seminary family. The final pricetag was $170,000. It continued:

Testimony to God's faithfulness in this experience as in all others in the history of Dallas Seminary was a theme of the address by John E. Mitchell, Jr., chairman of the Board of Trustees. . . . Dr. Walvoord was unanimously elected President and Professor of Systematic Theology by the Board of Incorporate Members October 10, 1952, J. F. Strombeck, chairman of the board indicated in presiding at the inauguration ceremony (2, p. 2).

The article closed by noting that "... $20,000 is still needed to pay completely for Chafer Chapel. The Boards . . . invite cooperation in prayer for this provision" (2, p. 2).
February 13, 1953, Dr. Walvoord wrote Mrs. Harry Ironside, describing the dedication of the organ she had donated:

... We had a very beautiful service of dedication for the Chapel on February 6 and for the organ on February 8. ... The organ dedication service was most effective, I believe. The Chapel was practically full. ... We also featured the organ throughout the Dedicatory Bible Conference, having a fifteen-minute recital preceding each lecture. A bronze plaque ... has been mounted on the organ where it is visible to the audience. ... We used some of the additional funds you sent to buy ... twenty armchairs for the faculty and fifty additional chairs without arms for the choir (67).

Also on February 13, Dr. Walvoord appointed John Witmer Director of Publicity and Editor of the Bulletin, saying, "You will understand that under our constitution the President is held responsible for all publicity work and publication. For this reason, I should appreciate it if you would work with me much along the pattern we have worked before" (14). Dr. Witmer continued in the position until the seminary hired a full time Director of Publicity in the summer of 1960. February 13, Dr. Walvoord was also concerned for faculty interests. He reported to Howard Hendricks:

At a called meeting of the Board of Regents on February 7 [the day after the Inauguration and Dedication of the Chapel], action was taken extending to you an invitation and call to be Instructor in Practical Theology beginning September 1, 1953, contingent however on the completion of all your work for the Th.D. degree. In the event you find it impossible to qualify, the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents is empowered to work out with you an extension of the present full-time teaching-fellow status. ... It is my personal opinion that the Lord's hand is on you to do a great work in the teaching field and I am looking to God to give you grace and enablement and maturity for the use of your gifts to the full (62).
February 19, Dr. Walvoord lined up a speaking engagement at the National Convention of the Independent Fundamental Churches of America in Chicago. He listed his title for the event as "Will the Church Be Translated [raptured—or taken to Heaven] Before the Tribulation?" On February 21, he lined up speaking engagements for the Harrisburg Circuit beginning March 18. In addition to the regular meetings on the Circuit, he was scheduled to speak at the Christian High School, the Boston Youth for Christ, and the radio broadcast "Fellowship Hour."

February 23, 1953, Dr. Walvoord wrote Alfred Martin at the Moody Bible Institute, thanking him for the support and loyalty offered by the alumni in the Chicago area. It was just a few years before, that men in the Chicago area were demanding that Dr. Chafer name his successor, and Dr. John G. Mitchell had been their favorite candidate. In Dr. Martin's letter to Dr. Walvoord, Martin said, "... Dr. and Mrs. Jack [John G.] Mitchell were also with us. ... Dr. Mitchell spoke of criticisms that some people make of Dallas and said the alumni who are doing the job for the Lord are sufficient answer to them" (92). Had John G. Mitchell felt any bitterness at not being named President of Dallas Seminary, he would have found fuel to add to the fire in the Chicago area. However, no mention is made that Dr. Mitchell felt any bitterness at all. In a personal interview with him in Portland, Oregon, he said, "If I would have gone to Dallas, there
would be no Multnomah School of the Bible." This school was where his heart was at the time and has remained until now, where he continues to serve as Chairman of the Board. He is now in his mid-nineties and continues to preach and teach.

Also on February 23, Dr. Walvoord wrote a letter to George Ladd at Fuller Seminary, describing the philosophy of Bibliotheca Sacra. "... Our aim in Bibliotheca Sacra has been to avoid, on the one hand, limiting our subscriptions to technical scholars and, on the other hand, we have not attempted to write a popular journal" (77). He said instead they have made it their aim to minister to the average pastor or seminary student, with some articles of interest to scholars.

Dr. Walvoord continued his responsibilities of handling special Chapel lectures. Alva J. McClain of Grace Theological Seminary was invited to be the Griffith Thomas lecturer in 1953. Other responsibilities included being editor of Bibliotheca Sacra. This area involved additional work now as the result of the successful campaign initiated while he was Assistant to the President. The office had not been able to handle all of the new correspondence which came to them. He wrote, "... I understand that they are over two months behind on correspondence and I am beginning to get letters of complaint" (81). He hired additional secretarial help to handle the work load.

In closing the letter above, Dr. Walvoord made what was to become a "classic" statement of his, according to secretaries
interviewed for this study. He said, "In clearing my desk before I leave on my trip, I am taking this means of referring the problem to you" (81). Dr. Walvoord never left for an extended period of time without doing all he could to "clear his desk" before he left.

March 12, 1953, was a special day for Dr. Walvoord. He wrote:

... I met Billy Graham personally yesterday while he was in Dallas and the matter of Dr. Chafer's Systematic Theology was discussed. He has already ordered a set for himself. Dr. Graham would not let me present him with a free set (95).

In a memorandum to the student body, March 26, Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... At a recent meeting of the Board of Trustees, a tuition fee of $50.00 per semester was established, effective the fall semester, 1953. ... The amount to be charged is less than 20% of the cost of the education each student is receiving. The Seminary obviously needs the funds. ... The Board of Trustees also established a student aid fund ... to relieve hardship cases of students who cannot reasonably pay the tuition charge (119).

In a personal interview, Dr. Walvoord said, "Dr. Chafer wanted to give the students free everything--free tuition, free room and board. The trustees turned him down on free room and board and charged about what it cost." He went on to mention that at the board meeting, "... they looked out the window and here were a bunch of student's cars in the parking lot, a lot of which were brand new, and there was no evidence of poverty. The students could pay it." Some of the students thought it was terrible and that the
seminary wasn't trusting the Lord any more. The student body president at the time fought Dr. Walvoord the entire year. He said, "... I wrote a memorandum to the students—a full sheet—on why we were charging tuition... students should walk by faith too..." The students spread a rumor that eighty students would not come back the next year, but that was not the case. Dr. Walvoord scheduled a special meeting to hear complaints, and only six students showed up—and they just wanted to hear what other students had to say. There was no revolt (18).

New faculty appointees for the fall of 1953 were Charles Ryrie as Instructor and both Howard Hendricks and John Anderson as Teaching Fellows. No other changes were made.

March 26, 1953, Dr. Walvoord wrote his friend Herbert Kann. The letter was notably absent of any humor or puns. Dr. Kann was in the process of resigning the Oliver Presbyterian Church in Minneapolis. Dr. Walvoord answered his letter saying:

I should very much like to help... However, I have just about ceased attempting to place men in the Presbyterian Church. I find that a recommendation from the Seminary is more of a liability than a help unless the church has committed itself ahead of time to wanting our type of ministry... When a man is a fundamentalist or a conservative somehow he gets very little help in securing a church, whereas they will turn handsprings to help a liberal (73).

In a letter to J. Vernon McGee, March 28, 1953, Dr. Walvoord outlined McGee's preaching duties for the August Mt. Hermon Conference. He closed the letter saying,
"I just returned from an extensive trip to the East in which I participated in a half dozen Bible Conferences" (97). Now back on campus, Dr. Walvoord resumed other duties besides Conference organization and correspondence. April 3, he sent a letter to Charles Nash, the Registrar, saying:

On March 26, I interviewed [ ]. . . . In the event he makes application permit me to discuss his case with you. I have some serious questions whether he, on the basis of his personality, is a suitable candidate for the ministry, and he might prove a problem child. We probably would have to refuse him admission on some other ground as it would aggravate his difficulty further if we told him the whole story (112).

April 3, Dr. Walvoord also wrote a letter to Ralph T. Davis, General Secretary of the Africa Inland Mission. He expressed regret at having missed Davis, who was a Chapel speaker while Dr. Walvoord had been on the East coast. He wrote, ". . . students and faculty have reported their delight in the effectiveness of the program. . . . The students reported that your ministry was one of the most effective of any of the speakers and I should be delighted to hear you" (50).

Moody Monthly had been requesting an article on the Biblical book of First Thessalonians, and on April 3, Dr. Walvoord sent them a letter outlining three possible articles he could write. The articles included one on First Thessalonians, a series on "the translation [rapture] of the church coupled with the practical exhortations that are contained in each context," and an Old Testament study of either Ezra,
Nehemiah, or Esther. All of this was in addition to the speaking, teaching, and administrative duties which were his. April 8, he listed courses he planned to teach in the 1953-1954 school year. For the Fall he planned to teach Spiritual Life and an elective class on Premillennialism and in the spring, Theology 104 and Theology 106, with an additional class on Amillennialism. He outlined the course load for Charles Ryrie, who was to be a visiting Instructor for the coming year. Ryrie would teach Theology 103, Theology of Crisis, and Pauline Theology in the Fall and he would teach Theology of the Pentateuch, Theology of James, Peter and Jude in the Spring, and handle other duties of an Instructor.

April 13, Dr. Walvoord wrote J. Palmer Muntz, who was considering Dr. Walvoord for an honorary degree at Wheaton College. Dr. Muntz was instrumental in getting Dr. Walvoord listed in "Who's Who in America." Dr. Walvoord wrote, "I should be happy to be considered for an honorary degree at Wheaton College if they desire to do this... Wheaton College elected me to their Scholastic Honor Society a few years ago" (110).

April 21, 1953, Dr. Walvoord addressed a letter to Nye J. Langmade of the Independent Fundamental Churches of America. He wrote:

... I wish herewith to withdraw my recommendation of Mr. [ ] which I made several weeks ago in connection to his application for admission to the I.F.C.A. The faculty... today, has dishonorably dismissed [ ] as a student on the ground of confessed immorality extending over some period of time (78).
April 30, Dr. Walvoord wrote Judge T. W. Davidson, who worked at the Federal Building in Dallas. It involved another young man who had been placed in jail:

... I am familiar with the facts in this case. ... I have been acquainted with the parents of this young man for some time. Without minimizing the seriousness of the case, I have come to believe that in this instance there are grounds for extending mercy to the accused. ... He is very young and did not realize the seriousness of what he was doing. It is evident to me after interviewing him that he has learned his lesson and can be reclaimed as a useful and honorable citizen. If this his first offense is taken as sufficient ground for a reformatory sentence, I feel that it would do more harm than good (49).

No further word was available in the Archives as to the outcome of his trial or of his subsequent personal history.

On May 4, Dr. Walvoord visited Wheaton College, and on his return sent a note to Charles Nash about eleven men he interviewed while there. Each man was listed, followed by a detailed description of Dr. Walvoord's impressions of each one.

May 22-27, Dr. Walvoord attended the National Convention of the Independent Fundamental Churches of America meeting. In the program he was scheduled for the closing meeting, speaking on the subject, "Did the Church Begin at Pentecost." On June 3, after returning from the meeting, he mailed a thank you letter to the General Secretary, Nye J. Langmade. He wrote, "We appreciate a great deal your faithful remembrance of the boys [Dr. Walvoord's two sons] by means of your card. You certainly are a thoughtful man for one who has so much to do" (79).
June 3, 1953, Dr. Walvoord was involved in an oral examination for a doctrinal student. The student was denied the doctoral degree on the basis of the examination. The student wrote Dr. Walvoord:

... I have just returned from Dr. Nash's office where I received the news of my rejection. ... I came into the examination wholly unaware as to what it would be like, or the nature of the meeting. I felt that the major professor or someone would inform me as to what to expect. ... I have felt for some time Dr. Walvoord that my Southern Baptist background was going to make a difference in my chances of getting a degree. ... As my graduate professor, I would greatly appreciate your advice as to what to do (134).

Dr. Walvoord responded the following day:

... There was no question in my mind or any of the members of the committee that your examination was unsatisfactory. ... You are entitled to another application and examination a year hence if you desire to do so. I do not believe that it would justify spending another year in residence to prepare for it. ... I was surprised that you did not do better the other day. ... It is always a deep regret to us when matters like this occur, but it is a part of the hazards of higher education. ... Whether or not you plan to pursue your work here further, allow me to say it was a pleasure to work with you and we trust your studies were profitable in helping you in your work for the Lord even if they did not culminate in a degree (131).

July 7, Dr. Walvoord was again writing Van Kampen Press about the publication of his book on the Holy Spirit. He wrote:

... Much of it has been rewritten and the format of course will be entirely new. What I want to know now is whether you are vitally interested in it as I want to give you first opportunity. I am anxious to get it in print as soon as possible as I shall need it in January 1954, for a class I will be teaching (121).
During July, Dr. Walvoord was busy handling details of the upcoming conferences, particularly arrangements for the Mt. Hermon Conference and the two simultaneous conferences in San Francisco and Palo Alto. Even with so much on his mind, he was still intimately involved in details related to the seminary. July 10 he sent a letter to a student, now back home in Ohio for the summer, saying:

... When I stopped in the barber shop a few days ago [ ] inquired about a gift he had sent over for the seminary by you. He said he handed it to you early in June. A search of our records in the business office does not reveal that the gift came to us. Possibly this matter was overlooked by you ... (132).

June 24, 1953, Dr. Walvoord had received a letter from Rev. Richard Seume, pastoring the Madison Avenue Baptist Church, Paterson, New Jersey, saying:

... Within the last two months the Lord has seemed to indicate His will that we should lay down the tools of sacred trust committed to us here and move on. ... I have given the past two months to counseling and assisting the Pulpit Committee in its organization. ... I finish on the 28th ... but I do want to assure you of my personal interest in the work here and any part you may be able to play in its further ministry (33).

July 10, he responded to Rev. Seume with a list of three men which were described in detail. He recommended James A. Nelson, Cyril I. Reid, and James H. Comstock. He closed the letter by saying, "... We shall follow you in your new work with interest and trust the Lord will continue to bless in all your testimony for Him. Remember us to Mrs. Seume" (117). Richard Seume was later
to become the Chaplain at Dallas Seminary and Mrs. Seume would serve as the Dean of Women. Richard Seume served the seminary for many years until he passed into the Lord's presence in 1986.

Following the inauguration of Dr. Walvoord, an article had appeared in The Sunday School Times, June 13, which announced his Presidency. In the article, it made the statement, "... We trust these businessmen [the Board] may take legal precautions against any future alienation of this property by New-Unitarians" (10). June 19, Dr. Walvoord wrote the magazine saying:

... To say the least, we feel that the last sentence of this paragraph has most unfortunate implications. The average reader gathers that my inauguration as President of Dallas Seminary somehow indicates a possible dangerous trend toward new-unitarianism. We have already had adverse reaction from our constituency. ... We have already had a request from one of our important donors for the facts involved. ... There have been those who have been interested in criticizing and misrepresenting Dallas Seminary, but as far as I know this is the first time in the history of this institution that either our friends or enemies have ever implied that we were Unitarian. We believe the situation is sufficiently serious to request a printed correction in your publication (120).

July 11, 1953, a retraction was printed, under the title, "The Times Heartily Endorses Dallas Seminary." The article states that, "... The Editor regrets that this sentence was the cause of any misunderstanding. He is sure [the author] did not intend to question the present doctrinal soundness of the Seminary, or any of its faculty." The article continued by saying, "What he undoubtedly had in mind was the history
of many New England Colleges and Universities and Seminaries . . . founded on the Bible . . . for the purpose of giving young people a thoroughly Christian education . . . but have departed from the faith" (11). The article closed giving a statement of full confidence in Dr. Walvoord as the new President of Dallas Seminary.

July 19, 1953, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Dewey Duncan from the Blue Water Conference Center. He thanked him for sending up his correspondence, which was there when he arrived. Of concern was a note from Dr. Bennetch, stating that he was resigning from the Seminary to take a pastorate in Virginia. Dr. John Witmer was asked to take over Bennetch's responsibilities as Associate Editor of Bibliotheca Sacra:

... It will also be fitting to have a nice article in the Bulletin even though it should be probably brief, wishing him well in his new work. We do not plan to replace him immediately but this should not be said in the article. ... Hope this finds all going well in Dallas. The conference is going well, with good attendance, much better than last year (127).

Dr. Witmer said in a personal interview, July 29, 1986, that with every increase in responsibility at the school, there was never more financial renumeration given (20). It seems that several of the older men on staff or faculty at the seminary would have liked to replace Dr. Chafer as President and Bennetch was not the only one who would resign.

July 21, Dr. Walvoord wrote J. Vernon McGee, saying:

We are spending this week at Blue Water Conference. . . . Next week I will be at Canadian Keswick and then follow with a week at Winona
before hitting the trail for Los Angeles [and the Mt. Hermon Conference]. You will probably want subjects for the 16th and the 19th of August while I am at the [Church of The] Open Door.

Dr. Walvoord closed the letter with a P. S. "... You will be interested in the news that through a legacy received we were able to pay off $25,000 on the Chapel, leaving only $4,000 due on the seating. This is a wonderful answer to prayer" (98).

Also on July 21, he wrote Fulton Lytle at Mt. Hermon:

Dr. McGee is now planning on speaking on the subject "Should the House Un-American Activities Committee Investigate the Clergy?" He has used this subject in Los Angeles and drew a big crowd. Also he has arranged for Lee Childs of the Hollywood Christian group to sing (90).

July 24, Dr. Walvoord wrote S. L. Johnson in Dallas, asking him to help absorb the teaching load of Dr. Bennetch. He said, "... It is hardly feasible to attempt a replacement of any permanent character for the fall semester as the time is too short" (69). He asked Dr. Johnson's advice on how to handle the three courses Bennetch would have taught and they made suitable arrangements.

When he arrived at Winona Lake August 3, 1953, he found his mail waiting. "... Your letter and materials were waiting for me when I arrived" (51). He went on to list items for "Who's Who in America," which were requested. He concluded the letter noting, "... The conference is going well here in Winona. We are beginning to count the days until the return journey to Dallas." At the bottom of the page he noted, "Grades--Systems--Mortimer, A; Watson, B."
August 5, he wrote to Dr. McGee from Winona Lake, giving the titles for his messages while he would be at the Church of the Open Door. They were, "The Gospel of the Anti-Christ," on August 16, for the morning message; "Paul's Best Sermon," for the evening message, and "The Day of the Lord in Relation to the Lord's Return," for the August 19th message. He concluded the letter by saying, ". . . We are driving to Los Angeles with the family, leaving August 11. . . . Please hold any mail I might receive" (99).

Dewey Duncan wrote Dr. Walvoord on August 5, 1953:

Your letter from Winona Lake of the third came today. . . . I have gone through the mail here and I believe there is nothing that really needs your attention now. . . . What has collected here can very well wait until your return from the northwest in September (9).

August 11, Dr. Walvoord wrote John G. Mitchell in Oregon:

. . . We have been impressed with the need for more emphasis in the field of Biblical exegesis on the level that would appeal to Seminary graduates, as well as more advanced Biblical scholars. . . . I am wondering whether in your busy life you can find time to give us an article of approximately 2500 words. . . . We plan to issue the publicity matter this fall and it would be a help to us to have your contribution listed. While no honorarium is provided for contributed articles, we shall be happy to give you extra copies (104).

The Mt. Hermon Bible Conference Program for August 23-30 listed Dr. Walvoord speaking four times, on the subjects of "Power in Prayer;" "Building Broken Altars;" "The Temple of God;" and "The Way of Revival." At the Palo Alto Conference he was listed as speaking on "Israel's Future Day," and at the San Francisco Conference on, "The Church in Prophecy."
Other speakers included J. Vernon McGee, S. L. Johnson, Merrill Unger and Earl F. Morgan (pastor of Calvary Baptist Church in San Francisco). The familiar face of John G. Mitchell was notably missing. In a letter dated October 21, 1953, Dr. Mitchell was placed back on the program for 1954. Dr. Mitchell wrote:

... I do not know where you received the information that I was suffering from overwork this summer. It is true that there are times when one becomes tired, but we have gone right along with our work. In fact, we have not had any vacation at all this summer (105).

Dr. Mitchell went on to mention that Dr. Walvoord might use one of his Bible lectures at the Seminary for the requested article for Bibliotheca Sacra.

After returning from the busy summer, Dr. Walvoord went right back to work at the seminary. He found waiting for him a letter from the Commission on Education of the National Association of Evangelicals. In the lengthy letter was a discussion of "Should theological seminaries provide four-year training for students preparing for the ministry." They discussed the advantages, and discussed how the additional year might affect enrollment. The paragraph concluded with, "... See Dr. Walvoord's letter ... attached." The letter was one addressed to Dr. Richard S. Beal, Jr., at the Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary in Denver (28).

Dr. Walvoord had written:

... I am glad to know that your Seminary is considering seriously a four-year program. ... No doubt, in any case where standards are raised it
will discourage some of the fainthearted and I presume some students avoid us because of our high standards. On the other hand, we had a definite increase in enrollment the first year the four-year course went into effect in 1936 [?]. . . .

The type of student who is hindered most by the four-year requirement is the poor student who has difficulty keeping up with Master's level quality. . . . I believe the fundamental question is not whether we should have three or four years, but whether we can offer an adequate training in the time specified. We have found it impossible (114).

September 9, 1953, Dr. Walvoord was in correspondence with Van Kampen Press, and he wrote:

. . . By this time you probably have been able to examine the manuscript. . . . I should greatly appreciate it if the book could be available by the first of February. . . . I shall be teaching it next spring to a class of about seventy-five students. During January, February and March I shall be conducting six different Bible Conferences where it would probably have a good sale. . . . In any case I do not want a hurried job that would not be up to standard (122).

September 10, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Howard Hendricks, who was still serving as a teaching fellow at the seminary. He had been offered the position of Instructor, depending on the completion of the work for the Th.D. degree. Dr. Walvoord wrote:

. . . In order to supply your temporal needs for the coming school year, the Administrative Committee has authorized a salary of $2700 per year plus a cost-of-living bonus of $75.00 a month. . . . We sincerely hope that the larger salary provided this year will enable you to meet your needs with less effort than in the previous year and will give you some freedom from financial limitation. . . . It has been decided that teaching fellows will be invited to attend faculty meetings and participate in the discussion as may be required though without vote (63).

By way of contrast, during the same year, Merrill Unger received $3600.00 plus $100.00 a month bonus. S. L. Johnson
received $2800.00 and the bonus, but Johnson was active in a full-time ministry at a church in Dallas and received a lower salary as a result (70).

September 18, Dr. Walvoord was asked to sit on the Board of the Jewish Evangelical Witness (J.E.W.) organization. He already was involved with the American Association of Jewish Evangelism, Inc., in Winona Lake, Indiana. He consulted Dr. Abraham B. Machlin and asked for his "unbiased" opinion of the new (J.E.W.) organization. Dr. Machlin responded, saying, "There is nothing derogatory I can say. . . . I can, however, fully understand his desire to have you serve on their Board" (25). Dr. Walvoord was asked by Machlin to sit on the board of his own organization, and Dr. Walvoord wrote him back, saying, "I appreciate very much the invitation to serve on the Advisory Council of the American Association of Jewish Evangelism. It would seem best . . . not to accept the other invitation, as in some sense the two organizations are competitive" (91).

In October, 1953, Dr. Walvoord was busy planning the program for the December meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, of which he was Vice President. By October 8, the program was complete and all speakers had been informed of their part in the program. The only place left to fill was one short morning devotional, and he wrote to William Culbertson at Moody Bible Institute, requesting him to give it. Dr. Culbertson accepted the invitation (48).
Also in October, Dr. Walvoord had mailed out the yearly Report of the President, and October 12 he received a letter from Dr. R. V. Edman, President of Wheaton College, saying, "... Just a wee word of very warm congratulations on the Annual Report. ... We all do well to keep our people informed; and your annual report is excellently done. Chin up and knees down!" (12).

Dr. Walvoord wrote Carl Armerding at Wheaton College explaining plans for an upcoming Bible lecture at the Seminary which would be given by Armerding:

... Things are going very smoothly here at the Seminary and the Lord is certainly blessing us in many ways. While as usual we do not have any great supply of funds, we are rejoicing in the fact that faculty salaries are currently paid in full, which is quite unusual for this time of year. We of course, are faced with the staggering costs of putting an addition on Davidson Hall, which will probably cost $200,000 and for which we have no funds in hand (36).

October 22, 1953, Dr. Walvoord wrote to John G. Mitchell, giving him information for the Bible lecture series coming up in February. Dr. Walvoord requested that they include an evening series for the week "... beginning either Monday or Tuesday night and extending through either Friday or Saturday." Dr. Walvoord also wrote, "I know there are many local friends of yours who love to hear your ministry in the Word who would greatly enjoy having such a series of meetings scheduled" (106).

October 22, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Warren C. Young at Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, concerning the December
meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society:

... It happens that I am going to be in Chicago next week from Monday through Wednesday noon. ... I wondered if [we] could go over ... the program to put it in final shape. You have had more experience in this than I have and I am sure that two minds are better than one. I am also not clear as to the mechanics of how the announcement should be made to the association (130).

Before he left for Chicago, Dr. Walvoord "cleared his desk" by writing several memorandums. He wrote C. Fred Lincoln, asking that repairs be made in his office, and asked Dr. Lincoln to preside at the faculty prayer meetings. He also asked Dr. Witmer to cover his radio broadcast while he was gone. "I believe we are one [broadcast] ahead and that this will take care of it" (82).

November 3, Dr. Walvoord was back in the office, making arrangements for the Summer 1954 Mt. Hermon Conference. John G. Mitchell was asked to be on the program, but he declined because of travel conflicts. Dr. Walvoord wrote to Carl Armerding, asking him to participate in the place of Dr. Mitchell. "It would serve to make your trip to the West Coast more worthwhile to have at least two weeks of meetings lined up. It is entirely possible that you can arrange other meetings yourself" (37).

On campus, Dr. Walvoord was asked to evaluate a financial policy for the Men's Gospel Team, which traveled representing the seminary. Dr. Walvoord felt the Team should use their own stationary and be responsible for their own finances. He wrote, "Under no circumstances should two
offerings be taken in the same meeting and no pressure whatever should be put upon the audience as a group or as individuals in the matter of making donations either to the Team or to the Seminary" (53).

November 30, 1953, Dr. Walvoord wrote Miss Louise Walvoord:

... A few days after Christmas I shall be going to Chicago for a meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, which is an organization of Christian scholars, of which I happen to be Vice-President and Program Chairman this year. After this meeting which will be December 30-31 I will go to Pennsylvania for ten days of Bible Conferences in four different cities. Immediately after the conclusion of this series of meetings I will go to Los Angeles by way of Dallas where I will be another ten days there in the Torrey Memorial Bible Conference put on each year by the Bible Institute of Los Angeles. There is a bare possibility that I will be able to circle back by way of Seattle in order to fill a speaking engagement there (125).

After the founding of Fuller Seminary in Pasadena, there developed a conflict between them and B.I.O.L.A. (the Bible Institute of Los Angeles). In a speech before the First Presbyterian Church in Downey, California, Dr. LaSor expressed the feeling prevalent in the Presbyterian Church about conservative schools in America, and in particular, about B.I.O.L.A. He said:

... We have in the Presbyterian Church a certain number of young men who will always go to non-Presbyterian Institutions. As a matter of fact, some of them have to go to non-Presbyterian Institutions because they can't get in the seminaries such as Princeton and the San Francisco Seminary. Maybe they can't meet the high standards there. Maybe there isn't room for them. Maybe there are other reasons. Maybe they have been taught by their home
church that all Presbyterian seminaries are modernistic. . . . Where will they go? Well, you can name them as well as I can. They can go to the "Fundamentalist Institute" [B.I.O.L.A.]. When they get finished there, they will be as fanatical as when they went in, or more so. Now, in the province of God, they can go to the Fuller Seminary. . . (22).

With this conference, Fuller Seminary broke away from the conservative schools such as the Bible Institute of Los Angeles and Dallas Theological Seminary, and was accepted into the ranks of the Presbyterian Church. Fuller graduates were soon welcomed back into the denominational churches and it would become a "Presbyterian" institution.

Back on campus at Dallas Theological Seminary, John Witmer was promoted to Associate Professor of Systematic Theology. Dr. Walvoord wrote, "... While the new title does not involve any change in salary, it represents a deserved promotion on the basis of your very effective teaching ministry. Allow me to congratulate you" (128).

Dr. Charles Ryrie was promoted to Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology, and received a raise to $3000 a year, plus cost-of-living bonus's which amounted to $1200 more. James T. Spangler was terminated as faculty for health reasons but was retained as Professor Emeritus of Practical Theology, Missions, and Philosophy.

Dr. Walvoord received an unusual request in December, 1953, when asked for a copy of the wedding ceremony he used while at Rosen Heights Presbyterian Church. He wrote, "As you requested, I am sending to you a copy of the Wedding Ceremony used at your wedding. . . " (68).
December 10, 1953, Dr. Walvoord received word that Dr. Kantzer could not be part of the program for the upcoming meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society. "... I was sorry about Dr. Kantzer but the time did not allow another subject and with this incident behind us perhaps we can get him to write one for next year" (29).

Also on December 10, Charles Nash submitted his resignation as Registrar, listing health as his major reason. He also wrote:

"... The circumstances and understanding under which I entered office at the request of Dr. Chafer are undergoing a change which looks toward reducing the office from an administrative and executive function to that which is merely secretarial. Under such circumstances, I would not be willing to continue in the office. Conflicts would be engendered which would not be good for the Seminary (27).

He went on to mention the Board's inability "to grasp the significance of the problems with which I have had to contend." He does not list the problems to which he is referring. However, John Witmer mentioned that he was often called upon to teach Dr. Nash's classes on a moment's notice. He also mentioned that he did this "free of charge." Dr. Witmer seems, at least from this study, to be one of the unsung "heroes" of the success of Dallas Theological Seminary.

December 11, Dr. Walvoord sent a memorandum to Dr. Lincoln, suggesting changes in the way the various offices answered the telephone. He suggested that, "Good Morning, Dallas Seminary," be used by the receptionist, and this has been used from 1953 until the present (83).
During this time there seems to be increasing tension between the Registrar's Office and the President's Office. Repeatedly, Dr. Walvoord sent letters requesting lines of communication be opened between the offices. He often asked for information on the health needs of students and other pertinent information. "The President's Office desires to be informed regarding any serious illnesses which occur among the students and also notices of births to student families." He sent this note repeatedly to Dr. Nash during the Fall semester.

December 18, Dr. Walvoord wrote a thank you letter to a donor, saying, "... It was my privilege this morning to announce to our students ... that God had provided sufficient to pay all current obligations. As the amount needed was many thousands of dollars, it certainly was an answer to prayer (94).

December 18, Dr. Walvoord also wrote Dr. Lincoln, saying, "As you know, I will be absent from the Seminary December 27 to January 25. I may be able to be in the office a few hours only for the morning of January 14" (84). He continued the letter by asking Dr. Lincoln to handle faculty meetings while he was away. He sent a note to Dr. Witmer, asking him to teach his Eschatological Problems class on January 6 and 8, and asked Dr. Evans to evaluate the "Treasure Chest" radio broadcast and have a report ready when he returned. In clearing his desk, he asked Dr. Lincoln to repair the door to his office and asked Mrs. Goodrich to deposit his checks.
December 30, Dr. Walvoord wrote J. Vernon McGee:

... I am dictating this letter on the train en route to Chicago where I am going to attend the Evangelical Theological Society meeting. From there I go to Pennsylvania, eventually coming back through Dallas to Los Angeles ... In regard to my coming visit to California [January 14] I am planning to go to Seattle for meetings January 25-29, immediately after the conference in Los Angeles. I find that my return route will bring me through Los Angeles on Sunday, January 31, and it would be quite convenient to stop off that Sunday if I had some ministry. I am wonder if John [L.] Mitchell [Dr. McGee's Assistant Pastor] would undertake the job of inquiring whether there is some church that would like to have me for that Sunday morning and evening? (100).

The fifth annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, held at Trinity Seminary and Bible College in Chicago was well planned. The only problem encountered was the one cancellation of a paper, and it was replaced by a paper presented by J. Barton Payne of Bob Jones University. The paper by Rev. Henry Van Til was not given because of a sudden illness.

The E.T.S. was a society composed of two hundred evangelical scholars on the faculties of theological seminaries, colleges, and Bible Institutes (30). During the business meeting, Dr. Walvoord was elected President for the coming year. Harold B. Kuhn of Asbury Seminary was to be Vice President and Program Chairman. Dr. Walvoord would experience some grief during the coming year because the program chairman did not plan things well in advance as was Dr. Walvoord's style. At the meeting it was resolved that, "... The Evangelical Theological Society recognizes the need for an accurate and
dignified translation of the Bible done by men who are in full accord with the doctrinal position of the Evangelical Theological Society (13). On January 6, 1954, Dr. Walvoord wrote Frank Gaebelein:

... I have been concerned for some time with the continued usefulness and testimony of the Scofield Reference Bible. I understand that the Oxford Press is contemplating some sort of revision as a basis for a renewed copyright of the Bible which expires in a few more years. My concern is that the Bible, if it is revised, be revised by those that are friendly to Dr. Scofield and to his general doctrinal position. ... It would be comparatively easy to collect an editorial board of recognized scholars who are in sympathy with dispensational theology such as is presented in the Scofield Reference Bible. The work would need to be done with utmost care and probably take several years. ... I am writing to you because of your contact with Oxford Press. ... I am planning an itinerary which will take me through New York City the latter part of March and I am wondering whether it would be advisable at that time to plan an interview with the Oxford Press (57).

January 6, Dr. Walvoord also wrote Van Kampen one of several letters in early 1954, about his book which was soon to be released. He was concerned about errors, about the form of Scripture references which would be used, the style of the writing which should conform to thesis style and other items. He also requested a copy of the contract and requested at least a forty-five percent discount if he purchased 500 copies for his personal use (and to sell through the seminary bookstore) (123).

On January 14, he wrote Rev. and Mrs. Bert Kreller, describing some of the difficulty he experienced on his extended trip through the Mid-West, East and then back to Dallas:
The train for which I am waiting in Lebanon [Pennsylvania] proved to be quite a bit late, and, therefore, I took the earlier bus which came along at 9:30 instead, as I needed to get an 11:00 train from Harrisburg. On arrival in Harrisburg, however, I found that the other train was also an hour late, so I had plenty of time there. I am dictating this as we are nearing St. Louis. The train is still about two hours late, but as we have more than two hours between trains in St. Louis I do not believe I will have any difficulty (74).

January 14, he also wrote John G. Mitchell about Dr. Mitchell's planned lectures in February at the seminary. He wrote, "... I am leaving today for the Torrey Memorial Conference in Los Angeles... (107). His one-day stopover in Dallas was also the day he began correspondence with Dr. Donald K. Campbell, asking him to consider taking the place vacated by Charles Nash. He stated that he felt Dr. Campbell had the necessary qualifications to do the job of Registrar. He wrote, "... The office of Registrar in Dallas Seminary is a very important position due to the fact that we have no Deans. While some of the functions of a dean are performed by the President... the situation calls for a... responsible... Registrar." He continued, saying:

... No doubt you are very happy and comfortable where you are now situated. One of the problems we need to work out would be a continued teaching ministry on your part... If you are willing to consider the position, we should be happy to pay your expenses to Dallas on some weekend to enable us to confer in detail about it (42).

Donald Campbell responded on January 18, 1954:

... I received your letter yesterday and must admit was very surprised at its contents... Already we have given much consideration and prayer
to the matter of my accepting the position of Registrar. I realize the importance of that position and feel honored that I have been asked to consider it... I don't feel that I could consider the position unless some teaching were involved... The decision will be a difficult one to make since we have been happy here at Bryan [William Jennings Bryan University] and I have enjoyed my teaching, but if the Lord wants me at Dallas Seminary I would be glad to go (3).

Donald Campbell wrote again on January 26, saying:

... I too feel that a conference would be advisable and will be able to be away the weekend of the 7th and 8th of February. After checking transportation, I find that it would be possible to leave here on the train midnight Saturday, arriving in Dallas 8:55 p.m. Sunday. This would leave Monday free for conference, perhaps making it necessary to fly back Tuesday. In this way I could meet my Saturday classes but would cancel Tuesday classes (4).

January 26, 1954, Dr. Walvoord was concluding his conference ministry on the West Coast. He wrote, "This letter finds me on the west coast just finishing up a week's meetings in the Torrey Memorial Bible Conference. I go from here to Seattle for a series of meetings in various churches before returning to Dallas February 1" (52).

He wrote to J. Ellwood Evans soon after that, summarizing the extended preaching tour:

... Thanks for your extensive correspondence during the last four weeks... This has been a most busy month but I believe most profitable also for the Seminary. If I carry out the schedule as planned I will have preached 58 times since January 1 by the time I get back, not counting the sixteen class hours I transcribed. I will be glad to have a little slower schedule (54).

Part of this itinerary was revealed in the Archives.

Dr. Walvoord preached at eleven churches between January 15
and January 24, and also at one "telecast," and at the Chapel services at Westmont College and BIOLA.

When he returned to the office February 3, he mailed to Van Kampen two signed copies of their contract, and approved the layout for the jacket of his book on the Holy Spirit. He also wrote:

P.S. I find that people are somewhat impressed by the fact that my book on the Holy Spirit has about 1500 Scripture citations. This fact has a way of impressing people with the comprehensive character of the study. It might be mentioned either on the jacket or in any publicity material which might be released (124).

On February 6, he mentioned to Rev. Laurel W. Hanely in St. Paul, Minnesota, that, "... I have just returned from about 10,000 miles of travel during the month of January. My next trip will be to Newton, Massachusetts in March" (59).

February 9, 1954, Dr. Walvoord responded to a letter from Rev. Robert L. Briggs, the Princeton graduate who had replaced him at Rosen Heights Presbyterian Church in Fort Worth:

... I am sorry about the new difficulties you are facing in contending a true testimony in the Rosen Heights Church. One of the reasons why I felt I should leave the Presbyterian Church when I did was that I had reluctantly come to the conclusion that there was no future for a fundamental minister or a fundamental church within the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. ... Generally speaking, however, one by one the fundamental churches are falling by the way side as Presbyteries force upon them men who do not teach what they had formerly believed and fundamental pastors who oppose the will of the Presbytery are eased out on one pretext or another (41).

Dr. Walvoord went on to say that he did not know of
anyone to recommend for the pulpit supply at the Church. He did not feel the Presbytery was being sincere when they told Rev. Briggs that the Church could have any fundamental preacher it wanted, provided he did not come from Dallas Seminary. After all, Rev. Briggs was a Princeton graduate, and he was having more trouble than Dr. Walvoord had pastoring the church. Dr. Walvoord went on to say in the letter:

... I feel that the Rosen Heights is going to have to face the fact that sooner or later they are going to have to take an ordinary Presbyterian preacher who does not preach what you do. ... I believe that sooner or later the people of Rosen Heights Church who are really in earnest about having a continued fundamental testimony are going to have to start another church (41).

Rev. Briggs was later "eased out," and a more liberal pastor was supplied by the Presbytery. According to the Walvoords, people would come to Sunday School at the church and then go home, not bothering to attend the church service to hear the new liberal pastor. While the man was not completely liberal, he was not a very good preacher and soon resigned. The Presbytery then put in a modernist pastor. Several things happened that brought the church to a showdown with the Presbytery. "It finally got to the point there was so much controversy between [the new pastor] and the congregation that he closed the Sunday School and Young People's Meeting in an effort to eliminate all of the Fundamentalist teaching." As a result, the congregation pulled out of the buildings belonging to the Presbytery and began Northwest Bible Church in Fort Worth, Texas (19).
Dr. Walvoord said that one of the leaders in the Presbyterian said to him once, "... You are the only fundamentalist I have ever met that is a gentleman." He said that the man promised to get him a large church if he would leave Dallas Seminary. However, Dr. Walvoord was not about to compromise his beliefs in order to "get a large church" (15).

February 13, 1954, Donald Campbell wrote Dr. Walvoord: 

... My visit in Dallas was very pleasant and I surely thank you for all that you did to make it so. The return flight was most enjoyable; however I have found it difficult to "come down out of the clouds" (5).

February 15, Dr. Walvoord wrote back to Donald Campbell:

... It is a genuine pleasure on behalf of the the Board of Regents of Dallas Theological Seminary to extend to you a call to the office of Registrar of the Seminary, effective July 1, 1954, at an annual salary of $3300.00 plus the cost of living bonus which is currently $125.00 a month. ... It is further agreed that we promise to pay you $350.00 for moving expenses (43).

February 19, Dr. Walvoord had received Donald Campbell's letter of acceptance for the position of Registrar and wrote back to him:

... We are most happy to have your letter of February 18, indicating your acceptance of your election to the office of Registrar. ... If it is possible for you to come to Dallas a week or two before July 1, it might be better for you, simply to acquaint yourself with the office routine while Dr. Nash is still in the office (44).

Dr. Walvoord continued by saying that the office of Registrar had the automatic rank as that of a professor, although it would not give him specific standing in any one department. He added, "... You will be interested in the
fact that we have ordered new air conditioning equipment for both your outer office and the private office, using Frigidaire units. This should assure you comfortable working conditions during the hot summer" (44).

February 24, 1954, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Fred Howe, who was seeking counsel about going on for further education. Dr. Walvoord assured him that some seminary graduates had gone into the teaching field without a doctor's degree, but that was usually not the case. He encouraged him to remain in seminary and receive the Th.D. degree. He did, and became a faculty member, serving from 1958 to 1961 and then again from 1973 until the present (66).

March 11, 1954, Dr. Walvoord sent a memorandum to Dr. Lincoln, saying, "I notice that the water fountain in Stearns Hall has been out of order for many months and am wondering if something can be done to place it in order in view of the coming hot weather" (85).

During this time, and up until C. Fred Lincoln retired in the late 1960s, the seminary had two leaders. Dr. Lincoln was not accountable to Dr. Walvoord, as was mentioned before. Concerning this relationship, Dr. Walvoord said:

... When I was elected President, we had a peculiar situation where the business manager reported to the Board of Trustees, he did not report to the President. And in a sense, we had two heads of the institution; the President had the spiritual side and the business manager had the financial side. And I had no control over the business manager at all. I couldn't get anything done. ... Well, how can you run a school spiritually if there is a broken window and no one
fixes it? That's what happened. He didn't mow the lawn and it was a foot high one summer. And I couldn't get anyone to mow it—I couldn't get any action. . . . I'd probably have got somewhere if I'd gone out and mowed it myself. Dr. Lincoln said we couldn't afford it (17).

So behind the scenes, behind these brief memorandums—and the Archives has many of them—there was a battle raging. But it was done quietly, and Dr. Walvoord exercised a great deal of patience. He said, "... Well, as Dr. Chafer got weaker and weaker, Dr. Lincoln moved more and more in power, and then he couldn't give it up. . . . Dr. Lincoln was a wonderful Christian man . . . but one of those qualities was not giving up what belonged to him! (17).

March 5, 1954, the faculty were notified of a meeting to evaluate the entire curriculum of the seminary. They were considering a three-year course of study:

. . . While we are engaged in a careful study of the three-year plan at this time, the discussion should be limited to the faculty and it is not desirable for the issue to be debated with students. It is not at all clear at present whether such a three-year plan will ever be instituted and . . . there should be no public discussion (55).

In the attached study it was shown that the first year curriculum would be identical to the four-year curriculum. The second year was identical as well, except "that Apologetics 109 will replace the two-hour elective provided in the Spring semester." Church History 404 would be dropped from the program and in its place would be put Pastoral Theology. "The foregoing course of study includes all the
prescribed work now offered in the four-year course except Hebrew 205, 206; Greek 307, 308; History 404; and an approximate loss of two hours in the Bible" (55). At the faculty meeting the new program was not approved, and the regular four-year curriculum remained the same.

March 25, Dr. Walvoord received an urgent letter from an interested friend of the school, reporting an article which had appeared in the Southern Patriotic Breeze. In the article, "Who are the Fellow Travelers," it said:

... Only a month or so ago, lengthy letters appeared written from the Dallas Theological Seminary, signed by a group of students, future preachers, condemning Joseph McCarthy and the activities of the Congressional Committees exposing the traitors in our midst (72).

In a letter to the author, Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... May I assure you that Dallas Theological Seminary has always been and is now opposed to Communistic activity. We are therefore concerned about the accusation which you make. Could you inform me who are the students who have written letters as you indicated? Also, can you furnish us copies of their letters? (115).

The original letter which alerted Dr. Walvoord to this false accusation was from Dr. Elizabeth Johnston. She also wrote:

... Now having known something of your Seminary for some many years past, being acquainted with its beliefs and its standard of righteousness and truth, and being in thorough accord with your teaching, and furthermore having seen them exemplified consistently in the preaching and teaching of its graduates ... I am deeply concerned with such a charge (21).

Dr. Walvoord wrote Dr. Johnston right back saying,
"I am endeavoring to find out who the parties are in the case. . . . My suspicion is that the article is in error and that the letters which he cites have come from students of another institution" (72).

March 27, Dr. Walvoord wrote his Vice President with the Evangelical Theological Society, who had requested information about what he was to be doing. Dr. Walvoord closed his response by saying, "... Last year when I had this work to do, I managed to have several meetings of the committee. . . . My own experience was that it took a great deal of correspondence to get everything lined up" (75). He mailed a copy of his response to the Secretary also, and did not hear back from them for several months.

April 6, 1954, Dr. Walvoord again communicated with Donald Campbell at William Jennings Bryan University:

... I thought it best to make the announcement [in Chapel] concerning your appointment as Registrar. . . . I was sorry that we could not wait any longer if this was desired by Bryan University. . . . It was impossible to keep the matter a secret any longer. I could not see that a few days more or less would make any difference (45).

He went on in the letter to discuss keeping Grace Gillespie as full-time secretary for him, and terminating the employment of the other secretary. "... Unfortunately, there is no other place in our organization where we could use her. . . . We of course would . . . allow her . . . ample vacation with pay so that she would not be in financial difficulty" (45).
April 9, 1954, Dr. Walvoord responded to a disgruntled alumni, who had written him several times. He wrote:

... Your letter of April 6 has been received in which you accuse me of communicating "malicious charges" against you and that I "started a vicious circle of falsehood and lies." I am always happy to answer courteous letters which honestly seek light on Biblical problems. Your letter however, is neither courteous nor is it seeking light, and for this reason I see no profit in discussing the theological issues involved. ... I believe that all I have ever said about you is absolutely true and your correspondence certainly has not changed my mind (38).

At this time also, many fundamentalists were angry that Dallas Seminary was supporting the Billy Graham crusade taking place in Dallas. Many were accusing Dr. Graham of being modernistic because of alleged support by the World Council of Churches. Dr. Walvoord wrote one such person saying:

... Dr. Chafer and Billy Graham were warm friends for some years and Billy Graham has often been in contact with Dr. Chafer. While there is always difference of opinion on mass evangelism, the general consensus of conservative Christians is that Billy Graham is a genuine servant of the Lord and ... he had an outstandingly successful evangelistic campaign in Dallas, Texas in the summer of 1953. ... I do not know of any sponsorship of Billy Graham by the World Council of Churches (109).

April 23, Dr. Walvoord sent this message to Roy Martin in Chattam, Canada: "The Walvoord household has a brand new baby boy named Timothy Peter who arrived April 17" (93).

April 28, John Witmer, now Director of Publicity, mailed out an announcement of two summer Bible Conferences, the Blue Water Conference in Canada, August 1-6, under the leadership of J. Ellwood Evans, and the other the Gull Lake Bible
Conference under the leadership of Dr. Walvoord, August 7-13. Dr. Walvoord was scheduled to bring a series from the book of I Thessalonians and a series on "The Christian Hope and the End of the Age." In the attached brochure, a week's stay at the conference would cost one couple $15.00 for a room for the week, and meals could be purchased for between 65¢ and $1.95 (31).

Dr. Walvoord felt that such Bible Conference ministries were very necessary because:

... evangelical churches are ignorant of prophecy, and it is the pastor's fault, because eschatology is so inter-woven like a fabric, unless you know the field well [you will never speak on it]. ... I've had people again and again, at Bible Conferences, say "This is the first time I've understood it." Well, it's a compliment to me but where have their preachers been? ... I've tried to simplify it and make it understandable ... like the time the parents of a ten year old girl came up and said, "Our girl can understand you." Well, that's good. ... I'm very conscious of the person in the pew being bewildered by what I say (16).

Dr. Walvoord explained that he began working in the field of Eschatology (Biblical Prophecy) when he was asked to teach it when he joined the faculty. "... I had to sink or swim. And in the course of things I developed my own system. ... And I was invited to speak. 'It was,' as Calvin would say, 'an accident' " (16).

April 29, 1954, Dr. Walvoord had to turn down a request to perform a wedding in Memphis, Tennessee. "... One of the hard things of being a President of a seminary is that you get so many calls from friends to which you have to say no" (35).
Dr. Walvoord wrote to Donald Campbell about providing an article for Bibliotheca Sacra. He also mentioned needing a picture to be used for publicity in other seminary literature. The same day, Dr. Walvoord wrote J. Palmer Muntz, thanking him for his help in being listed in "Who's Who in America." "... I think we will have to appoint you Assistant Promotion Secretary to Dallas Theological Seminary. I appreciated also your efforts regarding an honorary degree from Wheaton though nothing ever came of it" (111). Dr. Walvoord was awarded the honorary degree from Wheaton College in 1960.

He closed the letter to Muntz, saying, "... As you probably know ... we are enjoying in our home a new arrival by the name of Timothy Peter. While he seems to have Paul's facility for preaching in the wee hours of the morning, he is nevertheless deeply appreciated by his entire congregation" (111).


May 1, 1954, on Dr. Walvoord's forty-fourth birthday, he received a card from his secretary, Myrtle Cole. She wrote:

... Happy Birthday! This is my last day of work. ...
... I want to add that I have enjoyed this year in your office tremendously. It has been a real pleasure to get to know you and your family better and I appreciated seeing first hand your administrative gifts in action in the important position you hold (98).
Graduation was held for the 1954 graduating class with Willard M. Aldrich, President of Multnomah School of the Bible as speaker. Later in May, Donald Campbell wrote that the semester had closed at Bryan and they were planning to move soon (6). June 8, Dr. Walvoord wrote him back, saying:

"... Dr. Lincoln and I would like to have you consider the possibility of teaching Bible 601 and 602 beginning this fall, and if necessary, drop the elective courses for which you have been scheduled. ... Bible 601 deals with general introduction to the whole Bible and Hermeneutics [Bible Study principles] while 602 is a course in exposition of the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, and I and II Samuel (46).

The classes became available when Alden Gannett left the faculty to take the Presidency of London [Canada] Bible Institute (46). June 7, 1954, Torrey M. Johnson wrote Dr. Walvoord for advice since being asked to take the Presidency of the Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary in Denver. He listed three main problems about the position and asked Dr. Walvoord for his personal opinion. Dr. Walvoord answered:

"... I do not believe that affiliating yourself with the Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary would in any wise curtail your ministry such as you had in the past in a more independent environment. ... The second question you raise is the serious one. As you know, the Seminary in Denver is a new institution with a small staff and many problems. ... I do not see how you can do an adequate job as President of the institution unless you spend most of your time on the ground doing the necessary detail work. ... At Dallas Theological Seminary ... I find it necessary to be here three-fourths of the time. I am on the road, however, for about three months a year but it is spread out so that I am not gone more than a few weeks at a time. ... The success of your institution would depend upon it having a distinctive approach which would justify students coming to you instead of going to other institutions. [Johnson later refused the position] (71)."
June 14, Dr. Walvoord wrote to Mr. and Mrs. A. E. Bartholomew in Kansas City, Missouri, saying:

... The trip back to Dallas was completed on schedule. ... Bart will be interested in the fact that the records show that I made better than twenty miles per gallon all the way from Decatur, Illinois to Dallas, including the running in Kansas City. ... Timothy, by the way, now weighs about twelve and a half pounds and is certainly growing fast (39).

June 17, Dr. Walvoord sent a memorandum to C. Fred Lincoln in care of Paul Capehart:

... In regard to the salary arrangement with Dr. Donald K. Campbell, the action of the Regents began his term of office as Registrar July 1, 1954. It was understood however, in oral arrangements with Dr. Campbell that we would begin his salary here upon his arrival June 15. We are therefore requesting that he be entered on the payroll for the appropriate amount of his salary and bonus (41).

Dr. Lincoln was in Central America for six weeks of the summer, and it is assumed that Dr. Walvoord had no problem making these arrangements. In regard to finances, Dr. Walvoord reported the following to John E. Mitchell, Jr., a member of the Board:

... During the past week at Dallas Seminary we have been able to pay the May bills which were still unpaid along with two payrolls both for the faculty and staff amounting to $2600.00. On Monday we lacked $2000.00 having sufficient funds to meet these obligations which were due. On Tuesday morning at the faculty meeting I asked the faculty to pray especially for supply for our financial needs. While the faculty was in prayer we received a check for $1000.00 from Mr. Strombeck. ... Then on Thursday ... a check for $1000.00. ... We also have not paid the bonus to the faculty for the month of May. Otherwise we are up to date in our accounts (103).
faculty to turn in their grades on time. "In view of the fact that the Registrar [Dr. Nash] made a formal complaint to the Board of Regents . . . that the faculty was not cooperating in reporting grades, I am making a study of the situation" (64). Notices were sent to J. Ellwood Evans and to Howard Hendricks. They were both involved in teaching Practical Theology courses which included work off campus.

June 21, Dr. Walvoord wrote Willis E. Garrett in Florida, asking him to consider taking the pastorate at Reinhardt Bible Church, which had been vacated by Alden Gannett. He wrote that, "During the past two years our Sunday School attendance has grown from . . . 125 to an average of 260. . . . I see no reason why [we] should not grow to a work comparable to that of the Scofield Memorial Church (58).

At this time, Dr. Walvoord wrote C. Fred Lincoln in Guatemala, informing him of changes being made in registration procedures for the coming fall. "... We feel the new system will provide an orderly procedure which will require a minimum of waiting and confusion" (86). He makes no mention of placing Donald Campbell on the payroll two weeks early, but does say, "... we are having unusually hot weather and it is a blessing that we have the air conditioning in the offices. I don't know how we could have kept the work going with the temperature outside well over a hundred day after day" (86).

On July 25, Dr. Walvoord wrote a letter to a former
student, denying him admission back into school. The student had a mild nervous breakdown the previous semester, and felt he could return to school. Dr. Walvoord—and several doctors—felt otherwise. He wrote the young man:

... While we rejoice in the recovery that God has given you, we recognize that there is a possibility of reoccurrence of the difficulty if you put yourself in a position where you are under pressure such as would be true if you reenrolled here. ... It also seems wise if you are going to continue schooling to make a new start in another environment. We want to do that which is best for you and feel that to allow you to return would not be a wise decision on our part (133).

Concerning the faculty teaching loads for the fall of 1954, Dr. Walvoord was scheduled for three, two-credit courses; Dr. Campbell had one, two-credit course; and Siegel, Johnson, and Renfer each had a maximum twelve hours. Other teachers varied between these numbers.

August 17, 1954, Dr. Walvoord responded to a letter from Harold Lindsell, Dean of Administration at Fuller Seminary:

... I am sorry if there appears to be a spirit of criticism abroad of the work of Fuller Seminary. I certainly do not want to contribute to this in any way. The correspondence to which you refer was supposedly within our own seminary family and not intended for publication. ... The reference to Fuller Seminary consisted of just a few sentences in a six-page letter. It has been my understanding, based upon conversation with Fuller students and correspondence with various people who ought to know the situation, that Fuller Seminary does not limit its student body to those who are premillennial. I also have been led to believe that it is possible for a student to graduate from Fuller Seminary without believing in the verbal inspiration of Scripture (87).

Dr. Walvoord went on to say that Dallas Seminary required
students to agree with their published doctrinal statement before they enrolled as students. Students were again questioned about their doctrinal position at the end of their third year of school. ". . . Students not in conformity with our position are asked to transfer to some other institution. We make every reasonable effort to assure doctrinal purity." Dr. Walvoord closed his letter to Dr. Lindsell by saying, ". . . While we may have differences of opinion on matters of policy as well as minor theological beliefs, I take it that those of us who are evangelical should endeavor to pull together and be sympathetic to each other" (87).

Dr. Lindsell wrote Dr. Walvoord on August 24, 1954, with a lengthy letter which involved theological issues. Towards the middle of the letter he wrote:

. . . All theological seminaries and all Christian Colleges have had and will continue to have the same experience that Dallas and Fuller Seminaries are having and will have in the future. By this I mean that we cannot guarantee the doctrinal purity of the graduates of an institution for the life of any one individual subsequent to graduation, since changes come which we do not approve of (23).

Dr. Lindsell went on to defend Dr. Fuller, who had called Dallas Seminary "Ultradispensational." He explained that the statement was made to several Dallas Seminary students while aboard an airplane, and they were made in a joking manner. Dr. Fuller was sorry for the problems it had caused in the relationship between the seminaries, and Dr. Lindsell mentioned that Dallas Seminary was not, of course, ultradispensational. He concluded the letter saying:
... It certainly is true that whatever differences of opinion which separates us, we are in the historic tradition of the Christian Church and are seeking to promote those fundamentals of the faith about which we have no differences whatever. The great tragedy of orthodox Christianity is its inability to get along each with the other when it involves matters which are not basic to the Christian faith (23).

Dallas Theological Seminary would soon drop the requirement of signing the doctrinal statement of the seminary before being admitted to the school. Students would, however, have to continue signing it at the end of their third year and would be encouraged to transfer to another school if they deviated very far.

August 30, 1954, Dr. Walvoord received a letter applying for the position of President's secretary, which had been vacated by Myrtle Cole. This woman was the wife of a first year seminary student and came highly recommended by Roy Aldrich, President to Detroit Bible Institute. Dr. Walvoord hired Mrs. Lillian Bergren and wrote to her saying:

... This letter is a confirmation of our interview on September 13, relative to your employment as secretary in the President's office. It was agreed that you would begin at a salary of $46.50 per week... In addition to working in the President's Office, you will serve Dr. J. E. Evans as his secretary and Dr. J. A. Witmer as his secretary. In so far as your work pertains to the President's office you will be under the supervision of Mr. Duncan (40).

On September 4, 1954, Dr. Walvoord replied to Dr. Lindsell in another long letter. He said, "... I have been much reassured by your letter concerning your care in ascertaining the doctrinal position of your students. However, I personally feel that you are falling short in not
requiring your students to adhere to your doctrinal statement." Dr. Walvoord went on to say:

... There is no use training students who might destroy the very thing for which your school stands. ... We feel it is a misuse of funds sent to us to train men in our particular doctrinal viewpoint if we use the funds to train men to teach just the opposite (88).

On September 14, Dr. Walvoord wrote Harold Kuhn, his Vice President with the Evangelical Theological Society, asking what progress had been made "... relative to the program, date and place" of the annual meeting of the E.T.S. Dr. Walvoord liked to see organization and action, and he tried to stimulate both. He also liked to be in control of every situation, and he was not feeling in control of the upcoming meeting. October 8, Dr. Walvoord wrote to him again, saying, "... By this time last year the entire program was more or less formulated and subjects assigned. I want to help all I can as President ... but on the part of the program committee most of the detail will fall" (76).

September 22, Dr. Walvoord contacted Moody Press about the possibility of publishing his book on 1 Thessalonians, much of which he had written in a series of articles for Moody Monthly magazine. "... Inasmuch as Moody Monthly was kind enough to print the articles in the first place, I thought it only fair to offer the book to you first" (108).

Howard Hendricks was given a $300.00 raise for the coming school year. October 11, Dr. Walvoord wrote to him saying:
... We are much pleased with your work as a student fellow and the Board of Regents voted to continue this arrangement for the coming year. We are hoping that you will bring your studies on your work leading to the Doctor's degree to a conclusion, at which time the Board of Regents will consider your election as a permanent faculty member (65).

At this time Dr. Walvoord received word of the upcoming meeting of the Revision Committee for the Scofield Reference Bible. "As indicated earlier, the Oxford University Press will take care of your expenses." Also listed in the letter were committee members Culbertson, Feinberg, Gaebelein, McRae, Mason, McClain and Smith.

October 8, Dr. Walvoord wrote to R. Laird Harris at Faith Seminary, because he was getting anxious about the meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society:

I am somewhat concerned about the program for the upcoming annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, as I have had no word whatever from Dr. Harold Kuhn. . . . It seems imperative that something be done at once if we are going to have a program for the December meeting. I am wondering whether you can do anything about it? I am also writing Dr. Kuhn again hoping to get some action out of him (60).

October 20, 1954, in a memorandum to the faculty, seven items were discussed including the addition of thirteen new elective courses. It also said, ". . . It was decided definitely that the three-year course leading to a B.D. degree be not adopted at this time and that the four-year plan therefore will continue to be our basic course" (56).

In a list of Bibliotheca Sacra contributors since January 1954, Dr. Walvoord was listed as having contributed four articles and giving thirty-four book reviews during that time (7).
In a letter to William Peterson of the Christian Life magazine, Dr. Walvoord listed answers to four questions he had been asked relative to the coming year, 1955. The most significant development of 1954 affecting evangelical Christianity he listed as the outstanding success of the European campaign of Billy Graham. The outstanding objective for the individual Christian to which he should devote more time in 1955 was the practical application of Biblical truth to his personal spiritual life and growth. He cautioned Christians to watch out for increased nationalism, and concluded the list by saying the greatest urgency for evangelical Christians for 1955 was an increased Biblical testimony through missions, printed materials, radio and television, and "... a flood of dedicated and trained Christian workers as well as Christian business and professional men" (116).

On November 10, 1954, the student body collected a petition saying, "WE DESIRE DR. WALVOORD TO SPEAK ONCE A MONTH IN CHAPEL." It was signed first by Bruce Waltke, followed by fifty-five names. Included on the list were the words, "What for?" and in typical student humor someone signed "John Walvoord." He was speaking all over the country, but the students wanted to see more of their President (34).

At last, on November 17, 1954, Dr. Walvoord heard from Harold Kuhn. Dr. Walvoord wrote R. Laird Harris saying:

... I understand from Dr. Kuhn that things are moving along for the coming E.T.S. meeting. ... I should appreciate any advice you may wish to give concerning
my duties as President [of the Evangelical Theological Society]. I want to do all that I am supposed to do and I am not clear as to what is essential (61).

On November 23, John Witmer was assigned a first-year student to help him carry part of the work assigned to him. Ed Plowman was hired to help in publicity work for the seminary (129).

In planning for the Bible lecture series in 1955, J. Vernon McGee was chosen as the speaker. Dr. Walvoord wrote him with several ideas to help facilitate the meetings. On November 19, 1954, McGee wrote back saying, "... You are the Boss. We will follow your directions." November 26, Dr. Walvoord wrote McGee, saying:

... I am duly having a gilt edged frame made for your recent letter of November 19, beginning with the immortal words, "You are the Boss." However, there has been serious question raised concerning the verbal inspiration of this particular quotation even though it is over your legal signature (101).

This brings to a close the records available from the Archives. All subsequent records remain in the President's Office and access to them was not permitted. Dr. Walvoord finished his first year firmly in control of the spiritual and academic aspects of the seminary. He traveled widely, worked very hard, and fulfilled the great responsibility placed upon him at the death of Lewis Sperry Chafer. He was, in the words of J. Vernon McGee, "... the Boss."
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CHAPTER VIII

THE PRESIDENCY OF JOHN F. WALVOORD, 1955-1986

This chapter shall be devoted to providing a brief overview of the growth of Dallas Theological Seminary from 1955 to 1986. It includes pertinent information concerning the life of Dr. and Mrs. John F. Walvoord, as well as comments from a variety of sources, including several personal interviews.

In an interview, Dr. Walvoord said his major goal while President of Dallas Theological Seminary was to make it the very best educational institution he could possibly make it. He commented:

... I don't think I am a "dictator type" leader, though I do provide leadership and I do have certain standards. ... I want excellence. I want things well done. I don't like shoddy business. I'm not a perfectionist in the absolute sense, which drives people crazy. Perfection is a relative thing. What can you do with the time, resources and people you've got. ... The team should perform at its top level. I don't expect them to do what they can't do. We do the best we can do under the circumstances. And it reflects itself in everything from keeping the lawn cut to painting the buildings (40).

Much of Dr. Walvoord's drive for perfection he credited to his mother. Geraldine Walvoord described her as the original "Dutch Cleanser." Dr. Walvoord said:

... My mother was Dutch and a perfectionist in her own realm; her house was always spic and span. When we were kids, she'd get up at 4:00 and have half a days
work done before we got up. Then she'd take a nap in the afternoon. She did that until she was in her eighties (40).

Geraldine Walvoord noted that Dr. Walvoord's mother was twice voted "Woman of the Year" for helping the poor by knitting sweaters and socks and giving them to the Red Cross. She was very active up until she was ninety-six years old, and died at one hunred and one. She would bake cookies and take them to "old people" and led the Jr. High group at her church long after her peers had died (39).

Dr. Walvoord described the seminary as he found it when he became President. He said, "When I first came to Dallas, there was a very lackadaisical standard here: 'anything goes' you know. I tried to fight it for years. It wasn't done overnight, I can assure you...." He continued by saying, "At the seminary, we have a lot of competent people.... You can't run a school like this if you just have one man that is brilliant. But you have to have a whole core of people who are capable, dependable, competent and self-starting" (41).

In the early part of 1955, Dr. Walvoord's health began deteriorating rapidly, as a result of the fast pace at which he was living. He commented:

... Back in the 40s [his age], not long after I'd become President, I started running out of gasoline. I'd work for two hours and I would be spent, or I'd preach and just be exhausted. I went to the doctor and they couldn't find anything wrong with me, and I fiddled around with different doctors and nothing happened. One of them finally said it would do me
some good if I did some walking. I never got it in. It was always too hot or too cold, too wet or too dry. . . . One of our alumni . . . had a program from the Canadian Air Force, which they were instructed to follow if they were captured and put in a 6 X 6 cell. . . . It was primarily a program of running in place. I started in, and in ten days I could tell a difference, and in a month, the symptoms were gone. Now I do it twenty to twenty-three minutes a day and it is not strenuous. I'd be under six feet of sod if I hadn't done it (41).

Dr. Walvoord's health improved, and he had no more trouble until the early 1970s. This shall be mentioned later in this chapter.

John Witmer wrote that in the Fall of 1953, the enrollment at Dallas Seminary reached 294 men, and the Spring enrollment reached the 300 mark and stayed close to that for the next five years. " . . . But this was caused by restricted admission of new students because of crowded facilities, not by decreased applications" (52, p. 3). Dr. Walvoord mentioned that when he became President, he had very little authority, and he felt like he was only a figurehead. C. Fred Lincoln controlled the money, and both men were equally accountable to the Board. No concrete plan of development was approved, and as a result, the seminary grew very little for the next twenty years.

In the catalogue for the 1953-54 school year, there was a distinct change from previous years. There was a detailed list of "Expenses." These included tuition for each semester amounting to $50.00, plus other fees. The catalogue stated that a single man could expect to need about $675.00 for the
school year, while a married man would need about $225.00 per month, depending on his life-style.

Admissions standards were similar to those of previous years. The 1945-46 catalogue had stated:

Dallas Theological Seminary was founded to provide the highest standard of theological instruction, teaching, and defending the faith of evangelical Protestantism from the viewpoint of the premillennial system of doctrine as set forth in its doctrinal statement. To attain this end, the student body is limited to men who show evidence that they are born again, are yielded to the will of God, are endowed with necessary gifts, and who agree essentially with the doctrine taught in the Seminary (1, p. 17).

In the January-February, 1954 issue of the Bulletin, it stated:

The doctrinal statement of Dallas Seminary has been reprinted. . . . The document of more than 3000 words has been the foundation and expression of the doctrinal position. . . . The articles added in the new edition deal with the subjects of the Dispensations, the Sacraments or Ordinances, and the Tribulation (3, p. 3).

In 1953, just finishing the course work of the seminary was no guarantee of earning the degree. The 1953-54 catalogue stated:

. . . The completion of minimum requirements does not automatically qualify for the degree. The student must have evidenced to the satisfaction of the faculty solidarity in Christian ministry, along with stability of mind and definiteness of purpose as to life service. No candidate for the degree of Master of Theology . . . shall be allowed to receive this honor from the Seminary who does not hold the system of truth as set forth in the doctrinal statement of the Seminary (2, p. 24).

In the January, 1955 edition of the Bulletin, Dr. Walvoord explained the need for the four-year curriculum:
Scores of ministers had confessed that they were handicapped in expository preaching, by inadequate courses in Bible in their seminary training. In 1954, after graduating nearly 400 men who had studied under the four-year plan, a careful re-study of the four-year course by the faculty strongly confirmed the desirability and necessity of this unique and higher seminary standard. The four-year plan allows emphasis in several areas other than the major study without sacrificing essentials. The increased hours of instruction give more thorough grounding in the Word and better quality scholarship. There is no short cut to thorough Biblical training (4, p. 2).

A look at Dr. Walvoord's itinerary announced in the four issues of the 1955 Bulletin, revealed that he spoke at seven churches (located in Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, Oklahoma, New Jersey and Texas). He was scheduled to speak at one Commencement and one college Chapel service, and three other special events including the Scofield Bible Revision Committee meetings. He was conference speaker at fifteen week-long or weekend Bible Conferences (located in Michigan, Ohio, New Hampshire, New York, California and Oregon).

In the November-December, 1956 Bulletin, it stated that Howard Hendricks was promoted to full Instructor in Practical Theology and then in May of 1957 to Assistant Professor. He had not yet completed the work on the Th.D. degree but was promoted on merit. He never completed the work on the Th.D. degree but did receive an honorary degree from Wheaton College. Dr. Hendricks was instrumental in developing a Department of Christian Education at the seminary, which began in 1958.
Also in 1958, work was finally begun on campus expansion, as plans were finalized for Mosher Library. The November edition of the Bulletin had a scale drawing of the proposed new building and ground-breaking was described in the January 1959 issue. The January 1960 Bulletin noted that Dr. Walvoord had received an honorary degree from Wheaton College. It is assumed that J. Palmer Muntz was instrumental in bringing this about. The Bulletin said:

... President John F. Walvoord was honored by Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, his alma mater, with the conferral upon him of the Doctor of Divinity degree at the college's Centennial academic convocation January 9. Dr. Walvoord wrote the concluding essay, "The Hope of the World," in the Wheaton College book, "The Word For This Century," published by Oxford Press (5, p. 3).

In the May-June, 1960 Bulletin, it announced the retirement from the faculty of C. Fred Lincoln and Charles Nash. Dr. Lincoln had served the seminary staff as Business Manager and Treasurer since 1927. The Bulletin noted, "... he will continue in this capacity." He served the seminary for almost another ten years, well into his eighties.

In the July-August, 1961 Bulletin, it was announced that "Dr. Donald K. Campbell, Registrar, will assume the responsibilities as Dean of Education with the opening of the Fall term. This administrative action came in an effort to meet the demands of a growing student body" (6, p. 3). The November-December Bulletin for 1961 announced, "Dr. John F. Walvoord recently announced the completion of his latest book, Israel in Biblical Prophecy, embodying the lectures given
at Western Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary in Portland, Oregon (7, p. 2).

The January, 1962 Bulletin, announced the final payment for Mosher library expansion. "... Through the generosity of a faithful donor to the Seminary the remaining indebtedness on the library equipment was cancelled. This makes it possible to begin planning the next official phase of the campus building program." The next phase was the remodeling of the third and fourth floors of Davidson Hall, which had contained the library. "... The proper use of this area is especially pressing because of the urgent need for additional faculty and staff offices and educational facilities. ..." (8, p. 2).

In the President's Report, July-August 1962, Dr. Walvoord broke down the seminary income into "operating" income and "general expense." Of the operating income, 61.6 percent came from donors, 34.2 percent came from educational fees, and 4.2 percent came from miscellaneous giving. General expenses showed that instruction took 42.7 percent of the budget, administration took 35.7 percent, building and grounds took 12.6 percent, and 9.0 percent of the budget went for miscellaneous costs. Of the total income at Dallas Theological Seminary, 81.4 percent came from living donors and estates with the rest coming from churches, students and alumni.

... The cost to the Seminary of administration and its total educational program for the past year
approximated $130,000 more than was provided by student fees and miscellaneous income. Required over and above this amount are funds for equipment, buildings, remodeling, and similar capital improvements. At least $50,000 a year should be set apart for this purpose (9, p. 2).

In the May-June, 1963 Bulletin, Dr. Walvoord made a key administrative addition. He hired George H. Rutenbar as the Assistant to the President in Development:

... Because of Mr. Rutenbar's experience in life insurance and estate planning, he is well qualified in the area of development. Interested friends of the Seminary are urged to consider the particular services now offered by the Seminary through a program of deferred giving (10, p. 2).

Also in this edition of the Bulletin was an article entitled, "Old Principles For New Leaders," by Charles R. Swindoll, Assistant Pastor of Grace Bible Church in Dallas, and a 1963 graduate of the seminary. It is interesting to note that Rev. Swindoll wrote:

... The third and final principle is in verse 8 [of Joshua chapter 1]. Blessing is predictable when one is absolutely obedient. This verse places the emphasis upon absolute, unwavering obedience to both God's word and will. If the newly appointed leader conducted his life according to this standard, his labors would be blessed with eternal prosperity and success.

... The men who stand as spiritual leaders today do so because they know by experience that these principles are true. Let us who are beginning a lifetime of ministry learn them soon ... and learn them well (43, p. 5).

In 1986, Charles R. Swindoll is one of the best known evangelical pastors, authors, conference speakers, and radio broadcasters in America. His Evangelical Free Church in Fullerton, California has a congregation of over 4,000 people.
The November-December, 1963 Bulletin noted changes in the administration. Dr. James Rand died suddenly of a heart attack at the age of forty-seven. He was replaced as Librarian by none other than the faithful John Witmer. Dr. Witmer would add to his several degrees by pursuing another one in Library Science to better serve the seminary.

The Bulletin also announced:

In recognition of the fortieth anniversary of the seminary being celebrated this year, and in anticipation of the fiftieth anniversary in 1974, a planning committee has been recently appointed. . . . Duties of this committee will be to collect and collate facts and suggestions regarding a program of advance and to make a master plan of the Seminary operation as a whole (11, p. 2).

In the November-December Bulletin a year later, the ten-year program was announced, but it did not specify what it was. At this time the study did attempt to clarify the seminary's distinctive purpose:

... The aim of Dallas Theological Seminary is to train men for effective Christian ministry. This requires instruction in the Scriptures, cultivation of the spiritual life, and development of spiritual gifts. The curriculum, therefore is designed to prepare Bible expositors to serve throughout the world as pastors, teachers, missionaries, evangelists, and administrators. Each department is bibli- cally oriented to make its distinctive contribution to the fulfillment of this aim (12, p. 2).

Dr. Walvoord's itinerary for the year 1964 included twelve churches (located in California, Indiana, Texas, Washington, New Jersey and Ohio). He spoke at twelve Bible or prophetic conferences (located in New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Canada, Indiana, California, and Texas), and spoke at four colleges in California, Florida, Canada and Tennessee.
In the Annual Report of the President for July-August, 1965, the faculty included fifteen men plus five English Bible lecturers. Dr. Walvoord reported:

. . . Our faculty of fifteen resident scholars hold a total of nineteen Master's degrees and fifteen Doctor's degrees and is well qualified to provide academic leadership. . . . The faculty is currently engaged in a restudy of its curriculum and academic strategy, and contemplated curriculum improvements are being considered. . . . After forty-one years of steady progress, it is not a simple matter to continue a steady advance in every area (13, p. 3).

Dr. Walvoord went on to say that the seminary was one of the largest evangelical independent seminaries in the world. He said, "... Many seminaries with rich, historical traditions and large support financially from denominational connections have been faced with drastically curtailed enrollments." He said that the fact that Dallas Seminary continued to be packed with all the students it could hold, "speaks for itself" (13, p. 3).

In the November-December, 1965 Bulletin, Dr. Walvoord described "The Philosophy of Education at Dallas Theological Seminary." He described it as a "Distinctive theology, including the great fundamentals of the faith," such as verbal inspiration of the Bible, the virgin birth and deity of Jesus Christ, His bodily resurrection, the imminency of the rapture of the church, and the premillennial return of Jesus Christ. It also involved a "Distinctive Scholarship." In this area, he said, "... Something more than ordinary scholarship was necessary. . . . It was considered more important that faculty
members be spiritual giants than intellectual giants, men of God rather than men of letters."

A third area was the "Distinctive Curriculum." He said:

... The unusual objectives of the Seminary, its theological standard, and its criteria of scholarship led to the development of a curriculum quite different from those of other seminaries. All sixty-six books of the Bible were to receive as much attention as the curriculum would permit (14, pp. 4-7).

Dr. Walvoord listed the fourth "Distinctive" as that of epistemology. Undergirding the entire philosophy of education at the seminary was a Biblical epistemology. "A student to be properly qualified for seminary instruction, must be walking in fellowship with God so that he could be taught by the Holy Spirit. Emphasis was placed on the spiritual life with special attention given to it with Chapel" (14, pp. 4-7). He continued:

... In evangelical circles, in the effort to attain status, intellectualism has too often displaced the teaching ministry of the Holy Spirit.
... Biblical scholarship apart from the teaching ministry of the Holy Spirit and a living fellowship with the Lord only produces pride of the intellect and spiritual sterility.

The final "Distinctive" was the program of advance which had been on the drawing board for two years. Dr. Walvoord wrote in conclusion:

... The importance of the practical field has been increasingly recognized with added attention to homiletics, pastoral theology, and Christian Education. ... The Bible remains, however, the central textbook and the most important teacher is the Holy Spirit (14, pp. 4-7).
In the May-June, 1966 Bulletin, it announced a new book by Dr. Walvoord entitled, *The Revelation of Jesus Christ.* "This volume is beautifully designed and intended for textbook use. At the same time the author avoids unnecessary technical language, while devoting special attention to important textual and doctrinal matters" (15, p. 2).

The January, 1967 Bulletin, noted the release of the New Scofield Bible, April 13, 1967. Dr. Walvoord had been a member of the committee, which began during his first year as President of the seminary. "Culminating more than a dozen years of labor by a nine-man Revision Committee, the New Scofield Reference Bible . . . will serve to perpetuate Biblical truth" (16, p. 2).

In the May-June, 1967 Bulletin, it pictured Dr. and Mrs. Walvoord standing with their son John E. Walvoord at his graduation from Dallas Seminary. He was the oldest of their four sons.

The September-October, 1967 Bulletin announced that Howard Hendricks had received an honorary degree from Wheaton College. "An alumnus of Wheaton, Dr. Hendricks is chairman of the Christian Education Department at Dallas Seminary. He is an authority on evangelical Christian Education, and serves on the Advisory Board of Scripture Press Foundation (17, p. 3).

The November-December, 1967 Bulletin outlined the proposed expansion program of the Seminary. The areas of the
program included (1) improved scholastic programs, which involved the employment of additional faculty members and staff, audio-visuals, placement and alumni programs and improvement of the library; (2) improvement of property including extensive repairs to the Carroll and Gaylord apartments and renovation of Stearns Hall; (3) new dormitory and apartment facilities at the corner of Swiss Avenue and St. Joseph Street, providing housing for fifty single students; (4) a new educational quadrangle including Davidson and Chafer Chapel (a plan which was greatly altered later); and (5) a call for (help) prayer.

In the January, 1968 Bulletin, it was announced that C. Fred Lincoln was retiring:

... After more than forty-one years of service on behalf of the Seminary, [C. Fred Lincoln] retired on December 20, 1967. In 1926 Dr. Lincoln joined what was then known as The Evangelical Theological College. He already had fifteen years of effective missionary service in Central America. Beginning as Business Manager, he later on became Treasurer of the Seminary. Dr. Lincoln worked through our own courses, receiving the Mastor of Theology and Doctor of Theology degrees. And in 1936, he was chosen to be the first Professor of the Bible Exposition Department. He did much to create it and set up the courses of study which characterize our Bible emphasis (18, p. 2).

In the January-February, 1969 Bulletin, the campus expansion program was begun:

... With the successful completion of Phase I [renovation of Stearns Hall] and Phase II [$1,000,000 down payment on Swiss Avenue property] in 1968, the Phase III of campus expansion was inaugurated on January 1. Phase III . . . includes as its major objective the erection of a large educational building to provide complete classroom facilities,
[and] is the largest project ever authorized by the Board of Trustees. . . . Necessitated by the growing enrollment, which in the Spring semester, 1969, reached a new high of 441 students, the new building is planned to take care of all the classroom needs of the Seminary (19, p. 2).

In the September-October, 1969 Bulletin, the seminary had purchased the old Proctor Hall building owned by the Y.W.C.A. It is known now as Lincoln Hall and could house seventy-six students. In the November-December, 1969 Bulletin, construction was begun on the new Academic building:

. . . [It] will provide a total educational plant for the Seminary enrollment up to 750 students. . . . The need for expansion is occasioned by the increased number of applications which total 250 in 1968-69, with the present level of applications running 50% higher than the preceding year. Only about one-third of those who are currently applying for admission will be able to enroll as students, even with maximum use of present facilities (20, p. 2).

In the January-February, 1970 Bulletin, it announced that Dallas Seminary was Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. A team of educators had visited the campus in March of 1968 and again in October of 1969. Their recommendations focused on an increased educational budget, an enlarged faculty, and an enlarged library staff with corresponding budget. They also recommended the school put together a faculty handbook containing policy statements on promotion and tenure. Dr. Walvoord wrote, "Naturally we are most grateful for this recognition by a secular organization which judges our educational programs on an entirely impartial basis" (21, p. 2).
The report on the Institutional Self-Study for the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools notes several areas where changes were suggested. In the mission statement of the seminary, suggestions were made to broaden the curriculum and make courses more relevant to the occupational roles of students. More flexibility in curriculum and programs were suggested for those students who would not qualify for the standard four-year Master's program. The summer session initiated in the summer of 1972 was evaluated. 180 students had taken part in this new program.

A second area examined by the Accrediting Team was the Board of Incorporate Members of the seminary. It was suggested that these men become more involved in relation to policy formation and fund-raising and it suggested that a program of instruction for Board members become a reality.

A third area of concern was educational advancement. This section of the report suggested a 75/25 percent ratio of required courses to elective courses as a general guideline. It suggested a study of a possible three-year curriculum for Ministers of Youth, Christian Education Directors and other ministers.

In the area of finances, the report listed the various officers involved in institutional finances. Areas of suggestion involved routine procedures for handling finances, budgeting, and auditing. The report stated that although a fund was created for the establishment of an endowment on
May 18, 1966, no money had actually been placed in the fund as of March, 1973. Auxiliary enterprises listed as sources of revenue in 1973 included Bibliotheca Sacra, the book store, the dining room, the Seminary Press, and rental properties.

The Self-Study Report stated:

. . . The students will continue to pay between 40% and 50% of the operational costs of the Seminary. Although we do not have endowment funds as such, we are assuming that Dallas Seminary Foundation will receive additional gifts. . . . We anticipate investments in the physical plant to be at least $3,000,000.00 in the next ten years (30, p. 96).

Concerning the faculty, the report stated that the faculty of twenty-nine men held ninety-six earned degrees from thirty-six institutions located in eighteen states and three foreign countries. Seventy-seven percent of the faculty held earned doctorates and ten percent held double-doctorates (Th.D. and Ph.D.). At least fifty percent of the faculty in seven of the eight departments held doctorates and in the eighth, Howard Hendricks held an honorary doctorate. The age of faculty ranged from twenty-nine to sixty-five, with half of them forty-one years old or younger. Fifty-five percent of the faculty had served less than five years but the report explained that it was caused by faculty growth and not by turnover, since only two full-time faculty members had resigned in the last thirty-seven years (Armerding and Feinberg). Forty-one percent of the faculty had served over ten years.

Concerning faculty tenure, faculty may be dismissed for
(1) moral delinquency or other conduct unbecoming of a faculty member; (2) professional incompetence or incapacity; (3) departure from the doctrinal position of the Seminary; (4) extreme financial exigencies requiring reduction of faculty. Non-tenured faculty were employed on a yearly basis, with tenure set at two years for Professor, three as Associate Professor, and four years as Assistant Professor.

The library was staffed by twelve persons, eight of whom were full time. Four of these eight had been added since 1968. The report stated that fifty percent of the faculty were satisfied with the library, thirty-five percent were somewhat satisfied and twenty percent neutral or dissatisfied with it. The library held about 72,300 volumes as of December, 1972, with 500 magazines and periodicals received regularly.

The report stated that in the area of student personnel services, concern for the emotional, mental, spiritual, physical and social well-being of a student was vital to the life of the seminary. Neglect in these areas made a student "dull and thus less able to concentrate on his studies." No graphs were made of student responses about life on campus, but the report stated that "response received from the student body . . . showed a trend downward from being neutral toward being somewhat dissatisfied the longer the student was in Seminary." It continued, saying, "The response was almost identical when questioned concerning the spiritual atmosphere on campus" (30, P. 184).
In the summary at the end of the report, the issues concerning the spiritual life of a student on campus were neglected. Emphasis was placed on providing some type of athletic program for the men and some attempt to establish alumni chapters for graduates. "In general, projections of the Seminary activities relating to student personnel involve a continuation of present policies." The report concluded with:

While increase in enrollment is contemplated, there is complete agreement that improvement in quality is more important than improvement in quantity, and every effort will be expended to make the total educational program of the Seminary an effective preparation for students preparing for ministry in our contemporary world (30, p. 283).

In the early 1970s, the focus of attention in the Bulletin was directed at "inflation," multiplying enrollments and expansion. In the November-December, 1970 Bulletin, Dr. Walvoord wrote "A Vision For Excellence." In it he described the need for greatly expanded facilities which would be the "key to a more effective and expanded educational program."

He continued by describing the new Academic building they were in the process of funding:

... The unit will include eleven classrooms, two preaching chapels, six listening and playback rooms for homiletics, four rooms specially designed for Christian Education, an audio-visual production center, a language laboratory, a graduate research library, a missions display area, and forty offices. Three additional one-story units will be added later to provide excellent modern facilities for a student body of 750 men (22, p. 2).

In 1970, Dr. Walvoord maintained a vigorous travel
itinerary. He spoke at five churches (located in Oklahoma, Alabama, Florida and Texas). He spoke at twenty Bible or Prophecy Conferences (located in Pennsylvania, Arkansas, Missouri, North Carolina, New York, California, Michigan, Iowa, Georgia, Ohio, Florida, Canada and Guatemala). He also spoke at a Chapel service at Dallas Bible College.

In 1971, the publicity campaign began which called seminary students "Dallas Men." "Dallas Seminary has over 450 college graduates currently preparing for a lifetime of Christian ministry. Many of these men, while differing in background, experience and abilities, are seeking opportunities to serve this summer" (23, p. 2). Also at this time, John E. Walvoord, son of Dr. and Mrs. Walvoord, became the Assistant to the President, but served only a few months. Dewey Duncan retired in 1971, after thirty-seven years as secretary in the President's Office. The November-December 1971 Bulletin, announced a $3,160,000 program called the "Fiftieth Anniversary Capital Fund Program." The project provided $2,285,000 for property acquisition and construction including the new Academic building described above; $195,000 for campus improvements, including a new shop facility and $680,000 for an expanded and conservative financial base for the school (24, p. 2).

In 1971, Dr. Walvoord hired a successful alumni who had been pastoring in North Dakota. Bob Salstrom reported:

... Dr. Walvoord calls himself a partial-mystic in making decisions, and often says, "Bob, you are here
because of one of those mystical decisions." He called me and I came to Dallas. He said he had lots of needs and he felt I could help him meet them. He told me to take two weeks and write up all the ideas I felt I could fulfill and when he returned [from a speaking engagement] he took it and dictated a job description—which I have done ever since (37).

Mr. Salstrom noted that Dr. Walvoord had a keen insight into people and sought to put together an effective team of men. Once a man was hired, he was given a great deal of freedom to develop a ministry based upon his personal talents. When Mr. Salstrom came to the seminary, the administration held weekly meetings, which included Dr. Walvoord, the seminary treasurer, the head of Public Relations, Kent Barnard, George Rutenbar and Mr. Salstrom. "We met each week to share what we were doing, and to pray together. . . . You felt like you were part of the Seminary decision-making process. We had a retreat once or twice a year also." He continued:

When Dr. Walvoord hires you, he really trusts you. He believes you can do the job. He doesn't look over your shoulder unless he hears something contrary. He needed to have an occasional, regular conference with people in leadership. . . . I know it is difficult to do, but if you don't, you will have a lot of people with their own little kingdoms (37).

Enrollment for the Spring semester, 1972, reached 485 men, the highest in the Seminary's history. Ground breaking was planned--but for two academic buildings instead of just the one initially planned for. The fund-raising campaign had been more successful than they had hoped. Also a new summer school program was planned for the summer of 1972, and began with an enrollment of 185 students.
In the July-August Bulletin, it noted that Dr. Walvoord hired an Executive Assistant, Dr. Steve Slocum (25, p. 2). Bob Salstrom reported that when Steve Slocum came, Dr. Walvoord was very reluctant to let loose of his control of the seminary. He had been in charge for so long that he had not yet learned to delegate responsibility. "Steve Slocum is the best administrator we've ever had on this campus. He did some things in breaking down barriers between the faculty and staff" (37).

In an interview, Steve Slocum reported:

... I like to delegate, and that's one thing Dr. Walvoord does not like to do and didn't learn to do any of it until 1973-74. Dallas Seminary had been a one-man-show up to then--now I speak out of great admiration for Dr. Walvoord. I saw a man who had never delegated, and one time counted the chairs on the platform to be sure we had enough... Perhaps that was one of my contributions when I came, that he had enough confidence in me--but he never gave it up entirely--but he made that transfer (38).

Dr. Slocum felt that the Executive Committee existed only in name, and each week Dr. Walvoord came in and told the Committee what he was going to do. The Executive Committee was made up of Dr. Slocum, Donald Campbell, Tim Wright the Business Manager, and Dr. Walvoord. "Tim Wright did as much for this period as anyone, a knowledgeable, proven, expert C.P.A. And he was tough. Dr. Walvoord found that a little tough, because Tim would say, 'You can't do that Dr. Walvoord. I don't have enough cash.' " Steve Slocum went on to say that Tim Wright would go along with whatever was decided, but he never backed down, except out of respect
for Dr. Walvoord. Steve Slocum went on to say:

... Dr. Campbell has been a great right arm of Dr. Walvoord, and is a delightful person. We were going through the motions, but when Dr. Walvoord was away, I would say, "Don, I want us to make some decisions recorded in the minutes, and we will have gone through the process of an Executive Committee." That made Dr. Walvoord nervous—we were careful not to do anything momentous, but there got to be a pattern, and he got fidgety. One time he questioned me, and I said, "Dr. Walvoord, if you can't trust Don Campbell and Steve Slocum to do what you would do, who can you trust?" At the end, he thanked me... That was the single-most beneficial period we went through, weening him away... Dr. Walvoord made the transition from a one-man-show when he was well into his sixties (38).

Dr. Slocum, now the President of the American Tract Society, said that Dr. Walvoord was very uneasy around people. Working with people closely was not one of his strengths. Geraldine Walvoord was his strength in that regard. He felt that Dr. Walvoord would have been better in one-on-one relationships if humor had been part of his personal style. He could say some funny things, and often did in letters. But few people saw humor on a day-to-day basis. Dr. Slocum said, "I took him home once in my Pinto station wagon, and I said, 'What am I going to tell people—that I took you home in my humble Pinto?' He thought about it and said, 'Tell them you made two trips' " (38).

The first year on staff, Dr. Slocum had to come to terms with George Rutenbar, the Assistant to the President for Development. Mr. Rutenbar felt that Dr. Slocum had usurped his relationship with Dr. Walvoord. "After a heated meeting, I called him into my office..." Dr. Slocum continued:
... That's what I like about George, no shifty eyes and soft voices! We were talking forthrightly! George left the room under a truce. ... We cleared the air. ... You could depend on George Rutenbar (38).

Dr. Slocum almost left after his first year at the seminary. He explained:

... There was too much management behind the scenes. And that is where John E. [Walvoord, Dr. Walvoord's oldest son] came in. John E. has outstanding gifts. ... That relationship had great advantages for Dr. Walvoord, because it brought imagination, creativity and intense skills. ... If you are a leadership purist, that should never have been allowed. But Dr. Walvoord lacked the creativity that John E. provided. It violated every fundamental principle of management and it was deeply resented [at the seminary]. It wasn't bumbling--it was always superior--but it was resented (38).

Dr. Slocum attributed much of the seminary expansion plan of the 1970s to John E. Walvoord. Dr. Walvoord agreed, giving his son credit for much of the development of the school at the 1986 Founder's Banquet.

In the September-October issue of the 1974 Bulletin, it said:

... The organization which has directed the most men to Dallas is Campus Crusade for Christ. There are eleven former Crusade staff members in the first year alone. They came to Dallas to secure the biblical and theological depth needed to become leaders in the next generation (26, p. 2).

In the November-December, 1974 Bulletin, announcement was made for a new Winter Term, December 30-January 10. And also announced, for the first time in the seminary's history, women were allowed into the program. However, the women were limited to enrollment in the Master of Arts in Biblical
Studies degree program, a new two-year Master's degree. It would not be until 1986 that women would be allowed into the regular four-year program.

At this time, Dr. Walvoord developed heart problems. Dr. Slocum reported:

... Early when I came, Dr. Walvoord came back from a trip with fibrolations of the heart. We got alarmed, and he went to the doctor and it was found out not to be serious. And here was the ground-breaking for the first building of the expansion.... He had to turn the whole thing over to me... Dr. Walvoord had no hand in it. It went off well. I got there at 6:00 when it was just beginning to get light, with beautiful weather, and I walked into Davidson Hall thinking, "I wish I could be President so I could be home asleep." And there was Dr. Walvoord. He laughed because he had beat me there. He liked the triumph! But that day showed him it could happen through his competent staff (38).

In January 1975, it was announced that both academic buildings were completed. The school hosted a "School of Evangelism" in March which brought renewed emphasis in the area of missionary outreach. In 1976, renovation of Mosher library was completed.

The student body of Dallas Theological Seminary doubled from 1972 to 1976. In 1976, there were 229 new students and a combined enrollment in all programs of 1,103. In the November-December issue of the 1976 Bulletin, announcement was made that the Bulletin would be coming to an end. In its place would be a new quarterly magazine called Kindred Spirit. It began March, 1977:

... The magazine will be a full-sized, full color, twenty-four page ministry to the Seminary family. It will not be a scholarly journal like Bibliotheca Sacra,
but rather will seek to minister to all interested friends of the Seminary. . . . The new magazine will be sent free-of-charge to all friends of Dallas Theological Seminary (27, p. 2).

The Winter, 1978 edition of the Kindred Spirit announced the resignation of Dr. Steve Slocum. Bob Salstrom commented:

... I think he got frustrated because he didn't have more authority. Andy [Wileman] had more than Dr. Slocum did. As a person changes [Dr. Walvoord] in his style of leadership he lets a little more things go. After Steve left, and the Public Relations became a big effort of the Seminary, Jack Van Nessum destroyed the family-ness of the Seminary administration. He decided each area should make their own decisions and just report to the President. So we stopped meeting every week, and to me that was a tragic mistake. Dr. Walvoord didn't realize how important that was to all of us, and so it fragmented the Administration from Dr. Walvoord and from each other. The retreat we had once a year was also eliminated in the shuffle (37).

In the Winter 1978 edition of Kindred Spirit, it announced that Tim Wright was promoted to be the Business Manager of the seminary. John Kramer was given responsibility over the budget, and Jim Anderson was made responsible over plant management, in addition to his responsibility as Director of Personnel. Anderson would eventually become Business Manager. He reported:

... In the last ten to twelve years of administration, [Dr. Walvoord] was surrounded with a lot of people to whom he did delegate. He gave responsibility and he expected decisions. It was really exciting for me because I came here and took over Personnel. I was given full reign to give out policies and practices, and I reported to the Administrative Cabinet and to Dr. Walvoord, and was told to make it effective. With his trust in his department and division heads you felt like it was part of you (32).

The Summer 1978 issue of Kindred Spirit gave a report
of the seminary at the time. It discussed why the school was founded, and explains the distinctive curriculum, which had not changed significantly since the founding of the school. Listed were (1) the Bible as the basis for the curriculum; (2) the breadth of the theological curriculum; and (3) the practical emphasis on "communication skills, teaching techniques, the family, counseling, evangelism, and missions."

It also broke down the growth of the seminary into three eras. The "Early Years" were those years from the founding of the seminary in 1924 until 1952 when Dr. Walvoord took the Presidency. The "Stabilizing Years" were from 1952 until the mid 1960s. The "Growth Years" were from the late 1960s until 1978. It continued:

... While the 1950s saw the Seminary grow and stabilize, dramatic growth did not come until the mid 1960s. Then the campus facilities became taxed beyond their limits and hundreds of qualified applicants had to be turned away. Under the leadership of President Walvoord, the Seminary Board launched a $4 million expansion program in 1971.

The new academic facility was dedicated during the fiftieth anniversary celebration at the Seminary, and a second academic building was dedicated in the fall of 1974. One major building is still needed to complete the academic complex (29, p. 2).

The article goes on to briefly mention the people at the seminary, including faculty, staff, students, alumni, and the supportive family, and lists four degree programs available at the time. They included the regular four-year Master of Theology, the Master of Sacred Theology (added to a regular Master of Divinity degree), the Master of Arts in Biblical Studies (a two year program which was open to women),
and the Doctor of Theology program. It concluded with a note about the literature ministry with *Kindred Spirit* reaching early 200,000 homes, and *Bibliotheca Sacra*. A radio ministry called "Heritage" was heard across America.

With this all as a way of introduction, the next issue of *Kindred Spirit* announced the development of "Project Timothy,"

... a bold new plan of advance for Dallas Seminary was announced February 15 by President John F. Walvoord. Project Timothy, a three-year land acquisition, building, and expansion program, is part of the five-year plan developed in 1978 by a special board committee. ... Project Timothy is designed "to multiply the ministry of Dallas Seminary both on and off the campus" and will make room for the 1,500 student enrollment expected by 1983 (46, p. 2).

Project Timothy would cost about two and a half million dollars, and would be the final element in the Academic Center complex. It would house a student union, numerous offices, a post office, book room, and counseling facilities. "Dr. Walvoord also stressed that its completion will free areas in the Academic buildings which are needed for classrooms and are now being used for offices and the book room" (46, p. 2).

*Kindred Spirit* noted that the seminary had 1300 students enrolled in formal programs and another 1000 involved in the Lay Institute program. Dr. Steve Slocum said this Lay Institute was a program developed by Bruce Wilkinson of the Walk Through The Bible Ministry. His idea was to provide teaching opportunity for graduating students. "Wilkinson wanted them to be paid by how many signed up for the course--of course
he would have made a lot of money. But they were not to be paid" (38).

The Spring 1979 Kindred Spirit said:

... When Kindred Spirit went to press on May 1 [Dr. Walvoord's sixty-ninth birthday] $490,000 was needed by Dallas Seminary to end its fiscal year on June 30 with all its bills paid. The amount represents the largest financial need the Seminary has ever experienced at this time of year. Since Dallas Seminary receives no tax support and no major income from any denomination or group of churches, the $490,000 will need to be provided by interested friends (44, p. 19).

No further word concerning this need is mentioned in subsequent issues of Kindred Spirit. It must be assumed that the need was met in full.

In 1979, the faculty of the seminary was strengthened with the addition of several men, including J. Lanier Burns, Norman Geisler, and Donald Sunukjian. Anthony Evans was appointed as Instructor in Pastoral Ministries. He was one of the first Black students to attend the seminary, and was helped a great deal by Steve Slocum when he was serving at the seminary.

At this time tragedy struck the Walvoord family. The Walvoord's third son, Timothy, was killed in a traffic accident. Kindred Spirit reported:

... President John F. Walvoord's son Timothy was killed in an automobile accident June 22. Dr. and Mrs. Walvoord were in Australia in Bible Conference ministry at the time, and flew home immediately. The night before leaving for Australia the Walvoord's had attended Tim's graduation from medical school. He had every hope for an excellent medical career, and was involved in a ministry which touched many high school and college youths in his church (44, p. 18).
Concerning the death of Timothy, Steve Slocum said:

... If ever a man or woman verified their Christian convictions, they did then. He had to carry on faithfully. That is the fiber they are made of. I have a deep-seated admiration for him.

When Dr. Walvoord's son died, Don Campbell and I went over to their home, sitting, talking about nothing. ... I said to Don after we left, that it just breaks my heart that neither of us could reach up and give him a hug. First of all because of his size [6' 3"], but you just couldn't. We wanted to communicate our feelings, but he just isn't the kind of man that would touch anyone personally (38).

Bill Garrison, businessman in Fort Worth, Texas, and a member of the Seminary Board, said:

... Both Geraldine and John have talked about the hurt and pain and the inadequacies of platitudes in a time like that. ... And about some of the cruel things people have done. ... That is apparently a club of very very intimate people and they relate to one another. Dr. Walvoord has been very good about writing letters to people who have lost children. One I think of is Leighton Ford. Now he didn't know Leighton Ford except very causally, and when [Ford's son Sandy] was 19 or 20 he died, and Dr. Walvoord wrote him a letter. And Leighton told me later it was one of the most touching letters. And so this builds a bond between people that transcends the faith. Knowing that has greatly enhanced my understanding of Dr. Walvoord's sensitivity (35).

Dr. Walvoord spoke in one interview about adversity in the life of a leader:

... I find that great men very seldom become great by accident. If they become great it's by overcoming obstacles. For example, [John] Calvin was a sickly man with migraine headaches with a sickly wife and daughter. At the height of his career he was turning out a 500 page book a year besides preaching and running a school and a church and writing letters all over Europe—in longhand.

That's been true of—take Charles Hodge, the great theologian I greatly admire. He had a leg problem, and was in bed for years and lectured to his class from his bed. We think these men were great and that they just fell into the lap of greatness (40).
Dr. Walvoord has asked that this study not go into detail about adversity in his life, but there has been a great deal of it related to his family, and particularly to his four sons. In many ways, he felt closest to his son Timothy, whom he described as the brightest of his children. He said he made some mistakes with the others, but tried to spend time with Tim, going out for meals and talking. He said:

... I've learned that a lot of people don't know what to say to you. A gushy guy came up after about two weeks and said, "Tell us all the blessings you have received from your son's death." Frankly, I don't know any. The crazy guy--they don't know what to say, and the people who helped us the most are those who said practically nothing.

He concluded the discussion by saying, "It could have been so much more difficult, but I had a lovely wife and lots of friends, and pleasant work here--challenging and satisfying. I have no complaints about life" (40).

Andy Wileman, Dr. Walvoord's Assistant from 1980 to 1986 said that Dr. Walvoord talked a lot to him about Tim:

He was sweet. John E. was hard-nosed. John E. did not have time for Dad, but Tim did. He was more sensitive. No one will ever know the pain they have suffered over their children. They won't talk about it. He's been approached untold times about it to write on the subject but he won't. In fact, he considers that more than just weakness to talk about your tragedy. He considers that as selfish--drawing attention to personal pain (42).

A new program was planned for July, 1980. It was called the Doctor of Ministry degree. It was a program open to seminary graduates with three years of ministry experience since graduation. It was designed to "sharpen skills and raise men to new levels of excellence in church ... related ministry."
In 1980, Dr. Walvoord's itinerary revealed that he spoke in eleven churches, at three Prophetic Conferences, at five Bible Conferences and six other week-long conferences. Of these six conferences, four were billed as a "Dallas Seminary Conference," and featured various men from the faculty. The locations had expanded from Mt. Hermon to include one in New Jersey, one in Indiana, and one in Colorado.

By the beginning of 1980, Project Timothy had one million dollars in cash and pledges. The property had been acquired for the building and a large parking area was paved across from Chafer Chapel. Construction was planned for September, 1980. The Kindred Spirit also mentioned that at this time, $6,000 a day, each day of the year--over and above Project Timothy--was needed to meet their financial obligations (47, p. 19).

The Winter edition of Kindred Spirit reported that Project Timothy was ready to begin. On September 16, 1980, businessman William H. Seay, Chairman of the Board, presided over ground-breaking. Seay and Dallas Mayor Robert Folsom broke the initial ground for the building. "As of mid-October, close to $2.1 million had been raised in cash and pledges. Included in that total are two challenge grants amounting to $450,000. To receive those grants, the $2.5 million project goal must be reached by July 1981" (48, p. 19).

In November, 1980, Donald Swonger, the Business Manager of the seminary, died of a massive heart attack. He had
served the seminary just over one year. Jim Anderson was promoted to replace Mr. Swonger.

By the winter of 1981, Project Timothy was nearing completion, and the pricetag was a million dollars higher than expected. The building was ready for occupancy in the spring of 1982. Concerning Project Timothy and Dr. Walvoord's plan for the seminary, Andy Wileman reported:

. . . I think to some extent, completing Project Timothy completed his plan. . . . I saw those final years when the plan was complete. I saw him in an attitude of "We've done it. Let's sit back and enjoy what we've done." Normally a man can't bridge more than one extra generation. He bridged many. There is a limit to what anyone can do (42).

At this time the seminary developed a radio program called "Dallas Today." It was a ten-minute broadcast featuring a conversational format with seminary professors discussing issues that confront today's Christians. The advertisement on the back of Kindred Spirit listed the faculty as Charles Ryrie, Howard Hendricks, Norman Geisler, and Dr. Walvoord. The radio log listed twenty-two stations plus the Moody Satellite Network which would carry the program.

In the Spring 1982 Kindred Spirit, it described the special chapel on February 2, 1982, which honored Dr. Walvoord for thirty years of leadership as President of Dallas Seminary. A book entitled, "Walvoord: A Tribute," containing twenty-one biblical and theological essays, written by colleagues of Dr. Walvoord, was presented to him. Donald Campbell said:
... It has been an honor, for me to have a part in this day of recognition of one of the church's great and godly leaders. My many years of close association with Dr. Walvoord have increased my respect and admiration of him (28, p. 19).

The Summer 1982 *Kindred Spirit* noted that Project Timothy was completed on schedule, on December 15, 1981. The final pricetag was $3.6 million.

Fall 1982 saw a change of leadership in the Department of Christian Education. Dr. Howard Hendricks stepped aside to resume a full classroom and conference ministry. Dr. Hendricks reflected back on his years at Dallas Seminary:

... For years I was covered over with all kinds of committees and administrative stuff, and I went to Dr. Walvoord and said, "My gift is working with students and I don't have time for students." So he relieved me of a number of committees so I could spend time elsewhere. He has been totally supportive (36).

Kenneth Gangel, who took over as Department Chairman for Dr. Hendricks, credited both Dr. Hendricks and Dr. Walvoord for bringing him to the seminary. When asked if he felt he would ever "move up the ladder" at the seminary, he said no. He felt that key administrators at the seminary have always had both Th.M. and Th.D. degrees from Dallas. In the four years he has now been at the seminary, he remembers only once being called into Dr. Walvoord's office. Dr. Walvoord asked him to clarify some issues he had written in one of his many books (34).

The Winter 1982 *Kindred Spirit* mentions that the seminary was undergoing a ten-year re-evaluation for accreditation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.
It mentioned that a survey mailed out to alumni showed that 93.6 percent of those responding to the survey would again attend Dallas Seminary, and the same percentage said they recommend the school to others.

In the Report on the Institutional Self-Study, prepared for the accrediting team, the seminary reported:

... The original purpose of the Seminary has continued to characterize its expanded curriculum and development. An innovation in theological seminary education was introduced in 1936 when the standard curriculum was lengthened from three years to four and designated to lead to a Master of Theology degree. The purpose itself has been refined through the years to reflect the changing nature of ministry in society. The last change was made at the start of the 1978-79 school year in response to the addition of the M.A.B.S. program (31, p. 17).

The report listed four Master's programs, a Doctor of Ministry degree and a Doctor of Theology degree. "The Seminary's desire [is] to maintain a proper balance between being a graduate school with high academic standards and being a professional school that provides practical training" (31, p. 22).

This dual purpose was a source of conflict between programs of high academic and scholarly pursuits and areas more practically related to ministry. In a study done in relation to the feelings of the Board members, a high degree of satisfaction was expressed concerning the purpose of the Seminary, the competence of the administration, faculty, staff and alumni, and satisfaction with finances and facilities. A moderate degree of satisfaction was expressed with the size
of the student body, the faculty-student ratio, the vocational preparation of students and alumni, and the Th.M. and D.Min. degree programs. A low degree of satisfaction (below 70 percent) was expressed by Board members for the Master of Art in Christian Education degree, the Master of Sacred Theology degree, and the Doctor of Theology degree, student development in basic ministerial skills, the balance of theoretical with practical subjects in the curriculum and overall Board involvement in policies, faculty hiring, and dealing with Seminary financial matters such as fund-raising, faculty salary levels and fringe benefits.

... The board felt that the Seminary's greatest weaknesses were the lack of sufficient training in practical skills and interpersonal relationships, the danger of being too narrow theologically, the lack of more permanent sources of finances (e.g., endowments) and the danger of becoming too impersonal because of "bigness" (31, p. 34).

Beginning in 1970, all applicants to the seminary were required to take the Graduate Record Examination (Aptitude Test), except the M. A. and non-degree students. In 1978, all applicants were required to take the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (except M. A. and non-degree students). Beginning in 1982, M. A. students were also required to take this test.

Admission to the seminary has been based on four criteria. (1) Those most likely to become "mature Christian leaders" for various Christian ministries throughout the world; (2) those most likely to excel through "instruction
in biblical literature, evaluation of various systems of thought, development of spiritual gifts, and the cultivation of the spiritual life;" (3) those most likely to profit from seminary education; and (4) those able to meet seminary graduation requirements and demonstrate "solidarity of Christian character, ability, and acceptability to Christian ministry and commitment to the purpose of the Seminary."

In reviewing the "Guidelines for Admissions Committee Rating" of individual students, it revealed that each applicant was evaluated in four specific areas. (1) College grade point average; (2) references; (3) gift and promise of Christian ministry; and (4) Christian experience and service. The self-study stated that these policies were effective because of the low withdrawal figures over the years from 1972 to 1982. The seminary averaged only about eight percent withdrawal during this time.

In the 1981-82 school year, sixty of the 1295 resident students withdrew from school. Twenty-four were for financial reasons, sixteen were for personal reasons, seven were for academic reasons, five were for full-time ministry, four were going into secular work, two withdrew because of health, and one student transferred to another school. Nine of these students were freshman, thirteen were in their second year, twenty-one were in their third year, five in their fourth year, four were in the S.T.M. program and seven were in the Th.D. program. These figures did not include students in the M. A. programs.
Changes in the curriculum of the basic four-year program had been made in 1974. At that time, the normal student load had been dropped from six or seven courses per semester to five or six courses, and each student had the option of thirty elective hours instead of twenty-two. In 1977, two changes were made in dividing up courses that had been team-taught by two departments and Field Education credits were begun for service in the ministry, although not counted in degree totals. Student satisfaction with the four-year program was evaluated as high. About ninety-two percent of alumni responding to the seminary's survey stated they would again come to Dallas Seminary for their education. It was not clear how many actually responded to the survey out of the total number of graduates.

The only major change in the Master of Arts in Biblical Studies degree was a change in 1979 from requiring forty hours of credit plus a thesis to requiring sixty hours of course work without a thesis. The additional hours made it possible to include more required courses in Bible and Theology.

In 1978, the grading system was changed from the regular system (A, B, C, D, F) to a twelve point system (A, A-, B+, etc). The study stated:

. . . Studies showed the percentage of A's was too large in comparison with the desired distribution of 20% A's, 40% B's, and 40% C's previously adopted by the faculty. It was felt that a grading scale . . . would provide for better discrimination in
evaluating student performance. . . . With the new system begun in 1978 the faculty adopted the desirable, though not mandatory, grade distribution of 25% A's, 50% B's, and 25% C's, D's and F's. . . . The new five-point system with pluses and minuses . . . has not solved the problem of giving more than four-fifths of the students A's or B's (31, p. 136).

The study attributed that problem to the fact that the student body was comprised of above-average students.

The spiritual life on campus was rated very low by the student body. The report stated:

. . . Greater faculty-student differences were noted here than in almost any other area surveyed. These discrepancies show that further attention needs to be given to ways to raise the level of student satisfaction with the spiritual atmosphere and activities on campus (31, p. 255).

The study revealed that only fifty-four percent of students were satisfied with the spiritual atmosphere on campus; only fifty-two percent felt there was encouragement for spiritual growth; and only forty-eight percent of the students were satisfied with counseling services at the seminary. Sixty-eight percent were satisfied with the chapel program; sixty-nine percent were satisfied with the quality and value of the Bible conferences on campus; sixty-two percent were satisfied with the annual missions conference, and only fifty-four percent were satisfied with the quality and value of the "Day of Prayer" program.

The study reported that financial sources were being developed primarily through increased contact with donors through Kindred Spirit magazine. Other income was being
encouraged from wills, churches and foundations supporting the seminary. It also mentions that its new radio program was expected to generate increased sources of income. Changes projected in the physical plant were additions to the library and an enlarged chapel building.

The financial remuneration given faculty was evaluated in the report. It stated:

. . . Since the 1972 Self-Study, teacher's cash salaries have increased as follows: Professor--115%; Associate Professors--105%; Assistant Professors--92%; Instructors--78%. While the Seminary does not have a stated salary scale, the Board is currently operating on the following minimum cash salaries: Instructor--$15,000; Assistant Professor--$18,000; Associate Professor--$21,000; Professor--$25,000 (31, p. 203).

The Appendix listed the seminary's total compensation for the faculty at about $7,000 below the Association of Theological Schools norm for a Professor; about $5,000 below it for Associates and Assistants, and $9,000 below the norm for Instructors. In 1972, only fifty-eight percent of faculty were "satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied" with their income as compared to sixty-one percent in 1982. In 1972, none of the faculty reported they were "somewhat dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with their salary, but in 1982, twenty-five percent indicated such dissatisfaction. Concerning their teaching load, eighty-four percent indicated satisfaction. While there was a discussion about "academic freedom" on campus, no survey was conducted to indicate faculty response.
The library was evaluated and much improvement was planned in the coming years. A plan to purchase 4,000 books and a plan for 1,000 bound periodicals per year was set. The present collection was to be sorted out with 10,000 to 15,000 volumes put in storage or sold. In 1986, the library renovation program was officially begun.

In the area of student development, mention was made of the student survey of the spiritual atmosphere on campus. The Self-Study stated that the significant difference between faculty and student evaluations was caused by an optimistic faculty and a pessimistic student body. While it mentions that the problem was being referred to the Spiritual Life Committee, no further action was reported in the "Projections" at the end of the study.

The "Projections" mentioned several studies that had been made through the Academic Dean's Office, but no report was made of the findings. These studies were done concerning student study loads, study habits, and extra-curricular activities. A study done by the counseling services department on student psychological characteristics was also mentioned but not reported.

... At the present time, however, no committee or group acts to propose or recommend a continuing research program. Implementation of past research findings is often difficult to track. This may be in part due to the decision-making mechanisms of the faculty (31, p. 411).

Enrollment for the fall of 1982 was listed at 1,725. The Spring 1983 Kindred Spirit noted that a new Christian
Education major was planned for the 1983 fall semester:

... The new two-year program is an answer to the growing demand for professionally trained specialists in Christian Education. ... The new M. A. program is strictly vocational, says Dr. Kenneth Gangel, chairman of the Christian Education Department at the Seminary (49, p. 19).

The same issue noted the beginning of a Continuing Education Seminar held around the country. Rev. Donald Geiger who pastors the Reinhardt Bible Church, was the speaker for the two-day event. The topic was, "Principles of Effective Church Management." Another change at this time was the replacement of Jack Van Vessum by C. Michael Fluent as Editor of Kindred Spirit magazine.

In the Spring of 1984, the seminary planned a "60th Anniversary Pastor's Conference." Speakers for the event were Dr. Charles R. Swindoll, Dr. Richard Strauss and Dr. Gordon MacDonald. "Says Seminary President Dr. John F. Walvoord: 'We hope the fellowship and learning experiences will be beneficial in serving to stimulate and strengthen our alumni and other pastors' " (50, p. 22).

At this time, one of the administrators at the seminary resigned. Steve Slocum mentioned in an interview that A. Kent Barnard was one of the few men at the seminary that were "indispensable." Barnard resigned because he felt the problems at the seminary were snow-balling and would eventually overtake Dr. Walvoord. One of the problems he saw was an ineffective Business Manager. Some things were being done which may have been legal, but were not ethical in his mind.
"I had to lie at work, and then go home and tell my children not to lie." He felt many people were working overtime to cover up for the Business Manager. He also felt that three camps were developing at the seminary, one around this man, one around Dr. Walvoord, and one around Donald Campbell, the Academic Dean. But he was quick to say that he did not feel that Donald Campbell was out to replace Dr. Walvoord, but the administration was becoming fragmented.

In the summer of 1984, the Kindred Spirit announced a concern about the recruitment of students:

... For 60 years Dallas Seminary has been immeasurably blessed by God. The Seminary has remained unswervingly committed to God's inerrant word and to equipping young men and women for a lifetime of ministry. ... If you know of someone who is preparing for a ministry, have that individual contact Dallas Seminary (51, p. 22).

Andy Wileman, Dr. Walvoord's Assistant, commented about the area of recruitment:

... To me, the student [recruitment] issue is one of the greatest issues Dallas Seminary has faced. I mean there is very little which is more serious. But I never sensed that Dr. Walvoord was threatened by it--it just didn't disturb him. And again it was a problem he had never dealt with. ... He has a lot of flexibility in some areas like student recruitment (42).

The Fall 1985 issue of Kindred Spirit announced that Dr. Donald K. Campbell was elected to serve as the next President of Dallas Seminary, effective April 1, 1986. Andy Wileman had the following to say about Dr. Walvoord, who was taking the new title of "Chancellor," and moving out of the President's Office:
... It is hard to get to all that was involved in the change. I think there was a view of a need. His stepping down [or over] was really not a negative toward him as much as dissatisfaction with the way things were. The man is seventy-six, and at seventy-six it becomes by definition--imminent [that he retire or pass into the Lord's presence]. The Board decided to take control of the situation and make an orderly transition while he was still alive, rather than waiting until he died.

They may have sensed that to some extent Dr. Walvoord had used up his drive. Normally a man can't bridge more than one extra generation. He bridged many. There is a limit to what anyone can do. Things were changing. We had always been in a "turn-them-away" mode. Now we were having to recruit students [like everyone else!] (42).

Steve Slocum had a different perspective:

... I think when you have a strong figure, you shouldn't bring in the successor while he is still there. You have an outstanding commodity. You get into a form and there has to be a giant upheaval to get it fluid again. That is what you get with longevity. Who could go to First Baptist in Dallas now with Dr. Criswell? The next man will be a caretaker that watches it shrivel and then someone will come in and pull it together again. The establishment has never brought in fresh creativity. ... After you've been in a position for a long time you no longer have the energy to hold the reigns on a high stepping person. You kind of settle for a "plodding mare." Look around. There is uniformity. There is no tension spot (32).

Howard Hendricks voiced similar feelings about the latter years of Dr. Walvoord's ministry as President. He, like the other men quoted, voiced strong admiration for this man who had been the leader of the seminary for so many years. He said:

... I'm not sure if it was energy, or the aging process or what. But I think it is fair to say that in the latter years, his ministry was more of a maintenance ministry rather than a growth ministry. But I do know that the hardest thing he ever experienced
was being asked to [take the position of Chancellor]. And the reason is that for a lot of us who are aging, it is hard for us to recognize that we are moving on. "I don't know what a young man like me is doing in an old body like this!" Because I'm sixty-two, but I honestly do not think I feel that way. But periodically I get messages that I'm not the gung-ho man I used to be (36).

Dr. Hendricks went on to say:

. . . He felt somehow that they were taking his baby away from him before he fully nurtured and developed it to the point he would have liked. You need to understand that Dr. Walvoord is the most single-minded person I have ever been exposed to. "This one thing" --he lives, breathes, and sleeps the Seminary. Absolutely, this is it. It is life to him (36).

Bill Garrison, businessman and Board member of the seminary for many years, and a close, personal friend of Dr. Walvoord, had the following to say about him:

He is a great man. It is generally conceded that he took Dallas Seminary from a nothing, non-descript institution that was centered in the personality and genius of Chafer, and he put ivy on the walls. He gave it tradition, he gave it respectability, and he accomplished a great deal.

He is a great man, one of the greatest. . . . And in the transition, he didn't want to give up being President. Circumstances indicated a transition should occur and he went along with it--but it wasn't painless.

One of my personal goals, that I articulated to the Board, is that we must never let this man, in the frustrations of change which is occurring--we should never let him tarnish what has been accomplished through him--and preserve the man. He is a great and very wise man. When he became frustrated with the process it was only temporary. He always came back to reality. He is a great man. He could not think small (35).

Mr. Garrison went on to say:

. . . The man is seventy-six years old. There were changes and things that needed to be addressed. . . . I'm close enough to the man that I know he's a saint but he's also a sinner. I can see his shortcomings.
But those things would look petty. There was no conflict between him and the Board in the final analysis. The Board was very careful with him (35).

So as of April 1, 1986, Dr. John F. Walvoord stepped down from the position of President of Dallas Theological Seminary. He had served the school in one capacity or another for fifty years. He is currently maintaining a rigorous travel itinerary, taking him across America in Bible and Prophetic Conference ministry. He is also in the process of re-writing the eight-volume set of Systematic Theology which he helped Lewis Sperry Chafer write and publish forty years ago.
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CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSIONS

This final chapter will be an attempt to evaluate the career of Dr. John F. Walvoord. Such an attempt done about a person who is living presents several difficulties. It has been very difficult to obtain unbiased opinions about Dr. Walvoord. Some people have been tremendously positive in their discussion of him and his leadership at Dallas Theological Seminary. Other people have been so critical of his leadership that they have had nothing objective to say about him. An attempt has been made to walk a careful line between the two opinions, and to give an objective analysis. Those sources of information which tended to be the most objective during the interview process have been included in this chapter.

Bill Garrison, member of the Board for many years, and described by Dr. Walvoord as his closest personal friend, had this to say about Dr. Walvoord:

... Dr. Walvoord is a product of the generation that produced him, in which men gave themselves totally to the ministries that God called them to. He immersed himself in Dallas Theological Seminary under the tutelage of Dr. Chafer, and like many men in that generation, he did not learn to play or develop diversions (7).

Stephen Slocum, Dr. Walvoord's Executive Assistant for several years had this to say about Dr. Walvoord:
... He is organized, but also totally dedicated. I always used to say that if you ask him if the Seminary was the single-most important thing in the world, he would probably say, "No," and he would think of something else. But in his heart he would not be telling the truth! (12).

Ed Blum, for many years a faculty member at the seminary, said that Dr. Walvoord was a true "workaholic." He was very intense around the seminary, and he never played much (3). Don Sunukjian said he met Dr. Walvoord in California when he was on a speaking engagement, and he wondered, "Who is this man?" He was humorous and carefree, and very personable. He was not the same as the man Sunukjian remembered seeing around the seminary while he was a student there (13).

Andy Wileman, Assistant to the President from 1981-1986, said Dr. Walvoord was one of the most fascinating men he had ever met. He described him as from the "old school of leadership" which caused Dr. Walvoord to feel a great deal of responsibility to act in certain ways when he was around the seminary. For instance, on campus you would never see him with his suitcoat off. His predecessor, Lewis Sperry Chafer, always wore his coat. Dr. Walvoord mentioned that the only time he ever saw Dr. Chafer without a coat on was on his death-bed. He even ate dinner at home in his coat.

The only time Andy Wileman remembers seeing Dr. Walvoord without his coat was once when the air conditioner broke, and it was ninety degrees in his office. "He took his coat off and kept his door closed. That epitomizes who he is" (15).

It has often been said that an effective leader is one
who has a strong desire to impact the lives of people. Dr. Walvoord was such a person. People normally desire a strong and assertive person to lead them, provided he involves them in the decision-making process, and does not run rough-shod over them. Howard Hendricks admitted that although Dr. Walvoord liked to talk about having a team ministry, it was often difficult to perceive it that way from inside the seminary:

... I would say that if he has changed at all, he has changed in the direction of, "Let's find out what the faculty think." In the last ten years I've seen more of it.... He dominates discussion. The faculty is two different faculties depending on whether he is there or not (9).

Andy Wileman agreed:

... He thinks that he works through committees, but I haven't been in a committee meeting that he didn't control. And if you asked him, he will say, "Yes, I really believe that I don't make decisions by myself." But at the same time I've seen times when, because of respect for him, people have let him [have his way] (15).

Bill Garrison said that when it came to decision-making, Dr. Walvoord was very competent. "You have the feeling he would have succeeded at anything he would have done. He is a very decisive person; very, very, much in charge. He does not wring his hands. He comes with a plan of action." Because of this, the seminary achieved tremendous goals under his leadership and has become a stable institution (7).

Bill Garrison reflected back on the years he has known Dr. Walvoord, and he described him as a defender of the theological position of Lewis Sperry Chafer. This was his
job description and he gave his life totally to it. At the same time, he never surrendered responsibility as the theological head of the seminary. Mr. Garrison stated, "He could have been a great theologian. . . . But when he became President in 1952, he became an administrator. As an administrator, he became a guardian of the faith, rather than a proponent of it." The constituency of Dallas Seminary saw him as a defender of the position of Lewis Sperry Chafer, and they supported him for it. They welcomed his influence and appreciated the books, articles and lectures he produced.

In many ways, Dr. Walvoord had the primary ingredients usually found in great leaders. He was tall—six foot, three inches—nice looking, and a white male. He was able to dissociate his own sense of well-being for that of the seminary. He took the job of President dead seriously, and he immersed himself in it.

Other characteristics which have been observed from this study include a sense of humor—which was most often observed in letters to close friends, or from "one-liners" given in private. He has an intelligence that is above average. Andy Wileman simply said, "He's smarter than the rest of us. He has a phenomenal mind. He can remember what he paid for every car he has ever owned, and he's owned a bunch of them" (15). Jim Anderson said that Dr. Walvoord had an exceedingly fine mind to grasp figures. He could read a financial chart and know exactly what was there (1). Ken Gangel described him as a genius, and compared him with Robert M.
Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago. He was, like Dr. Walvoord, both a scholar and an administrator (6).

Other words used to describe Dr. Walvoord have been courageous, persistent, and sensitive. According to Steve Slocum, the ministry of Dr. Walvoord has been one of integrity and honor:

. . . Dr. Walvoord didn't have many perks. It used to bother him about getting a big car. I said, "Hey, you are a big man. No one expects you to drive anything else. . . ." He would buy a big Mercury or something. . . . There was never any doubt that what he had in mind was the best for the Seminary (12).

John Hannah mentioned that if he needed help, Dr. Walvoord would stop the world to help him. "He has encouraged me and he has occasionally given me a boot in the pants." Once he called Hannah into his office and said, "John, you are going sixty miles an hour, and the Seminary is going twenty. What are you going to do about it?" Dr. Hannah said he slowed down (8).

In describing the sensitivity of Dr. Walvoord, one faculty member said, "If I went into his office with a tear in my eye, he would have a tear in his eye when I left. . . ." Many letters reflected sensitivity to people's feelings, particularly when the occasion was one of joy or extreme sorrow. Most people did not see this side of Dr. Walvoord, because it was expressed in writing, not in close personal relationships.

Although early in his tenure as President, Dr. Walvoord described himself as, "Running out of gasoline" physically,
he developed the habit of keeping physically fit. He was seen by most people as a man having extreme reserves of physical energy and stamina. Andy Wileman mentioned about his work:

... I think that one of the things that surprised me most about him is how much he related his task to getting his desk cleared. If all the correspondence was answered and memos responded to, and there was not any certain project to do, then he went home and worked on some project there (15).

Jim Anderson described him as an extremely practical man that most people did not know. He would go home to relax—and would replace the motor in an air conditioner, or wire a new circuit to the bathroom. "That was now he relaxed, by putting his mind [and hands] into practical things at home" (1). Steve Slocum mentioned that Dr. Walvoord went home for lunch some times and considered that "vacation." "I think it bothered him because I got four weeks vacation and I would take them—all at once" (12).

Dr. Walvoord’s energy and stamina were demonstrated throughout his career. Not only was he President of the Seminary, teaching two or more courses a semester up until about 1980, but was also editor of Bibliotheca Sacra. He reviewed hundreds of books, and wrote hundreds of articles, and published many books. In addition to this, he traveled extensively, preaching at every opportunity, and sat on the Board of many organizations. He demonstrated remarkable stamina.

Dr. Walvoord fit the pattern of many effective Presidents in the United States. He was from a middle-income
family, he had taught fewer than ten years (when he became Assistant to the President in 1945), and he was in his early forties when he took the Presidency (42). He had a very strong sense of mission, which was a prerequisite in a small, financially destitute seminary. Ed Blum said:

"... He built an institution. The physical plant is first class—the library isn't—but the physical plant itself is. If you look at it from the physical point of view, the Seminary was begun before the start of the depression and nothing was really built until Dr. Walvoord was on the scene (3).

The finances of any institution are difficult, but the finances of the seminary were in shambles. Some critics of Dr. Walvoord mentioned that he spent too much time on the finances, but once he became involved, the school developed a firm base of support. As the years went by, the energy of Dr. Walvoord revolved around financial issues. Andy Wileman stated that Dallas Seminary has become the "standard" in direct mail solicitation. He poured much of his recent life into direct mail fund-raising, and it was a success. "He has been told so many times nobody knows how he does it. We break so many "rules" with a school of our size, having no endowment [and no denominational support], etc" (15).

Steve Slocum said he never wanted to sit by Dr. Walvoord at a staff meeting. "He would smile in humility and say, 'Well, I'm not very good with financial records.' " Dr. Slocum said he told him once, "The Lord is going to strike you dead with lightening the next time you say that." He felt that he was a born financial man (12).
Dr. Walvoord was also a born electrician. Dr. Slocum went on to say:

"... I told him once that it was nice because if he didn't make it as a seminary President he always had a career to fall back on! He could be an electrician. ... [One faculty member] would come away with awe that I could say something like that to him. He had never seen anybody do it. I knew Dr. Walvoord had the warmth (12).

Dr. Walvoord surrounded himself with the positive. He did not like to dwell on negative issues. When it came to the seminary, only the positive issues were emphasized. One administrator said, "He was never one to dwell on your mistakes. He was one who never liked to emphasize the wrongs. He always looked to the next day" (1). Bob Salstrom said, "If there was a note to call Dr. Walvoord, it did create a little fear in you."

"... Only once in fifteen years did Dr. Walvoord call me in and chew me out. It was for a couple of bad attitudes I had. After he had pinpointed them, he said, "Bob, I want to pray, and we are going to forget it, and I'll never bring it up again." And he hasn't (11).

Andy Wileman said there was a darker side to Dr. Walvoord, and if you did not take it for what it was, "It will blow you out of the water." He called Wileman into his office after Wileman had been at the seminary only a month. "He thought I made a mistake. ... He tore me apart—the guy can do it better than anyone I've ever been around. He left me bleeding. And it was phenomenal. It was very methodical, and quiet, but by the time he was through with you. ..." Wileman cooled down and went in to see Dr. Walvoord:
... I stormed into Dr. Walvoord's office and explained my side of the story. "Fools rush in where wise men fear to trod." But that day did more for our relationship than anything else. He never climbed on my frame again. I think he didn't expect it and he liked it (15).

Mr. Wileman felt that most people misunderstood Dr. Walvoord. When he came on strong, people felt it meant more than it did. It wasn't a personal attack. "He came across harder than he is. I think people place too much expectation on him... They build up a false view of how great he is going to be, and when he doesn't meet it, they are just crushed" (15).

Several people mentioned the idea that if a person ever made a serious mistake, they got a "cloud" over them. They would forever be viewed under that cloud. The cloud could come from personal contact with Dr. Walvoord, or through key administrators or the faculty. But for the most part, Dr. Walvoord concentrated on the positive. He lived the saying of C. I. Scofield, quoted earlier, "Never descend to controversy. You have no time or strength for it. Give out the positive truth. There is nothing that can stand in front of it" (4).

Throughout his career, Dr. Walvoord traveled extensively. Many people have reflected on this aspect of his ministry, and feel that he was a "different person" while on the road. He was socially involved with people, and developed warm interpersonal relationships. Andy Wileman said, "Most of his peers are gone. Everyone else is his student."
He is a totally different man with the men on the Moody Prophecy Tour. They are his peer." Wileman went on to say that Dr. Walvoord was most difficult to deal with after he had been out of town for an extended period of time. He came back to campus somewhat insecure and with a strong need to re-establish his control. He was not a "talker," so his frustration would work its way out. "You knew you better have your ducks in a row when he got back in town." He was least patient then and his staff was most likely to get a chewing out (15).

In terms of power, Dr. Walvoord is a very powerful man. He used his personal power in a positive way, and was totally dedicated to the advancement of the seminary. He used his personal power to influence other people, both on and off the campus, and attempted to use it for the common good. One source of power Dr. Walvoord used was the threat of punishment. Students coming into Dallas Seminary were required to sign the doctrinal statement—and later were still required to agree to it at the end of their third year of seminary. If they deviated very far, they were encouraged to graduate from another school. Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... For many years now, the only thing a student signs ... is to what extent they are in agreement with the doctrinal statement. Students often state exceptions, but no student has ever been denied graduation. I recall one student whose graduation was postponed a year because the Seminary specifically tries to avoid what is called the "noose" effect --a catch at the end of their career. If anything, we have been very lenient with students even though they were warned when they entered the Seminary that
they were required to be in general agreement with the doctrinal statement (14).

While punishment was rarely carried out, students came to the seminary with a fear of what could happen were they to go very far astray from the seminary's position of theological issues. "In the last 10 years I cannot recall a single student who was denied graduation because of differences with the doctrinal statement which he indicated to us" (14).

Another area which might come under the fear of punishment was the requirement to take the M.M.P.I. psychological test. Although used rarely to deny admission, it could be viewed as a threat by entering students.

Secretaries who worked for Dr. Walvoord felt very threatened. One said, "I knew if I made a mistake, I would not be there the next day. . . . I would go in for my annual review and he would have a three-page form--and he would catch everything." She wondered if she would have a job the next day--for two years (5). Another secretary worked in his office for over a year before he ever spoke her name. Dr. Walvoord wrote:

. . . Frankly I cannot understand . . . that the secretaries felt threatened. . . . I always felt free to call attention to mistakes in typing and so on, but we have never fired a secretary for poor work. There was one case where a girl quit after the first week. The idea that if they made a mistake they would not be there the next day was never in my mind. I do not see how they got that impression (14).

However, this fear of punishment did not exist for the
faculty or administration. Andy Wileman said:

... One time one of the staff complained to him about me because I joked with students too much and I was too candid with students in explaining student aid. ... Dr. Walvoord called me in and I said if he couldn't tolerate me to get someone else. He said, "No, I don't want you to change. I just want you to know there are those who don't like it." There is an element in which he is very tolerant (15).

The faculty did have some fear that if they deviated far from the doctrinal position of the seminary they would lose their position, as was one of the reasons for dismissal in the faculty handbook. Dr. Walvoord said in an interview that the most difficult decision he made during his years at Dallas Seminary was to release S. Lewis Johnson from the faculty. Dr. Walvoord wrote:

... He was never any problem at all except that he held to five point Calvinism, and he placed regeneration before faith. This is contrary to our doctrinal statement, and Dr. Johnson refused to sign the doctrinal statement. It was on this basis that he was terminated as an adjunct teacher. He had already retired as a full-time professor. He was a close friend whom I greatly admired. The problem was entirely doctrinal (14).

Some at the faculty felt that the conflict which developed between the two of them was not particularly over doctrinal issues, but rather over matters of loyalty and financial policy. But for whatever the reasons, the threat of punishment was carried out, and it has been said that once punishment is actually carried out, the leader becomes less effective. Many felt that Dr. Walvoord's respect on campus wavered after this series of events, particularly with the faculty.
Another source of power used by Dr. Walvoord was that of giving rewards. One person said, "No one is ever fired around here." People were often hired for their availability and were retained for their loyalty to the seminary. People remain intensely loyal to Dr. Walvoord. Howard Hendricks mentioned that loyalty is crucial to the endurance of any institution.

Ed Blum said that institutions tend to move out the Mavericks. Creative people either have to swallow a lot or move on. Andy Wileman said, "Dr. Walvoord does tend to stifle creativity. Dr. Seume always said it was because he was Dutch. . . . There are certain areas where Dr. Walvoord feels like he is right and that is it--case closed. Normally, he is right" (15).

Howard Hendricks said that the downside risk to gifted, creative people is that they are usually restless. Several men left the seminary in recent years, some of whom were very gifted and could have been trained to be key administrators. Ed Blum said:

... In a certain sense Dr. Walvoord is a very strong individual. I think you would have to say that. But I see insecurity in him—we all have our insecurities—but he was never able to have strong people around him. . . . The fact that he never groomed a successor indicates this (3).

Steve Slocum mentioned that Dr. Walvoord has never had a man working for him that was 6'3" tall. "All of the rest of us were little guys!"
Dr. Walvoord wrote about the task of finding someone to replace him as President:

... In regard to my successor, I told the Board five years before I retired as President that Dr. Campbell was the one to consider. The faculty never suggested anyone else. The alumni had been sampled and none of them came up with a suggestion for a successor. Board members also were searching for candidates. Dr. Campbell was the only one ever considered (14).

As President of the seminary, Dr. Walvoord had a great deal of power simply given him with the position. For most of his career, his authority was never questioned. It was only in the last five years as President that people really began to question his leadership. Kent Barnard said there was never an outright rebellion, but there was an eroding of his authority (2). The longer a person is in a position, the better people get to know him, and his power is eroded. Rather than allow conflict to develop on campus, Dr. Walvoord stepped aside, and the Board appointed Dr. Campbell to replace him as President.

Dr. Walvoord was an expert in the field of theology, and especially in the area of prophecy. Bill Garrison reflected on Dr. Walvoord's life and career, and said:

... He never got the credit—in my judgment—for being the thinker he is. In certain circles he has, but in terms of the evangelical world at large—the world that thinks of itself as theologians—has never given him the credit he deserved. ... When he was forty years old [when he was about to become President of the Seminary], if he had addressed himself purely as a theologian, he might have done what no other man has ever done as a dispensationalist, and that is make Dispensationalism respectable [to the evangelical theologians]. ...
... The reason that the non-dispensationalist hates the dispensationalist so much is that he knows that within dispensationalism—if he opens the "box"—he will lose his perceived control over the channels of grace. That is inherent in their make-up... and the dispensationalist does not understand that fear (7).

As an expert in theology, Dr. Walvoord was more effective as President than he otherwise would have been. He inspired support both from faculty and staff, but also from thousands of laymen who have given financially to the seminary over the years.

Throughout this study, very few people have been critical of Dr. Walvoord as a person. Most have admired him both as a person and as a leader. They have placed a great deal of trust and confidence in him. The vision of Lewis Sperry Chafer was held up by Dr. Walvoord as an inspiration for the seminary to follow. Without that inspiration, the men and women who have worked at the seminary over the years—often at great personal sacrifice, would not have done so. He has kept them inspired with a vision, with a mission, that what they were doing was absolutely necessary for the cause of Christ in the world.

One of the reasons Dr. Walvoord continued for many years as President, was because of his ability to inspire confidence and a vision for the future. Although many people criticized him for his lack of interpersonal relationships on campus, it was that social distance from people that allowed him the length of tenure which he enjoyed. Day to day intimacy
destroys the mystery surrounding a leader. The more frequent
the contact with followers, the more the position is weakened.
Steve Slocum said:

... He had a great sense of privacy. He must know
in his heart and mind all kinds of disasters on the
part of the Seminary. But he did not share them.
If I had to know, he would tell me, but there was
never any unloading of the burden of so many things
he must hold. We were not aware of the load he was
carrying (12).

Bill Garrison remembered one such incident:

... There was a time in the early days [the 1960s
when Garrison joined the Board], when I was on the
Board, in which the property on Live Oak was avail-
able and the Board reluctantly followed him to buy.
And in those days the Treasurer was Dr. Lincoln,
and the Constitution of the Seminary put the Trea-
surer responsible only to the Board, not to the
President. And the Treasurer refused to buy the
property! Even though the Board told him to do it! He
refused! We subsequently paid a higher premium for
the property. Dr. Walvoord was enormously frustrated.
Yet he could not do anything. His hands were tied
as to leadership (7).

Dr. Walvoord maintained distance with the faculty as
well. Andy Wileman said:

... He'd often tell me, "I need to get over to the
faculty lounge and sit down and talk. I don't do
that enough." Or, "I need to get over and talk to
the students from time to time." But whether I re-
minded him or not, he never did it. ... That is
a more insecure area for him. If I had to live the
way he believes he has to live as the leader, I can
understand that. I don't see how he could get much
enjoyment out of it (15).

Dr. Walvoord successfully maintained a distance which
enabled him to remain an authority figure. Steve Slocum
said, "To the faculty, he was a distant figure, not the kind
you feel at home with." Another said, "He has made his
system work, but you have to go to him." Howard Hendricks described his relationship with Dr. Walvoord:

. . . He wasn't a mentor in the usual sense of the word. Usually by mentor you think of someone with whom you were very, very close and spent a lot of time with. I don't think we did that. I think I was as close as anybody got, but he is not the type of guy you get that close to. He doesn't spend that much time with anybody. But his door was always open, so if you had a question or were discouraged, he would do what he could do (9).

Because he was "remote," he could show himself very compassionate on occasion. Dottie Connor, his secretary for five years, said that once a couple called for marital counseling because their pastor (at a leading Bible Church in Dallas) was too busy to see them. Dr. Walvoord counseled them, and explained the plan of salvation to the man, who trusted Christ as his Savior. He then performed the wedding for them the following weekend at the home of the bride. Occasions such as this allowed people to see him as very warm and human (5).

A leader who allows followers to become very personal with them invites confusion and a disruption of the routines of administration. Dr. Walvoord walked a fine line, often paying the price of criticism, because many people saw him as cold and inhumane. Socially, Mrs. Walvoord was very active. Her home was very warm and open often. Mrs. Jeanne Hendricks said Mrs. Walvoord was a professional when it came to giving parties and receptions. She also put together a very effective program for wives of seminary students.
In terms of his personal style, Dr. Walvoord was described as a lonely person:

... You may have seen this book on a study of the American male [The Seasons of a Man's Life]. He made a comment that American males generally don't have friends. There are some good reasons for it in our culture--American competitiveness, we move a lot, etc.--but in European societies people tend to grow up in the same village and keep the same friends.

I would think that Dr. Walvoord would have been close to his wife, and sons, but once you get beyond that, I think he is a true workaholic (3).

Dr. Walvoord was often in touch with the "smaller people" on campus. Because of his concern for detail, he was aware of the craftsman as well as the caretakers on campus. Jim Anderson said he made the building and grounds his top priority and built an institution well provided for in terms of the physical plant. In this area he achieved excellence (1).

Those areas that received the greatest criticism were the areas where Dr. Walvoord demonstrated the greatest strength. Being seen as a dominant and strong leader left him open for the criticism of being impersonal. The lack of financial base of support left him open for the criticism of hiring young men, or only the graduates of Dallas Seminary. It also left him open to criticism that he spent all of his time on direct mail campaigns or other fund-raising activities often to the neglect of faith in God to provide.

Dr. Hendricks responded to the criticism of hiring young men by saying that it was not always a problem. When Dr. Hendricks began at the seminary, all of the men were old--and young men were not welcome. As the older men moved on or died,
younger and less expensive men replaced them. Dr. Hendricks continued:

... I think the criticism has come because the older guys are dying, retiring, or moving on, and there has been no one in the middle. There is a large layer of young men who have never had any ministry experience. And we're beginning to say that just because he has a degree doesn't qualify him. Your problem with hiring youth is the same one I have with guys graduating from here. A church wants a guy with vision... but they want an older guy. Great, but I don't have any older guys. Now, I've got some younger guys, who in my judgment have the potential... It's a gamble and we've won some with young guys (9).

Andy Wileman reflected on the problem of hiring younger men:

... He has always felt he couldn't afford an older guy... One time he told me that this was his way of discipling. He would take a younger man, and give him opportunity to grow. When I started the job, my responsibilities were very small and my pay was not much better. And he got joy out of watching me grow and take on more responsibility, and he liked taking credit for a lot of it. And a lot of it he deserved taking credit for.

I think one of the reasons he hires young guys is that they will do things his way, and that is the way you are going to do things (15).

Dr. Walvoord has also been criticised for his attention to detail:

Dr. Walvoord spends a huge amount of time on details, like correcting punctuation and spelling. The thank you letters he refused to sign with a signature machine. He would spend two or three hours a day just signing letters... He wanted to see them and know who was giving so he could thank them if he saw them in person. But most people felt it was an inefficient use of the man's time. He would check spelling after a secretary would check it through for mistakes. Rarely would he find a mistake... It is almost like he felt more secure doing this
kind of thing. All of us tend to gravitate to the things we are secure with. And we tend to leave the insecure jobs until later [or give them to other people] (15).

In summing up the career of John F. Walvoord at Dallas Theological Seminary, Dr. John G. Mitchell said:

... I think John Walvoord has done a tremendous job at Dallas. He is a very, very dear man. From a human standpoint the Seminary really went ahead with John Walvoord. He's a good man. He is steady. He is a man who is balanced, and he has done a great job (10).

Andy Wileman stated:

... I've seen him back down to people. He wasn't a tyrant. But because of the power he has, more often than not, people would never say anything to him, unless they really felt strongly about it. And he would go right on feeling like he had cleared it with them, and they felt like they had been "rubber stamped." His view of leadership I don't perceive as a weakness. It is just one way of working—and he has made it work (15).

Howard Hendricks concluded our interview by saying:

... I think Dr. Walvoord's educational philosophy has been one of vision. He has articulated a vision for the future that was lacking in 1952. He has built one of the stronger teams in terms of the faculty that I have seen in any Christian school. He built a base of continuity in terms of faculty that is almost unheard of. And he was committed to quality. ... Now in my judgment, we got too big, with the result that quality control went down (9).

September 12, 1986, Dr. Donald K. Campbell was inaugurated as the third President of Dallas Theological Seminary. The service included a procession of ninety guests from colleges, universities and seminaries throughout the United States. Dr. John F. Walvoord solemnly charged Dr. Campbell with the responsibilities which he carried for over forty years.
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APPENDIX

THE REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC DEAN

TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS, 1984-85

The Report of the Academic Dean, presented to the Board of Regents on October 25, 1985, contained the following information about the state of the seminary when John F. Walvoord completed his tenure as President of Dallas Theological Seminary. Class enrollments for the 1984-85 school year, including all people in all degree and nondegree programs at the Masters or Doctoral level, was 1,654. In addition, 1,739 students were involved in on and off-campus seminars and the Lay Institute program. The class of 1985 included 336 graduates in nine programs. The fall 1986 enrollment showed that the 1,654 students enrolled the previous year had declined by one hundred and ninety students. Of the total number of degree students, 171 were female.

Students at Dallas Seminary came from a variety of institutions. The largest number (279) came from public colleges and universities; eighty-five came from Church-related colleges and universities; seventy-four came from private colleges and universities; and forty came from Bible colleges. Fifty-five students came from foreign countries.

The denominational backgrounds of these students show
that the largest group (541) came from "Independent" churches. Baptists were the second largest category (401, but these were broken down into Southern (145), Independent (119), Conservative (52), General Association of Regular Baptists (25), General Conference Baptists (17), and other Baptists (43). The Independent Fundamental Churches of America had fifty-six students, the Brethren (Plymouth, Grace, United, or other) had forty-eight students; the Evangelical Free Church of America had thirty-nine students, the Presbyterian Church (Presbyterian Church in America, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., or the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. or others) had thirty-eight students, the Methodists had nineteen students, the Lutherans had two students, and those listing "Other" denominations were 163. This total of 1,307 students does not include Summer School students.

From September 1984 to September 1985, seventy-six students withdrew from Dallas Seminary. Sixteen of these were in their first year of the Th.M. program, twelve were in their second year, twenty were in their third year, and fifteen were in their fourth year. Four students who withdrew were in the M.A.B.S. degree program, six were in the Th.D. program and two were non-degree students.

Reasons given for withdrawing were finances (26), family or personal problems (16), academic problems (11), health (3), transfer (8), secular work (8), full-time ministry (9), and none were listed as dismissed by the faculty. The
percentage of 5.8 percent of the student body "is the lowest since these figures have been compiled starting 31 years ago" (when Dr. Donald Campbell became Registrar).

Of the 1,464 students enrolled in programs, 825 were in the Th.M. program, 308 were in the M.A.B.S. program, 103 were in the M.A.C.E. program, nine were in a combination of the M.A.B.S. and M.A.C.E. program, thirty were in the S.T.M. program, fifty-nine were non-degree students, eighty-six were in the Th.D. program, one was in the Th.M. and M.A.C.E. program and forty-three were enrolled in the D.Min. program.

In a breakdown of the 1985 seniors according to majors, 26.0 percent were in the Pastoral Ministries Department; 18.3 percent were in the Christian Education Department; 13.7 percent were in the Systematic Theology Department; 13.2 percent were in the Bible Exposition Department; 12.2 percent were in the Old Testament (Hebrew) Department; 7.6 percent were in the New Testament (Greek) Department; 6.6 percent were in the Historical Theology (Church History) Department; and 1.5 percent were in the World Missions Department.

There were seventy faculty listed, with forty of them full-time, twenty-eight part-time and two on Sabbatical. The faculty-student ratio for the fall 1985 was one faculty to 20.7 students.

Concerning academic programs added to the curriculum, three courses were added in the field of theology, five courses were added in the field of pastoral ministries.
(including topics on finances, counseling, media, and "The Pastor's Use of the Personal Computer"). Seven courses were added in the field of Christian Education, including courses on audio-visual techniques, creativity, public relations, and "School Law and Finance." Eleven elective courses were dropped, coming from several different departments.

Women students totaled 202, or 12.2 percent of the student body. This compares with the latest Association of Theological Schools report which stated the average number of women in their schools was 24.4 percent of theological students in 1983. Of the 442 M.A.B.S. students and M.A.C.E. students, 171, or 38.7 percent were women. "This compares with 43.8 percent of the M. A. students in A.T.S. member schools in 1983 who were women." The Dallas Seminary faculty voted on August 28, 1985 to admit women students to the Th.M. and S.T.M. programs beginning in 1986-87. It was done "... with the understanding that admission to and completion of those programs are not to be considered qualifications for ordination as senior pastors." The Report mentioned that it is logical to assume that women will eventually be admitted to the D.Min. and Th.D. programs. "The response to this is that admission of women to the doctoral programs seems logical. The vocational goals of the Th.D. program (to prepare scholars, researchers, academic teachers) and the D.Min. program (e.g., ministers to women, missionaries, and counselors) present few barriers to women."
The Report mentioned the progress made toward meeting the requirements for accreditation since the Self-Study report in 1983. A report of the findings of the Visiting Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools revealed that all but two of their twenty recommendations and thirty suggestions had been met by August 1984. The two areas still being worked on were the recommendations regarding the library and the Graduate Programs. On December 20, 1984, the seminary was granted accreditation for another ten years (1986 to 1994) (3).

"VISIONS 2000"

"VISION 2000" is a plan for taking Dallas Theological Seminary forward to the year 2000. It was prepared by the Strategic Planning Committee and was approved and adopted by the Board of Incorporate Members, May 10, 1985. In this vision, Mr. William Seay, Chairman of the Board of Incorporate Members and Dr. Donald K. Campbell, Chairman of the Strategic Planning Committee, listed the various goals of the seminary over the next fifteen years.

In the area of Academics, the first objective listed was student enrollment. The seminary will work to bring up "Full-time Class Equivalent" enrollment from 890 to 950 and to increase the cumulative credit enrollment in degree and nondegree programs to 2,300 students. An active recruitment program was outlined with emphasis on American minority students and international students and a plan to enlarge the
Summer School. The D.Min. program is to be expanded with off-campus extension centers throughout the country. Of major concern was limiting the current attrition rate between acceptance and matriculation from thirty-one percent to fifteen percent, and to reduce attrition from enrollment to graduation from the present twenty-five percent to ten percent.

The second objective was to develop an M.A. program in Cross-Cultural Ministries with emphasis on American Black, Hispanic and urban communities, and by developing Third World leadership. The third objective was faculty growth and class instruction. Areas of concern were the spiritual leadership of faculty both on and off campus; the application of truth to life in the classroom; relating contemporary issues and trends in morals, ethics, and theology, by training students to deal with moral and ethical problems in society (alcoholism, drug abuse, child and wife abuse, sexual deviations, teen suicide) and to help them with family problems facing the church; by encouraging faculty development programs and more research and publications; and to decrease the faculty/student ration to 1:20. Endowment funds for faculty housing and faculty development were also planned for.

The fourth objective was a continuing education program to minister to the alumni and other Christian leaders throughout the evangelical world with a cumulative noncredit enrollment expected at 3,800 by the year 2000. The fifth
The objective was the library expansion program as designed in the 1986 plans.

The objectives in the Student Development area began with a reorganization of the Chaplain, the Assistant Deans, the Director of Counseling Services and the Foreign Advisor. The Director of Student Finances, the Director of Housing, and the Director of Placement were to be placed under the Dean of Students. A full-time Assistant Dean for Women would be hired and an enlarged staff in the Counseling services area would be provided for.

The next objective was developing health services and some kind of recreational facilities. This concerned the evaluation of medical insurance and a study to see if some type of athletic facility could be built on campus. The third objective was the social development of students. This would involve an effort to strengthen student marriages and families, expand social programs for students, increase faculty-student contact on campus through an advisor group program meeting weekly, and an emphasis on community responsibility.

In the area of business affairs, the office was to be involved in evaluating life and health insurance, providing technicians for various trades, paving parking lots, computerizing all records, and planning for the housing needs of students, including the women now enrolling in the Th.M. program.
The area of development and public relations had the objectives of expanding *Bibliotheca Sacra*, the *Dallas Insider*, and *Kindred Spirit* magazine. The report suggested that contemporary moral, ethical and theological issues be specifically addressed. The video ministry was to be expanded, as well as an attempt to strengthen placement services and expand placement opportunities for alumni. The development office would be involved in a capital campaign (for a new library), cultivating gifts for student aid, encouraging present donors and seeking foundation grants.

These steps outline the plan the seminary will be following between now and the year 2000. "It is anticipated that the planning process will be an ongoing, routine operation with objectives, goals, and action steps, subject to constant review and revision" (1).

In the November 5, 1986 edition of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, it mentioned that:

> . . . Effective leaders take more risks and encourage others to be creative. . . . They care about "little people" at the institution and demonstrate a strong element of humanity. They realize they are not "running a popularity contest," and work instead for people's respect. They're caught up in a vision of their institution, and they personalize their dream so they can't really separate themselves from the office.

Certainly Donald Campbell has brought an element of humanity to the office of President. For this reason it is fair to expect that he will be a very effective leader in the years to come, as were the two men who preceded him.
AN INTERVIEW WITH DONALD CAMPBELL

... I determined that I would be different [from Dr. Walvoord], and I'm finding that the demands of the job are such that it is very, very difficult. I have a card here on my desk of five things to do every week. (1) Contact a Board member. That is no problem. (2) Have lunch in the faculty lounge--I can't pull that off because I'm scheduled for P.R. luncheons and so on every day. (3) Walk one section of the campus. Now today I did that because I taught a course for Dr. Gangel... (4) Eat in the school dining room--I haven't been able to pull that off. (5) Take a staff or faculty member to lunch--I do that but usually they are staff or faculty I am working closely with.

I think we [Dr. Walvoord and Dr. Campbell] have different temperaments and different personalities. I think I am more outgoing, just by nature, than he is, and I am more of a people-person... I would rather be with people than push paper, frankly. Dr. Walvoord loved to clean his desk. He found a certain sense of fulfillment in signing hundreds of letters and processing material... I don't remember [Dr. Chafer] mingling a lot with students. We didn't expect it in those days. We didn't expect to be invited to faculty homes. In the course of six years I was in two faculty homes... Today, the students want the discipleship model carried out; they want the one-to-one relationship or one-to-a-small-group. We're trying to shift to that and develop that, but it isn't easy...

The President must lead, by articulating a vision and setting goals to work toward and inspiring people to follow him. The school did advance of course during [Dr. Walvoord's] administration. He was President during the growth years, demographically as well as economically. And I'm not saying that is the only reason why the school grew--but he was in a favorable climate for growth. He was flexible enough that he could adjust to the innovative ideas that were brought to him. But he did not himself initiate change in many cases. The thing I always admired about him though was that with his advancing age, he wasn't set in concrete. Many older men are, and he was amazingly resilient and flexible...

The President must represent the Seminary to all parts of the Seminary family, to alumni, outside the Seminary to donors, to the community, and I'm coming to see that is a very important aspect of being President... There is a certain sense in which the President is looked upon in certain ceremonies to be the representative of the Seminary... [Dr. Walvoord] was an excellent representative of the school to alumni and supporters. The school in those days was being supported by his direct-mail program and there was not the need to diversify funding efforts like today... Well, we're now to the place where direct mail
[funding] has peaked and it is declining, not only in our support but universally—and we are trying to diversify our efforts in fund-raising... [Dr. Walvoord] traveled a lot to fulfill his ministry. In the process he represented the Seminary. But I don't think he made a lot of trips with the primary motive being, "I'm representing the Seminary here and here and here. . . ."

The President must manage the corporation, the institution. There is the business side of him, that he should be an educator and a businessman and a spiritual leader. He manages through delegation and he assembles a team of management people. One thing they said about Derek Bok, the President of Harvard University, the first thing he did was appoint four Vice Presidents. Before, Harvard had one—but he wanted four. . . . I determined early on, before I came into the office, but as Executive Vice President and knew it was the Board's intention that I should succeed Dr. Walvoord as President, I was determined to find a man who would serve as a Vice President type in the area of advancement. . . .

Jay Kessler, President of Taylor University, said, "I am not here at Taylor to do the work of Taylor University. I'm here to represent Taylor and to lead Taylor." That's an ideal and some day I am going to ask Kessler if it works. Here is the work of Dallas Seminary [pointing to the papers on his desk] and I will be carting this home over the weekend to work on it. . . .

Dr. Walvoord managed alone for many, many years, and it was hard for him to delegate, but eventually he began to see that he could not cover the bases. . . . Once he saw I was going to function responsibly, he let me have [the position of Academic Dean]. . . . I started in 1954 . . . [and] became Dean in 1961. . . . He gave me freedom to work, he was always available, very supportive of my work in the academic area. He never tried to undercut me in any way, and conversely, I was loyal to him. I never went behind his back in any way. I never undercut him with faculty or alumni or the Boards or anybody else.

The spiritual life at the Seminary is better than I ever remember. Chapel services are outstanding. There is a buoyant spirit, and that pleases me very much. I wish I could get out more, but this desk is just a ball and chain. . . .

I have great respect and affection for Dr. Walvoord. I've learned a great deal through the years by a close association with him. Some people find him hard to work for because he is very demanding; but it wasn't a problem for me because I like to work hard. I like to produce. There is a sense of satisfaction that I get from devising, developing and implementing programs. . . .

Some people feel we are too academic [at Dallas Seminary] and others feel we are too tied to the practicum, the practice
of the ministry... We will maintain a balance. Because we are not only a graduate school, we are a professional school... We're relating people to ministry... I don't want to see us reduce Bible and Theology and Hebrew and maintain the emphasis to prepare men and women to do what they have to do in the ministry... We had--I think--a very good working relationship over many, many, years. And he is a hard worker. He was impatient with inefficiency. He didn't necessarily expect everyone to work as hard as he did--but he wanted production... He was single-minded, single-purposed. He wedded his life to the school. That is why it has been hard for him to step aside from it. But he is making the adjustment... (2).
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---------, letter to Herbert Kahn, April 4, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

---------, letter to Herbert Kahn, September 12, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

---------, letter to Herbert Kahn, March 26, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

---------, letter to Herbert Kahn, March 27, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

---------, letter to Harold Kuhn, October 8, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

---------, letter to H. J. Kennard, July 9, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

---------, letter to Mr. and Mrs. Paul Kirkpatrick, November 21, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

---------, letter to Mr. and Mrs. Bert Kreller, January 14, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).
Walvoord, John F., letter to John Koontz, October 1, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to George E. Ladd, August 28, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to George E. Ladd, February 23, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Nye J. Langmade, April 21, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Nye J. Langmade, June 3, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


__________, letter to C. Fred Lincoln, September 16, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to C. Fred Lincoln, October 21, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to C. Fred Lincoln, January 9, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to C. Fred Lincoln, January 27, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to C. Fred Lincoln, February 2, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to C. Fred Lincoln, October 12, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to C. Fred Lincoln, January 3, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to C. Fred Lincoln, February 13, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to C. Fred Lincoln, February 27, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to C. Fred Lincoln, August 20, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to C. Fred Lincoln, August 31, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).
Walvoord, John F., letter to C. Fred Lincoln, January 28, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Walvoord, John F., letter to C. Fred Lincoln, March 6, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Walvoord, John F., letter to C. Fred Lincoln, April 21, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Walvoord, John F., letter to C. Fred Lincoln, June 3, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Walvoord, John F., letter to C. Fred Lincoln, October 26, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Walvoord, John F., letter to C. Fred Lincoln, December 11, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Walvoord, John F., letter to C. Fred Lincoln, December 18, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Walvoord, John F., letter to C. Fred Lincoln, March 11, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Walvoord, John F., letter to C. Fred Lincoln, July 17, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Walvoord, John F., letter to Harold Lindsell, August 17, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


Walvoord, John F., letter to Fulton Lytle, July 21, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Walvoord, John F., letter to [B.M.], July 16, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Walvoord, John F., letter to Abraham B. Machlin, October 3, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Walvoord, John F., letter to Alfred Martin, February 23, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


Walvoord, John F., letter to Clarence E. Mason, November 16, 1948 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


________, letter to E. H. McAllister, March 30, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

________, letter to Davis O. McCamy, November 19, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

________, letter to L. P. McClenny, March 12, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

________, letter to J. Vernon McGee, December 11, 1952 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


________, letter to J. Vernon McGee, July 21, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

________, letter to J. Vernon McGee, August 5, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

________, letter to J. Vernon McGee, December 30, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

________, letter to J. Vernon McGee, November 26, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

________, letter to J. Wayland McGlathery, April 2, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

________, letter to J. Wayland McGlathery, July 10, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

________, letter to J. Wayland McGlathery, January 5, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

________, letter to J. Wayland McGlathery, September 12, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

________, letter to the Memphis Furniture Manufacturing Co., October 27, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

________, letter to Millet the Printer, February 14, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to John E. Mitchell, Jr., January 17, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to John E. Mitchell, Jr., July 3, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


__________, letter to John E. Mitchell, Jr., July 8, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to John G. Mitchell, July 18, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to John G. Mitchell, March 9, 1948 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to John G. Mitchell, April 25, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to John G. Mitchell, April 27, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to John G. Mitchell, August 11, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


__________, letter to John G. Mitchell, February 5, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to John G. Mitchell, February 8, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to John G. Mitchell, March 22, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


__________, letter to John G. Mitchell, August 11, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to John G. Mitchell, October 21, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).
Walvoord, John F., letter to John G. Mitchell, October 22, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to John G. Mitchell, October 30, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


__________, letter to John G. Mitchell, November 9, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to John G. Mitchell, November 19, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to John G. Mitchell, December 29, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


__________, letter to John L. Mitchell, September 26, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


__________, letter to Charles Moore, April 4, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to W. S. Mosher, February 8, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Mrs. W. S. Mosher, December 18, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


__________, letter to Ira T. Moore, July 18, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).
Walvoord, John F., letter to M. E. Mulholland, January 14, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________, letter to J. Palmer Muntz, April 13, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________, letter to J. Palmer Muntz, April 29, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________, letter to Charles Nash, April 3, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________, letter to Charles Nash, May 9, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________, letter to Charles Nash, November 18, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


_____________, letter to Charles Nash, April 7, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________, letter to Charles Nash, August 15, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________, letter to Charles Nash, December 17, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________, letter to Charles Nash, April 3, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________, letter to Charles Nash, December 17, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________, letter to Harold Ockenga, February 4, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________, letter to Harold Ockenga, March 29, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________, letter to Charles A. Oehrig, November 5, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________, letter to Mrs. M. I. Oliver, October 2, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


__________, letter to Kenneth N. Peterson, August 9, 1948 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to William Peterson, November 8, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Ernest Pickering, September 29, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


__________, letter to Robert G. Rayburn, April 9, 1948 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


__________, letter to William H. Rutgers, February 13, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to General Manager, Safeway Stores, Inc., March 16, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Wendel Shank, January 13, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to J. E. Shelby, July 23, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Casey Smith, October 21, 1949 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Casey Smith, March 31, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to [R.S.], July 29, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Mrs. Ruth A. Stevens, December 14, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Russell Stewart, October 15, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Edward Stirm, January 31, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Cullen Story, September 6, 1945 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to J. F. Strombeck, October 10, 1945 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to J. F. Strombeck, May 24, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to J. F. Strombeck, August 15, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to J. F. Strombeck, January 10, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to the Student Body, March 26, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Richard Seume, September 13, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Richard Seume, May 12, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


__________, letter to The Sunday School Times, September 6, 1945 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to The Sunday School Times, June 19, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Shirley L. Swift, June 13, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Kenneth Taylor, March 5, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Kenneth Taylor, September 27, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Kenneth Taylor, October 9, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

__________, letter to Kenneth Taylor, July 16, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).
Walvoord, John F., letter to Kenneth Taylor, August 1, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

______________, letter to Kenneth Taylor, January 28, 1949 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


______________, letter to L. B. Trowbridge, August 1, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


______________, letter to Merrill Unger, July 11, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


______________, letter to Van Kampen Press, July 7, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

______________, letter to Van Kampen Press, September 9, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

______________, letter to Van Kampen Press, January 6, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


______________, letter to Frank Venn, October 18, 1945 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

______________, letter to Robert Voorhees, February 8, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

______________, letter to Howard Vos, April 21, 1948 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

______________, letter to Howard Vos, March 30, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).
Walvoord, John F., letter to [C.S.W.], December 18, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to Randall Walvoord, September 26, 1945 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to Louise Walvoord, November 30, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to J. Robert Walter, April 20, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to Nelson Warner, November 1, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to E. M. Wetmore, May 6, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to Florence Wheeler, October 20, 1945 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to Ernest G. Wiles, November 16, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to Earl Winsor, March 29, 1947 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to Mrs. Gerald Williams, February 22, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to John Witmer, June 6, 1951 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to John Witmer, February 13, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to John Witmer, July 19, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to John Witmer, October 20, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to John Witmer, December 2, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to John Witmer, December 18, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

_____________________, letter to John Witmer, November 23, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).
Walvoord, John F., letter to Warren C. Young, October 22, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

________________________, letter to P. J. Zondervan, June 19, 1946 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

________________________, letter to Laurin J. Zorn, August 4, 1950 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Unpublished Materials

Bibliotheca Sacra, chart on contributing authors, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


Gull Lake Conference Brochure, Summer 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Evangelical Theological Society minutes, December 30-31, 1953 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Faculty Standards, Fall, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


LaSor Transcript, no date (Walvoord Papers, Archives).

Mount Hermon Bible Conference, August 22-29, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


Three-Year Course of Study, outline, March 5, 1954 (Walvoord Papers, Archives).


Newspapers

Dallas Morning News, October 1, 1924.
The Sunday School Times, September 6, 1924.
The Sunday School Times, July 11, 1953.