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Abstract

As fundamentalist-conservatives pressed their agenda in Southern Baptist Convention life, and, in particular, as they assumed a majority on the board of trustees of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Wake Forest, North Carolina, the academic freedom of the Southeastern faculty became an issue. Concerns enunciated by Robert M. MacIver (1955) provide reference points in responding to the inquiry: "Was the academic freedom of the faculty violated at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary?" While a prologue and epilogue are offered, the study parameters of the Southeastern Seminary experience are 1979 to 1989. The study concludes that academic freedom was compromised in this case. The following areas were identified: the ability of the faculty to investigate in their fields, draw conclusions, and share their knowledge and skills with freedom; the censorship of the faculty as a collect, as well as some individual members; indirect curbs to faculty mobility; the manipulation of tenure and status conditions of the faculty to insure conformity to religious principles; and, institutional policies and procedures which impinged on academic freedom.
ACADEMIC FREEDOM
AND THE
SOUTHEASTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY EXPERIENCE
1979 - 1989
Chapter 1: The Problem

Introduction

According to Dr. Martin Marty, noted church historian at the University of Chicago, theological schools find their raison d'etre in the modern world as "centers for the religious life of church bodies" (1987, p. 124). The faculty is employed to provide a high level of instruction in, interpretation of, and research relevant to the faith. Under ideal conditions they confirm the faith in moments of doubt and perennially nurture new leadership to champion the mission.

However, ideal conditions rarely exist. Personally, faculty members are as subject to faith crises as anyone else. Intellectually, their scholarship may encourage them to probe far afield of the assumed mainstream of thought. Socially, they may not march with the church, just as the church may
not move with them, in the contemporary understanding and interpretation of the faith. As a part of the corporate experience, the institution may be more or less removed from center, and, consequently, more or less impacted by denominational politics. These potentially disparate positions sometimes become very real and, when fully actualized in church life, can lead to painful controversies.

The role of the church related theological institution is a potentially difficult one. Fundamentally, it is a child of mixed parentage. It is born of the church for the sake of a church objective. On the other hand, it grows under the watchful eyes of those who expect it to behave like a graduate educational institution. A certain amount of tension inevitably exists. Under certain circumstances, however, dissonance escalates into crisis.

The players in the struggle and the onlookers as well may apply different meaning to the struggle. For one the issue is adherence to orthodoxy, or, conversely, infidelity to the gospel. For another it may be scholarship, the pursuit and proclamation of truth, or, more specifically, an issue of academic freedom.
In a little more than a decade, a fundamentalist component of the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) targeted and secured control of the agencies of that denominational body, including the seminaries, through the board appointment process. As centers of denominational life, the SBC seminaries became focal points in the theological and political controversy that ensued. The affective climate, the relational milieu, as well as the processes of organizational life were impacted.

In the fall of 1987 fundamentalists secured a majority of positions on the board of trustees at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary (SEBTS). At once they mandated a change in the leadership style of the president. The intent was to institute their own far reaching changes through him.

The critical incident was when the board "commandeered the school's faculty appointment process" (James, 1989, p. 31). Consequently the president, the dean, and several administrative officers stepped down. The import of this maneuver was clear when a new dean was elected. The new president offered a list of candidates for the deanship to the faculty. The latter affirmed six candidates submitted by the fundamentalist
president. Yet a candidate the faculty had twice rejected was nominated and elected by the trustees (Religious Herald, March 23, 1989, p. 8).

These and subsequent events led the faculty to cry foul in terms of academic freedom. The American Association of University Professors did in fact censure that institution in the summer of 1989. The critical event cited was that "two adjunct professors had been denied reappointment because they held views that clashed with those held by the board's conservative majority" (Blum, June 28, 1989). Two accrediting agencies examined the institution: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada (ATS). Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary was placed on probation by both.

This example is not isolated. The regional accrediting associations are wrestling with definitions and policies of academic freedom in theological settings. The Curran case at Catholic University came to an apparent conclusion only after lengthy ecclesiastical and civil debate. At the same time Southeastern was being censured by the AAUP, Concordia Theological Seminary was likewise being added to the
censure list. The latter found that a tenured professor had been fired for holding a different position on the ordination of women than the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod.

These illustrate the continuing tension between the need for accountability to a denomination, as well as the desire to maintain standing within higher education. Dr. William Baumgartner, formerly of the Association of Theological Schools, says that what makes today's milieu different is that the tension is not just in one or the other denomination, but trans-denominational. Many institutions, denominations, and associations are struggling with issues of academic freedom (Baumgartner, 1989).

Purpose

The purpose of this investigation is to examine as a case study in academic freedom, the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary story from 1979, the advent of the conservative take-over, through the decade of change which followed. A prologue and epilogue are added for the sake of clarification. R. M. MacIver's principles of academic freedom will be employed as tests and reference points for discussion.
Chronicling these events will inform our understanding of academic freedom in church-related theological education. Ultimately, we must ask how archetypal the Southeastern experience is and what the implications are for the academic and religious communities to which it belongs.

**The Research Question**

Was the academic freedom of the faculty violated at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary? As fundamentalist-conservatives assumed a majority on the board of trustees of the seminary and concurrently attempted to turn the school in a more conservative direction, was academic freedom compromised?

**Subsidiary Questions**

**Descriptive**

1. Were MacIver's principles of academic freedom violated at Southeastern?
   a. Were faculty members free to investigate in their fields?
   b. Were the conclusions of study and research freely drawn?
   c. Were faculty free to share their knowledge
and skills?

d. Did institutional policies or procedures impinge on academic freedom?

e. Was anyone censored or censured, directly or indirectly?

f. Were tenure or status conditions manipulated in such a way as to insure conformity to religious principles?

(Status conditions include the broad range of opportunities to participate in and impact institutional life, e.g. faculty and seminary committees, advancement through the ranks, visibility at events, and participation in the governance process.)

g. Did authoritarian controls anticipate non-conformity? Were departures from the norm expected and lead to actions intended to curb opportunities to act or think with freedom?

h. Were there direct or indirect curbs to faculty mobility? Did barriers exist for those who sought to leave?

2. How do principles of academic freedom compare
with historic Baptist interpretations of faith?

3. Does the history of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary enhance our understanding of the events?

4. Did extra-denominational forces facilitate the crisis?

5. Did intra-institutional forces escalate the events?

Interpretive

1. What is the significance of the SEBTS controversy for higher education and theological education in historical, contemporary and future terms?

2. Does this study tender conclusions, however tentative, regarding the viability of academic freedom in seminary education?

3. What possibilities for further research does this study suggest?

Terms

Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary is one of six theological seminaries established by the
Southern Baptist Convention. Southeastern was founded on the former site of Wake Forest University in Wake Forest, NC, in 1951. In 1958 the seminary achieved recognition by the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada. In 1978, Southeastern received accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. There has been a chapter of the American Association of University Professors associated with Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary since June of 1988. In this study the shortened title "Southeastern" as well as the abbreviation "SEBTS" refer to Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary.

**Academic Freedom.**

Freedom is the ability to act or think without encumbrance. Academic freedom is the liberty to "hold and express view(s) without fear of arbitrary interference...." (Webster's New World Dictionary, 1970, p. 7).

MacIver holds that academic freedom is the freedom of the scholar within his or her community which is the "academy" (1955, p. 9). It is freedom from superstition and forced service that one may seek the
truth. The truth implies both the facts and an awareness of the dynamic relationship of things. It further allows for the scholar to make inferences from the evidence. MacIver continues by saying that academic freedom is:

essentially the freedom of the student within his field of study, and particularly the freedom of the educator to investigate, to draw conclusions, and to impart his [or her] knowledge. Anything that interferes with this freedom, either as a direct curb or by its indirect repressiveness, comes within our purview. We shall be concerned with "security" measures as well as with censorship, with tenure and status conditions as well as with authoritarian controls and the penalization of nonconformity, with the regulation of the academy as a whole as well as with interferences and charges directed against the individual teacher (p. 9).

Church-Related Theological Education

Church related theological education establishes the institutional parameters for the study. By "church" we mean to include those identified as a single body by reason of their association and
particular form of governance; a sect or denomination. Those institutions of higher education which provide for the study of God and the relationship of God to the creation constitute theological education. Church-related theological education will include those graduate institutions where ministers and teachers of the faith are trained for service in, through and to the church.

Non-graduate and non-church related institutions will be relevant to our discussion, especially as we need consider the historical development of graduate theological education. They will not be the central focus, however. Our preoccupation will be the graduate, church-related theological school or seminary.

Some may argue that the theological school and seminary exhibit different missions. Nevertheless, that they are church related and are both about the business of preparing church scholars and clergy makes them at all points difficult to differentiate. Therefore, the writer prefers to use the terms synonymously in this study.
The Theologies of the Players.

The players in this drama have been described as fundamentalist and modernist, ultra conservative and ultra liberal, evangelical, moderate, moderate fundamentalist and moderate liberal. This proliferation of identities is as much tied to the frequently perjorative nature of the dialogue and the individual desire for clarification, as it is the desire to establish linkages with others in a complex constellation of theological, philosophical, and social issues.

It is not an easy task to describe persons and perspectives fairly and appropriately. Even individuals of the same camp seem to have different preferences. Political correctness has various and sensitive rules of label etiquette. All of which led one exasperated layman to plead:

I'm fed up to my Adam's apple with all this gobbledygook from you preachers, classifying each other a liberal, conservative, moderate, ultra-liberal, ultra-conservative. Don't you know that what you may consider liberal views may be moderate to me or what I might consider moderate views may be conservative to someone else? Who
gave you the right to classify anyone except yourself?" (Hefley, 1986, p. 13)

Therefore, in the knowledge that any attempt to participate in party labeling and party definition is absolutely certain to meet with opposition from someone, a measure of grace is invited.

There is an historical and then an unfavorable use of the term fundamentalism. The former is intended in this document. "Fundamentalism, arose late in the nineteenth century to fight 'Liberalism.' It flourished in the first quarter of the twentieth century" (Ashcraft, 1988, p. 61). Its theology was and is, conservative in an absolute sense, its style, aggressive and uncompromising. It is unable to tolerate diversity, believing that the essentials of the gospel are unchanging.

"The New Conservatives who emerged after World War II, were theologically conservative, but different because of their congenial spirit and willingness to acknowledge other points of view." (Ashcraft, 1988, p. 61)

Conservatives sometimes share certain beliefs with fundamentalists, but do not employ them as vigorously as tests of orthodoxy and, consequently, of fellowship.
Fundamentalist lists are not always identical, says Rob James, (1988, p. 4), but they usually include:

Christ's virgin birth, his death as a substitute to God's wrath in order that human beings would not be punished, his bodily resurrection, and his visible return to rule on a Jerusalem throne for a thousand years. All lists included substantially the following statement: The Bible, at least in its original manuscripts, is both infallible or inerrant (error-free), and inspired by God, word for word (p.4, 5).

"Moderate" should suggest a theological center in American religious life. However, in Southern Baptist life moderates are actually fairly conservative. Generally, they would have little disagreement with the list above, only in their interpretation of it. It is their commitment to the Baptist ideals of individual autonomy, democratic congregationalism, interest in social concerns, and adherence to process, and discomfort with being identified with extremism which makes them amenable to the notion of being moderate.

Regarding the Bible, moderates will allow for the possibility of inconsequential errors in matters not spiritual. Errors based on incomplete knowledge and
without intent to mislead on the part of the original writers, errors in copying, differences between authors regarding parallel accounts constrain moderates to avoid any suggestion that the Bible is perfect or without error. God alone is perfect.

There are moderates by pandenominational standards, and, while relatively scarce in the 14.5 million member Southern Baptist Convention, there are true liberals. Fundamentalists believe that moderates and liberals have thrown overboard some biblical and historical Christian concepts that have been a part of Christianity for nearly two thousand years. Nor do they seem to realize that their predominate assumptions have been influenced by humanism, evolution, relativism and subjectivism. Nor do they realize that they neglect the moral teachings of the New Testament. Thus, many of them have failed to come to grips with the sinful, savage aspects of human nature (Miles, 1987, p. 17).

Alternatively, liberals might suggest that it is idolatrous to believe that any generation has a grasp on the totality of God's truth. Furthermore, God is the author of truth whatever its source. God may speak
that truth through revelations not secured through religious experience or the members of a particular religious group.

Their commitment to the use of higher criticism in the interpretation of the Bible has earned them quite a bit of criticism from their opponents. Miracles, healings, mystical experiences may be instructive and revelatory, but they also deserve consideration in light of the most up to date understandings of psychology, sociology, and anthropology. The authority of the scriptures is frequently second to experience.

Moderates and those to their left on the theological continuum have been described as more inclined to ecumenical and even interfaith relationships. Hefley describes them as extolling the virtues of tolerance, the "high church" traditions of worship, and employing a more collaborative style of church administration. The lattermost predisposition gave rise to notable support of denominational work. Women are more likely to be ordained and serve as deacons in these churches. Growth is slower, baptisms fewer (Hefley, 1986, pp. 17, 18).

Conservatives and those to their right on the continuum are described as more separatist, seeking out
those of like mind. Therefore, there has been a decided preference for their ministers to seek training in non-SBC Bible colleges and seminaries. "That old time religion" is preferred and the ideology of preaching is expressed in terms that are black and white. Characteristically aggressive in church programs, innovative through the media, and stoutly evangelical in appeal, these churches appear to be growing faster in numbers than their counterparts, all other variables dismissed at this point (Hefley, 1986, pp. 18, 19).

Some would prefer the use of the term "inerrantist" rather than fundamentalist, because it isolates what many believe to be at the heart of their complaint and agenda: the nature of the Bible. However, there are certainly other dimensions than those neatly regarded as theological, notably social and political. Therefore, it seems this term is as inadequate as others, if not more so. Former SEBTS President Lewis A. Drummond stated in a letter to the American Association of University Professor's staff (August 23, 1988) that "the view of 'biblical inerrancy' is quite nebulous within itself." (ACADEME,
1. For a more complete discussion of the identified camps, please consider reading *The Evangelical Dilemma* by Herbert J. Miles, "Drawing the Battle Lines: Issues Separating Fundamentalists and Moderates" in *Baptist Battles* by Nancy Tatam Ammerman, the chapter "The Contenders and the Crisis" in *The Truth in Crisis* by James C. Hefley, and selected chapters of *The Southern Baptist Holy War* by Joe Edward Barnhart. Summarily, the whole issue of nomenclature warrants its own study.
Chapter Two
Review of the Literature

Theological Education

Contemporary scholars generally concur that modern higher education was born, not in Athens or Alexandria, but in medieval Europe. (See Haskins, 1957; and Kerr, 1982) If we accept this context, then we accept the conditions from which it arose. At one point, higher education was essentially theological education. When not altogether synonymous, the Catholic Church was the context and policy maker regarding most matters of inquiry and instruction. Students were considered members of the clergy, even if not ordained (Thelin, 1987, lecture).

Nevertheless the institutions were increasingly secularized. Universities held out some appeal to laymen. (The gender is to be taken literally, of course, in this particular case.) Students would be rubbing elbows with the "right sort" of people and it took the "rough edges" off youths. An image of the
"Christian Scholar" issued forth. The curriculum, however, did not change much from that which prepared the clergy. In the colonies, the earliest ministers were trained in British or continental institutions until Harvard and Yale were founded. Ministerial formation was informed by British and continental Lutheran or Reformed divines (Layman, 1986, p.95).

The earliest colleges in the new world were generally established with three missions in mind: 1) the preparation of an educated clergy, 2) the nurturing of an educated and faithful laity, and 3) the conversion and civilizing of the aboriginal population. It seems that the ink was hardly dry when these purposes were abridged. For example, Dr. Ryland, the first president of the University of Richmond, observed that an early, fundamental choice was made as to the essential mission of his institution. It was to focus on the secular education of its students, and leave the study of the scriptures to a lifetime (Ryland, 1891). This experience appears to parallel others.

But until the early nineteenth century most ministry candidates depended on a system of apprenticeships. In fact, "there developed a pattern
of private instruction, ordained ministers gathering about themselves circles of young men who wished tutoring in theological studies" (Hollis, 1981, p.444). This continued for a year or two when the students would secure their own charges. This was particularly true of the Congregationalists and Presbyterians (Noll, 1984). Interestingly enough, many of these "log colleges" and farm/study arrangements did evolve into colleges, e.g. the University of Richmond, Jefferson College and Washington College.

On the other hand, newer groups like the Methodists and Baptists did not generally require training, "but relied rather upon native intellectual ability and the more direct calling of the Holy Spirit" (Noll, 1984, p. 20). Indeed, they were surprisingly unenthusiastic about their many "hilltop colleges" being training schools for ministers. "After all, Methodists did not expect their colleges to provide them with preachers; they expected the Lord to do that!" (Weddle, 1985, p.143). This alternative might be construed a "man-made ministry" (National Commission On United Methodist Higher Education, 1976, p. 37).

Initially the entire curriculum of the colonial colleges was imbued with matters of faith. Later,
college presidents began teaching a course in divinity for senior students. Divinity soon entered a new phase as the curriculum evolved into an array of specializations. This was concurrent with the decline in importance of theological and related studies. Divinity became one among many separate departments. Like the others, they soon constructed their own postgraduate programs. These were the precursors to the theological seminary (Layman, 1986).

Other conditions also led to the new center for theological education.

When Harvard succumbed to Unitarian influences early in the nineteenth century, Andover seminary was founded in 1808 as a protest and as a suitable place for ministerial training. The precedent having been established, twenty-two denominational seminaries were founded by 1830 (Layman, 1986, p.95).

Noll (1984) suggests that a post-revolutionary cultural crisis facilitated this rapid development. A rapid growth in the population underscored a tremendous need for clergy to fill pulpits. There was the suspicion that "secularism" was growing faster than the spread of the gospel. The period before the revolution
was considered an evil episode; the new emphases were the rights of the individual and individual accomplishments.

The new institutions addressed these concerns. The seminaries accelerated the training of ministers to win those outside the fold. Theological education provided specialized study in the Bible and theology to check the spread of infidelity. Finally, and not insignificant, a degree provided a familiar certification of accomplishment. According to Noll, it was an idea whose time had come. By the War Between the States formal seminary training was the standard for the major evangelical bodies.

Noll calls the theological seminaries the "prototype for graduate education in the country and...the most successful institutions for advanced study into the twentieth century" (p. 21). The author substantiates this claim by pointing to the tremendous numbers of graduates from these schools; and the seminary sponsored academic journals, unrivaled in sophistication for many years.

Because they trained the chief exponents of the faith, theological institutions were the critical cornerstone for the preservation and interpretation of
the faith. In fact, it was largely left to the seminaries to carry this responsibility. This strength and authority did not come without cost. While the seminaries indeed proffered the most effective, educated, and thoughtful Christian commentary, even more so than the Christian colleges, they did so in relative isolation. Detached from the colleges and graduate schools they did not enjoy dialogue with other scholars, Christian and not, and other disciplines like the sciences, liberal arts, and professions. Hence, there was very little "cross fertilization." This difficulty persists according to Noll (p. 23).

As seminary professors began studying in Germany, and as the German system impacted American systems of higher education, the seminary curriculum was decisely affected. The result was the development of scholarly guilds in that context as well, increasingly attuned to non-sectarian scholarship. This "professionalization" of the faculty, not unlike that in other disciplines, is incredibily important because it has to do with matters of identity, authority, and community (Layman, 1986). These will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

A final word is offered to help set the context.
Today's seminaries make up a very small component of the higher education enterprise. Only about 185 Protestant schools belong to the Association of Theological Schools (1991-92 Fact Book on Theological Education, p. 15). The total head count is around 60,000 and the total FTE (Full-time equivalent) enrollment is about 41,000 (pp. 26,27). The "entire enrollment of seminaries in the United States and Canada, including Roman Catholic and Orthodox schools, is smaller than that of Ohio State University. The average size of the institutions was 343 in 1980. Yet the majority of the growth in the 1970's was in only 11 evangelical seminaries, all with enrollments over 500. If the increases in these schools are "discounted," then the average of the remaining institutions was 246 (actually lower than 1970) (Fletcher, 1984).

Nevertheless, theirs is a story of creativity, adaptability and change. It is a vital, if small, sometimes influential facet of the world of higher academe. Theological education is quite worthy of serious study.
Academic Freedom in Theological Education:

Critical Episodes

Medieval Ages.

After Galileo brought forth the deductions of his astronomical observations, he was led before the Inquisition, the general court established in the thirteenth century for the discovery and suppression of heresy (MacIver, 1955). Academic freedom at that time was the freedom of the church to defend the faith from that old deluder Satan, as well as threats to church policy and polity. In some circles this definition persists (Cramer, 1986).

Changes were afoot, however. The universities in medieval Europe gained a sense of corporate autonomy unheard of previously. John Thelin outlines the trend (1982, p. 29).

The pattern involved three stages: first, a university gained the ecclesiastical status which made it immune from local secular urban jurisdiction; second, it received royal exemptions which meant that the king protected the university from both city authorities and the bishop; finally, a university was granted papal privileges, which meant that the institution was
accountable to Rome, exempt even from control by a nation's king.

The vying among these players for the loyalty of the universities led to many privileges. The gains in academic freedom are nominal by today's standards. Yet, the autonomy allowed by charter granted this guild license to grant degrees and, hence, some power over curricula and professions (Thelin, 1982, p. 30).

When Henry VIII broke relations with the church, so went the fortunes of the English colleges founded by monastic orders. The Act of Supremacy brought an end to the medieval profession of canon law and with it a powerful discipline of the university (Thelin, 1982, p. 51). Theological study was not absent, but hardly the branch of higher education that it once was. At this point, perhaps, freedom meant that theological scholarship had to find its own way among the disciplines with no extraordinary privileges.

Beginnings in America.

Henry Dunster was the first president of Harvard. Well regarded as a scholar and competent as a fund raiser, he nevertheless fell into disfavor with the Puritan overseers of the college. When he refused to
allow his fourth child to be baptized, New England was aflame with the news. Fearful of the repercussions of the scandal and sorely detesting the Anabaptist movement altogether, the General Court advised the Overseers to dispense with persons "that have manifested themselves unsound in the fayth, or scandelous in theire lives, and not giving due satisfaction according to the rules of Christ." Dunster tendered his resignation (Hofstadter and Metzger, 1956).

The Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century.

Perhaps the Dunster affair elicited a backlash from the other religious groups. The Unitarian takeover of Harvard and subsequent establishing of Andover was a prototype of things to come. Denominations established seminaries to educate their own clergy and preserve the traditions and maxims of the founders. In order to "guard against the rise of erroneous and injurious instruction in such a seat of sacred learning," institutional patriarchs often required the signing of a creed, or an "Abstract of Principles," as did James Petigru Boyce at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (Hinson, 1985). This is ironic, given the non-creedal preferences of the
Baptists. Yet, it does serve to illuminate the seriousness with which they took doctrinal purity, especially at the fountains of learning. Academic freedom was measured within the fence of orthodox beliefs.

Hinson outlines four controversies and the results at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky (1985). The report describes evidence of that institution's predilection for supporting denominational convictions over that of their own academics when the two experience conflict. While SBC sentiments inevitably prevailed, an 1859 issue of the Religious Herald (June 2) intimates that there was continuing distrust on the part of Southern Baptist's regarding Southern Baptist Theological Seminary's orthodoxy during the period.

Academic freedom was also a matter of the interpretation of those basic beliefs. Caught in the throes of significant social upheavals, religiously affiliated institutions experienced painful, even quite destructive consequences. The slavery question made for one such significant episode (Beauregard, 1982). For a more elaborate treatment of this issue the reader is encouraged to examine James Fraser's paper (1988),
"Abolitionism, Activism, and the Founding of Oberlin College" from Lane Seminary. It involved two significant names in the history of the church, Lyman Beecher and Charles Finney, whose separate interpretations of an activist lifestyle led them in distinctly different directions with regards to theological education and the Christian ministry. In the latter part of this century, civil rights and the women's movement have also impacted the position of the seminary vis a vis the church.

Modern Catholic Theological Education.

Charles E. Curran, himself the object of controversy in Catholic higher education, offers a succinct account of the evolving nature of academic freedom in the Catholic university and with Catholic theology (1980). From the outset academic freedom has been an issue for Catholics because of the ever present fear "of individualistic license and of the dangers of denying an objective morality based on the law of God" (Curran, 1980, p. 126).

Before the 1960's there was widespread feeling among college and university educators in general and among Catholic leaders in these fields that
the Catholic institution of higher education was incompatible with the full or absolute academic freedom existing in American institutions of higher education (p. 128).

But in the last two decades the Roman Catholic Church has given increasing attention to human rights. Catholic scholars endorsed the 1940 American Association of University Professor's Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Significant papers urged institutions to secure the full meaning of academic freedom. Most significant was the 1967 report signed by twenty-six leaders in Catholic higher education in North America. It was called "The Nature of the Contemporary Catholic University" or "Land O'Lakes Statement." Their position follows.

The Catholic university today must be a university in the full modern sense of the word, with a strong commitment to and concern for academic excellence. To perform its teaching and research functions effectively, the Catholic university must have a true autonomy and academic freedom in the face of authority of whatever kind, lay or clerical, external to the academic community itself. To say this is simply to assert that
institutional autonomy and academic freedom are essential conditions of life and growth and indeed of survival for Catholic universities as for all universities (Curran, 1980, p. 129).

Curran goes on to summarize that "cultural changes; changes in Catholic higher education; and philosophical and theological changes -- appear to have contributed to this abrupt change." Yet, academic freedom is not altogether realized. Significant struggles persist over who is in command of the parameters and policing of academic freedom. The courts upheld Catholic University's right to dismiss Father Curran for teaching views which differ from traditional church teachings. The mood at the University has been described as uncertain at this point. Nevertheless, Catholic educators from around the world met in Rome recently to discuss Vatican proposals governing Catholic higher education, including academic freedom. Papers continue to invite papal blessings on academic freedom.

Modern Protestant Theological Education.

Occasions for difficulty in our subject are not lost on the Protestant denominations. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Bulletin
for April of 1975 discusses a case at Concordia Seminary (Lutheran) in Indiana (Friedlander, Froehlich, and Wagner, 1975). Professor Arlis J. Ehlen was denied reappointment and dismissed for reasons that had to do with his interpretation of passages from the Old Testament. The AAUP investigating committee disapproved of the move on the grounds that Ehlen was not allowed due process or adequate protections that are underlined in the 1940 Statement of Principles.

Their story includes a sequel. At the 75th annual meeting of the AAUP Concordia was censured once again. Tenured faculty member Alvin J. Schmidt was dismissed for opposing the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod teachings forbidding the ordination of women. Mr. Schmidt in turn filed a lawsuit in Indiana State Superior Court against the institution.

The Chronicle of Higher Education reported that professors and administrators vowed "to fight what they call the 'fundamentalist takeover' of Mercer University and Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary."

Institutional leaders described the "takeover" attempts as "assaults on academic freedom" (Heller, 1987, p.A15). (See also The Christian Century, November 20, 1985, for a related story regarding a faculty member's
McMillan describes "a gloomy picture" for professors of religion (1987). "Restrictive church laws," "attacks on dissenting academics," and "arbitrary tests of orthodoxy" may be as fair a description of some Protestant experiences as Catholic in higher education. (pp. 9, 11)

Summary.

Miller describes church related higher education as the "sanctuary of academic freedom" (1976, ERIC Abstract). The illustrations which have proceeded show that these freedoms may not reach the seminary campus, or, at best, are under assault. Second, the roots of the concern for academic freedom run deep in the known and recorded past. Finally, academic freedom issues are "system wide" in theological education.

The Missions of Graduate Theological Education

The Mission: Ecclesiastical or Scholarly?

There appears to be a continuum in the understanding of the mission of theological education. On the one hand, there is a conserving and protecting
function to be provided. This is the mission to protect the treasure which is the faith and communicate it. On the other hand the seminary may be seen as a sanctuary of academic freedom. In this case, religious studies, are

pluralistic, comparative, interdisciplinary and objective. When these four criteria are met then the study of religion will be consistently academic and humanistic -- free of partisan control, open to radical doubt, responsive to cultural interaction, and concerned with human enrichment. (Kliever, 1988, ERIC Abstract).

Several attempts to synthesize this dichotomy have been made. In "La Liberte Du Theologien Dans L'Eglise et a L'Universite" Jean Richard (1981) discusses how freedom is essential for any undertaking in the church. Since the church is itself theological, then it, too, is subject to scholarly theological discussion. If this assumption is granted then no academic consideration is off limits.

Martin Marty (1987), and Hauerwas and Williman (1986), encourage a stronger consensus of purposes between church and theological community. Theological professors have been influenced more by their graduate
school training than church, they say. Some of the
problem is "They see themselves as process thinkers or
Barthians rather than as Baptists or Episcopalians..."
(Hauerwas and Willimon, p. 120). Marty elaborates,
"Tomorrow's theological schools do well to select
faculty and students with abilities to sense, locate,
define, and begin to address problems in the
experimental life of the church(emphasis added)."

Conservative Carl F. H. Henry advises that "no
school can be distinctive without some shared beliefs"
(1976, p.8) In fact, it is not that some theological
schools have beliefs and others do not. They differ
"in respect to the beliefs they overtly or implicitly
require" (Abstract). While many institutions do little
more than indoctrinate, they do better to allow
students to cultivate their own heritage. This faith,
responsibly possessed, is their academic duty.

**The Mission as Education.**

This alludes to the fact that there are different
perceptions as to what the education process really is.
Kenneth O. Gangel addresses the matter in such a way as
to be relevant to this inquiry (1978). Gangel comments
on the tensions between the academic freedom of the
scholar/teacher and the institution.
The point is that evangelical higher education must be concerned not only with the rights of teachers to be different from each other but also the right of institutions to be different (by virtue of their theological commitments) from the increasingly secularized educational establishment (p.196).

He describes a continuum line model adapted from T. F. Green.

Figure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct</td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditioning  Training  Instructing  Indoctrinating

*  *  *  *  *

*  Heart of  *
*  Rational  *
*  Inquiry  *
*  
*  Region of Intelligence  *

*  *  *  *  *  *  *  *  *  *  *  *  *  *  *  *

The author addresses the inappropriateness of
either the conditioning or indoctrinating extremes. He posits that truth will necessarily produce a "certain core curriculum" (p. 198). The heart of rational inquiry is the sum of the what, why and how's of particular subject matter. This freedom to press toward the center represents a willingness to worship God with the mind "by thoughtfully considering all aspects of potential truth."

The effective teacher will teach with concurrent commitments to the absolute truth and the spiritual dimensions of life. This can be terribly difficult. Unfortunately, Gangel stops short of describing his understanding of how one may secure that precarious balance, or, in other terms, who may share that key nexus. Is "effective teacher" defined by theological bent? Furthermore, while he deals thoroughly with the problem of conditioning from a spiritual perspective, he does not follow through with consideration of

1. In response to the question, "Of all the commandments, which is the most important?" Jesus replied, in part, "Love the Lord your God with all your...mind..." (Mark 12: 30, The Holy Bible, New International Version, 1984, p. 1576).
indoctrination as well.

The Mission Defined by Church Relatedness.

Degrees of church relatedness is a concept that requires attention. Obviously, the relationship between institution and denomination is as varied as there are couplings. Yet, no literature addresses this specifically. Articles relevant to the subject of church related colleges might be applied. Cunningham suggests three models of relatedness: the Consonant College (or Ally), the Proclaiming College (or Witness), and the Embodying College (or Reflection) (1978).

The Consonant College is an institution that, feeling independent in its own operation, is committed to the tradition of its related church and to consistency with that tradition in its own behavior. Its values are in the main its denomination's values. They are taken seriously and are evident in the life of the college and the lives of its alumni/ae...The Consonant College may talk very little about its church relatedness, and this may be one of its marks of consistency with its church, which itself may also be less concerned
with public protestation. Only those who start by assuming that only loud profession is to be credited could conclude that quiet admission is a weakness...This college, then finds itself in the position of being an Ally with its denomination, bent on upholding the same values but not engaged in breast-, or brow-beating on behalf of the denomination. Haverford and Salem Colleges are illustrative of this model....

The Proclaiming College...is an institution that joyously announces its affiliation with its sponsoring denomination at every appropriate occasion...in its program it practices what it proclaims in ways that seem approvable to the two worlds in which it exists -- education and religion....[It is] the acknowledged academic partner of the church, taking seriously both its intellectual and its ecclesiastical character. Once upon a time it witnessed to its own people...or it may have been a witness to the world outside and sought to persuade its own to carry the gospel to the unwashed. Most of the Catholic colleges belong here...Methodist colleges also...or (many) other mainstream Protestant
groups....

Whereas it might be said that the Proclaiming College is one whose allegiance is to the norms of the higher education with ecclesiastical overtones, the Embodying College would be one whose allegiance is to the tenets of its church with educational overtones. It is the mirror, almost the embodiment, of the denomination.... They're usually on the attack....[and] adhere to a sharply defined orthodoxy differing in some special regard from the general run of religious thought. Thus the colleges are Mennonite, Lutheran Church -- Missouri Synod, Church of Christ, Seventh-Day Adventist, etc (pp. 32-42).

Cole would have us consider four bands on a spectrum: the parochial school, the Christian college, the commitment to a "Christian ethos," and the totally secular institution (1970). At one end is the totally secular institution, quite often banned from any particular stance with regard to religion. The other extreme is the parochial school which clearly has as its aim the conversion of students to a particular faith perspective. One step in on the right on the band is the Christian college. Whether or not it has a
denominational tie, there is a commitment to a "Christian ethos" and tradition. One step in on the band from the left is the church-related college. "It shares with the Christian college and the secular institution a primary commitment to education as its task, but shares with the parochial institution an affiliation with a particular denomination." The Cuniggin and Cole models are quite similar. Together, they advise the reader that relationships with church bodies are peculiar, and also fluid.

Summary Conclusions.

There are many difficulties in describing the nature of academic freedom in theological education. Surely there are more dimensions to be found in this complex "Rubik's cube" than have been mentioned. However this section has commented on only three dimensions: ecclesiastical versus scholarly thrust, educational methodology, and definitions of church relatedness. The review reveals academic freedom to be a source of tension; manifested, discussed or able to be discussed in several ways; yet not in a single definitive work, article or study.
Key Interest Groups

The Denomination.

The faithfulness of the intelligentsia, the faculty principally, to fundamental principles and dogma was and is a critical, even vulnerable point for denominations. Most were founded with a particular expression of the faith in mind. The necessity of a continuing supply of orthodox ministers and scholars could be likened metaphorically to the need for offspring to cultivate the family farm in an earlier day. Satisfactory Biblical homogeneity grants stability. Cooperative spirits of like-mindedness help oil denominational processes. Yet it is seldom this easy.

Duane Cummins, President of the Division of Higher Education, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), summarizes "What the Church Expects of the Seminary" (1987). First, the seminaries supply "centers of theological inquiry," to offer contributions to Christian thought; to assist the church in developing its own theological identity; and the institution that will be expected to serve as the vital center of
thought for the whole church. (p.1)

Only, sometimes the church would rather be the center of thought, because the thinking of its scholars is suspect. On occasion the church has stepped over corporate boundaries in order to restore orthodoxy. This was the case at Concordia Seminary in Missouri. Professor Arlis J. Ehlen was denied reappointment and dismissed in February, 1974, for reasons concerning his interpretation of passages from the Old Testament. This occurred in spite of overwhelming support for him from his peers and the students. The investigative committee found the policies and procedures deficient in providing academic due process and protecting academic freedom.

This is the conclusion of the Investigative Committee regarding Concordia Seminary. "Concordia Seminary is seen as primarily serving the Church and only secondarily as an institution of higher learning where scholarly studies may be pursued no matter where these studies may lead (Friedlander, et al., 1975, p. 58).

Cummins (1987) identifies a second expectation of the seminaries. It is that these institutions serve a perennial need as "centers for educating its
ministers." These centers must be sensitive to and enablers in denominational changes, as well as societal changes, equipping ministers to serve throughout the transformations.

On the other hand, sometimes denominations and their institutions are not of the same mind regarding transformation. Predictably, controversies have both theological and political import. The controversy detailed in the Research Question above is a case in point. Theological moderates in the Southern Baptist Convention held sway for many years and once largely populated the faculties of the seminaries. The fundamentalist faction is committed to the position that the Bible is infallible and inerrant, though these terms have been subject to various interpretations. Nevertheless, they are committed to staffing agencies of the Convention with personnel who hold the same positions they do. The training of ministers to serve the Convention is the subject of debate.

Finally, Cummins suggests that "the church will look to its affiliated seminaries as centers for the development of national leaders in the coming age." Specifically, he observes that "our day is a time of fragmentation, individualism, pluralism -- an age of
separation." Only, church efforts to consolidate power and root out heresy have sometimes further splintered believers.

For the past couple of decades, most U.S. Catholic institutions have been considered university first and Catholic second. Generally, the commitment of Catholic higher education is to guarantee academic freedom. But conservative reformers at the Vatican are trying to bring the American institutions into line. According to Jerome Cramer (1986), the issue can be boiled down to this, "Can the Vatican decide who can teach or what can be taught in American Catholic universities or colleges?" (p.30)

Therefore, when the church threatens to revoke the ability to teach of well regarded theologian Charles Curran at Catholic University there is an uproar. Curran believes in the right to "always be in dialogue with the world...to criticize and learn." The Vatican considers this unacceptable dissent. Conservatives would have him removed from influential roles, including teaching.

At Catholic University, the Rev. Charles E. Curran, a tenured professor of moral theology, was suspended from teaching pending a separate
decision by the university to declare him ineligible to teach Roman Catholic theology.

(Blum, 1988, p. A20)

The university did consequently remove him from his position. Curran sued for breach of contract. A District of Columbia Superior Court judge upheld the right of the Holy See to declare him ineligible to teach Catholic theology, and therefore to teach at Catholic University (Blum, March 8, 1989).

Nevertheless, dissent remains widespread, dissent which intends to convince the Vatican to support principles of academic freedom (Stobart, 1989).

Like his conservative Catholic counterparts, evangelical Protestant theologian Carl F. H. Henry believes that Curran's position is a breach of contract (1976). He accuses some scholars of appealing to rights of academic tenure to cover "doctrinal aberrations." Should seminary and teacher arrive at this impasse, he suggests that the school consider earlier commitments unbinding, or the faculty member should resign.

Denominations, however, are rarely a people of one mind. Consider again the "Abstract of Principles," a confessional statement employed by James Petigru Boyce
to insure faculty conformity at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary more than a century ago. Not every Baptist agreed that the faculty should sign such an article. Here is the report of the Religious Herald, a state Baptist paper for Virginia, dated June 24, 1858.

That Creed. The Louisiana Baptist protests against the creed which has been adopted to regulate the teaching of the Professors in the Theological Seminary, Greenville, SC (p. 6).

The Faculty.

Nor do we find faculty in full agreement. Continue to consider the issue of confessional statements like the "Abstract of Principles" above.

1. A confessional statement is a written acknowledgement of beliefs, and in this case, those beliefs held in common. Sometimes it is a recapitulation of a formal creed of the church. Under other conditions it simply articulates a set of general principles of the faith or an historic tradition shared by a people. Faculty are often required to sign this article as an affirmation of their faith in order to assume the task of teaching at the school.
Charles W. Hedrick comments on the difficulties of such articles in the paper, "On Wearing Two Hats While Standing on a Banana Peel: Confessional Statements in Theological Education" (1984). The author describes four positions where these women and men stand regarding confessional statements: (a) They concur with the statement and its particulars; (b) they concur with the statement, but subject the particulars to a preferred interpretation; (c) they do not covenant with the statement, but sign anyway; (d) They initially believe, but subsequently change their minds.

Nevertheless, the faculty members tend to be supportive of one another. This may be a duplication of the phenomenon in universities where faculty are more at home in their discipline than in the university itself. That is to say, they are more at home in the specialty than the institutional mission. Likewise, the seminary faculty member may be more at home in the seminary or even discipline than in the denomination which spawned the mission. (Layman, 1986)

W. Robert Martin, who once worked with the Princeton based Fund for Theological Education, mourns the sad fact that many faculty and some administrators have indeed become preoccupied with
looking good in the eyes of the secular academy and in the process have clearly forgotten why their schools exist and to whom they really belong in the best sense of that word....

(The personnel of the seminary -- administrators and faculty -- really have to evaluate afresh their seriousness about the church, their seriousness about the mission of the church in the world, and their seriousness about the relationship of knowledge to the practice of what they teach as it concerns the hopes and hurts of the culture around them (Layman, p. 104).

On the other hand, this is only one side of the story. Remember that the faith community has largely required certification, training and approval from without for their scholars. Gangel, in the context of conservative Dallas Theological Seminary, avowed

The Christian professor striving toward excellence will cut the scholarship credibility gap by seeking and earning maximum credentials. Obviously, maximum credentials for teaching in college and seminary in the present day are represented by an earned doctorate...Only God can qualify but man can certify and credential those
qualifications (p. 202).

The terminal degrees are most often found in the secular universities where liberal persuasions like academic freedom are considered essential. Additionally, scholars must participate in a system which separates the cognitive study of God from the knowledge and experience of God. Theology became a science in early nineteenth century Germany along with a host of other disciplines. The impact of this has been well documented. (See Layman, p. 94)

One keynote in the tune for academic freedom is that when a teacher is under fire his or her actions or fitness for the academy he or she be assessed by peers. It is interesting to observe that in Hinson's review of controversies at Southern Baptist Seminary there is a decided preference for this (1985). There is apparent acceptance of the rightness of purges that are handled from within; but the author is not comfortable with the heat that comes from without, as is the case in their current confrontation with the fundamentalists.

Apart from the reports of a widening rift between theological education and the constituencies they serve, there is evidence to the contrary. Several citations suggest not only an interest, but real

American Association of University Professors.

Minimal standards for academic freedom were articulated in 1915 at the founding of the American Association of University Professors. This Declaration of Principles was followed by a "Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure" in 1925. This product of the meeting of the American Council on Education was generally supported throughout higher education because of its endorsement by both the Association of American Colleges and the AAUP.

The "Conference Statement" was a rather large and unwieldy statement which found itself replaced in 1940. This Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure was "endorsed by the most significant academic associations, (and) is generally accepted as governing higher education in the United States" (Curran, 1980). The Association of Theological Schools (ATS), the association of graduate schools of theology and seminaries, endorsed the 1940 "Statement" in 1963.
The recourse of both the AAUP and ATS in dealing with schools that violate standards of academic freedom is to censure the institution by putting them on probation (AAUP Bulletin, Spring, 1985). It seems the key decision for governing bodies is whether or not the institution seeks an identity through the denomination, an agency which ensures standards agreed to by covenanting schools, or both. These are self-limiting decisions resulting in restricting conditions.

The 1940 statement included: a) the right of the teacher to full freedom in research and publication; b) freedom in the classroom to teach subjects relevant to the course; c) the freedom to act and speak as any citizen as long as he does not abuse the privileges of his profession. It also suggested that "limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment." This is identified as the critical "limitations clause."

After a probationary period faculty should receive tenure. This could only be terminated for "adequate cause," except where retirement because of age is concerned, or financial crisis.

Certain practical principles regarding academic
appointments include: 1) the articulation of precise terms and conditions of the appointment; 2) the duration of probationary periods for tenure (not more than seven years) with notice of at least one year if tenure is not to be granted; 3) termination should be determined by both the governing board and the faculty; in which case, the teacher should be informed, have counsel, and adequate hearing (Hofstadter and Metzger, 1955).

Since the advent of the AAUP statement a number of articles concerning the "limitations clause" have followed. Collectively they have suggested a "general shift away from [creedal] limitations at institutions which teach theology as an academic discipline." (AAUP Bulletin, Spring, 1975, p. 53).

No confessional standard obviated the requirement for responsible liberty of conscience in the Christian community and the practice of the highest ideals of academic freedom.

So long as the teacher remains within the accepted constitutional and confessional basis of his school, he should be free to teach, carry on research, and to publish, subject to his adequate performance of his academic duties as agreed upon
The teacher should have freedom in the classroom to discuss his subject in which he has competence and may claim to be a specialist without harassment or limitations. ("Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Theological School," adopted by ATS in 1960. AAUP Bulletin, Spring 1975, p. 53)

In 1970, following a review of the matter by AAUP's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure in 1969, the following was adopted as Interpretive Comment No. 3 of the 1940 Statement of Principles. Most church-related institutions no longer need nor desire the departure from the principles of academic freedom implied in the 1940 Statement, and we do not now endorse such a departure (AAUP Bulletin, Spring, 1975, p. 53).

Therefore, on paper, AAUP no longer interprets seminaries as exceptional cases. Nevertheless, when Davis traced the consequences of events where a school denied academic freedom to professors, he found that AAUP was not likely to censor the institution. In fact, Davis concludes that "Since 1950 AAUP has not spoken in support of the restraint clause, but has also
failed to repudiate it" (Abstract, 1983).

Summary.

This section has been concerned with the principle groups which interpret and police the ideal of academic freedom in theological education: denominations, faculties, accrediting agencies and professional organizations. It can be a complex and anxious love triangle because of the peculiar chemistry of the theological institution.

The story of the development of theological seminaries...is a complex history of a "hybrid" institution that belongs both to the churches and to higher education. Those concerned with the interests of seminaries must know their history and not sever one purpose of the seminaries from the other, even though at a given time one or the other may need more sustained attention (Fletcher, 1984, p. 73).

Verily, there are tensions in theological education. Indeed, there are stressors within each actor in the drama. Yet this may be a creative and protective function. Hollis might have directed the following to this triumvirate (the faculty; the church constituency, especially as it has authority as a
denomination; and the professional organizations and accreditation agencies,) when he stated:

By stressing that God is sovereign over life and its institutions, this tradition (in this case, the Reformed tradition) has sought to discern in church, state, and Academy imperfect but genuine expressions of the divine will. In order that each might play its proper role, this tradition has also emphasized the importance of their relative autonomy. Such is needed to promote the common good, to challenge idolatrous tendencies in each other, to maintain a tension essentially creative and preservative of the values of freedom and justice. Thus, Christ and the culture transmitted by the Academy are not held to be in complete antithesis with one another, nor as being in complete harmony with one another. Rather, just as Calvin saw it, Christ and such culture remain in tension...(Hollis, 1981, p. 443).

Theological education is an historically and currently significant component of higher education. Academic freedom has provided a continuing source of tension in this quadrant of academia, one observed attentively by others in the larger community of higher
education. The Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary experience in the last decade is another critical incident in the history of academic freedom, one which warrants more detailed attention.
This study requires a benchmark reference point from which to assess the state of academic freedom. Maclver's succinct definition provides the larger conceptual framework for the study. It is "the freedom of the educator to investigate, to draw conclusions, and to impart his (or her) knowledge." These three principles are buttressed by the particulars of MacIver's interpretation of academic freedom. He adds that this ideal is

essentially the freedom of the student within his [or her] field of study, and particularly the freedom of the educator to investigate, to draw conclusions, and to impart his knowledge. Anything that interferes with this freedom, either as a direct curb or by its indirect repressiveness, comes within our purview. We shall be concerned with "security" measures as well as with censorship, with tenure and status
conditions as well as with authoritarian controls
and the penalization of nonconformity, with the
regulation of the academy as a whole as well as
with interferences and charges directed against
the individual teacher (p. 9).

Kindred documents like the 1940 "Statement on
Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure" and
subsequent interpretations by the American Association
of Theological Professors were useful as supporting
definitions in this investigation. A great deal of
care has been exercised to admit for discussion certain
definitions, formal or otherwise, that were useful in
earlier days, and/or appropriated by actors in the
particular context about to be studied.

Sources

Quantitative resources availed themselves to this
study. The 1991-92 Fact Book on Theological Education
by the Association of Theological Schools in the United
States and Canada, and sociologist Nancy Tatom
Ammerman's various cameo reports of surveys of Southern
Baptists in Baptist Battles (1990) provided basic re-
sumes, so to speak of ATS theological seminaries and
Southern Baptists respectively. These provided
interesting preparation for the study, but were not
intrinsic to it.

However, the vast bulk of the research has depended on qualitative materials: seminary and denominational archives, newspapers, religious periodicals, letters, institutional memoes, books of reports, and interviews.

Dr. Robert Dale, currently Assistant Executive Director of the Virginia Baptist General Board and once Director of the Doctoral Program at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, provided a great cache of articles and primary documents, as did the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary chapter of the American Association of University Professors. The former Librarian, at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Dr. Gene McLeod, was particularly helpful and patient in giving guidance toward particular sources. The American Association of University Professors and the Southern Baptist Convention Historical Society were helpful, especially in providing documentation of a chronological and historical nature, respectively. Some sources of particularly helpful chronologies and documents desired to remain anonymous because their continuing relationship with the seminary would be threatened. Together, these primary and secondary
documents provided the necessary foundation for this study.

The interviews proved exceptionally useful. While the interviews were intended to be a complimentary piece to the other sources, the recollections of participants proved so clear and meaningful that the interviews proved to be the primary sources of information for the study. Thirty seven persons of the past and present Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary administration, faculty, and trustees participated. An officer of the Association of Theological Schools, as well as one local pastor offered commentary.

One denominational leader, one student, two adjunct faculty, six administrators, six trustees, and 21 faculty members were interviewed. It does not appear inappropriate that more faculty were interviewed than representatives of other groups. It is their experience which gives this study a raison d'etre.

The interviews were intended to take just forty five minutes to an hour. Perhaps two actually did. Generally, they were an hour and a half, and as much as two and a half hours. With one exception, it appeared that everyone, on all sides of the conflict, desired to
It was suggested that the interview schedule, presented above as "subsidiary questions," be used as a survey in order to quantify responses, but this quickly proved impractical and not especially useful. The potential respondents began and left their relationship with Southeastern Seminary at different times. The faculty, in particular, drew a solid line between their experience prior to 1987 and after. Other variables like time, availability, even such things as teaching area would have made a difference as well. The questions were not as relevant to those not faculty, administration or trustees, e.g. the student, the pastor, and the denominational leader. Finally, the instrument was not designed as a survey, but as a prompter for an interview. Participants frequently ventured far afield from the questions, and sometimes with added benefit to the study.

When the proposal for study was conceived, the "war" was being waged and the outcome still uncertain. The fiery salvos were still being hurled; the strategies still being developed. At the time the proposal was accepted, the contest was essentially decided and the outcome embraced, if bitterly on the
one part. At this time the testimonies were emotional, the content a barrage of broken pieces. When, after gathering dust on the shelf for three years, the proposal was finally activated and the research completed, it was apparent that the signal events stood out clearer and the meaning of the experience had been refined in the minds of those interviewed. As the final denouement of the story was increasingly complete, and distance extended in time, geography, and, almost always, from deep emotion, the recall and the clarity with which the characters spoke of the issues became remarkable. It may have been one occasion in the history of graduate education when procrastination was profitable.

A vast amount of data is available regarding the events surrounding Southeastern. A veritable "paper trail" documents the tale. It is recent history, and the participants are alive to tell the story. The parameters of the study, 1979 to 1989, with supporting antecedents and epilogue, are relatively broad. It was a demanding task to sift and organize the material into a meaningful account, then, to sort through the scores of academic freedom related issues for analysis.

There was little contradictory evidence as such.
The facts are remarkably well established. However, there were and are differences in definition, particularly of academic freedom. There were and continue to be multiple viewpoints which generate various interpretations of cause and outcomes, and their respective values. Nevertheless, the benchmark criteria statement by MacIver as modified for the purposes of the investigation provides a fixed position from which to issue queries as to the state of academic freedom at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary during the period of the study.
Chapter 4

Academic Freedom and the
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary Experience

The Southern Baptist Convention

Introduction

There are over 14.5 million Southern Baptists, comprising the largest Protestant denomination in the United States. Martin Marty, of the University of Chicago, has described this collective as the "Catholic Church of the South" (Barnhart, 1986, p. 1). Without doubt Marty had in mind their numbers, geographic reach, pervasive influence in the southern ethos, and world-wide evangelical zeal.

The presenting issue at its genesis and schism with other Baptists was slavery. Specifically, the parting of the ways between Baptists was met when a slave holder sought appointment to foreign mission service. The Home Missionary Society declined to bless the call of James E. Reeves in spite of the fact that his home state of Georgia gave generous financial support to the cause. (Garrison, 1986, p. 5H)

However, there had been for some time a yearning
in the largely rural south for centralization. It was thought that centralizing the missionary endeavor would promote efficiency and effectiveness in advancing the gospel. It might also create a more democratic system than the old associations or societies for missions which had been dominated by the churches of the cities, largely in the North, of course.

The new structure was remarkably effective. Yet, as the vast programs and agencies of Southern Baptists swelled to grand proportions, so too did a robust bureaucracy determined to keep a plethora of traditions and testimonies of faith in the same boat for the sake of missions.

Indeed, according to Walter B. Shurden, "The glue which holds Southern Baptists together is...missionary, not doctrinal" (James, 1989, p. 3). "We do not get together to check out each other's theology," declared Cecil Sherman. "We get together to do missions" (Hefley, 1986, p. 15). Dr. Leon McBeth continues:

The famed Southern Baptist unity in the past has been more functional than theological; Southern Baptists have banded together to minister in missions, evangelism, and Christian education. So long as they emphasize functional ministry, the
'rope of sand,' as one called it, holds; when they switch from function to doctrine, unity is threatened. (Cited in James, 1989, p. 3)

To some degree Baptists held this theological imprecision intentionally. Ignited by the fires of the Reformation, this stalwart sect dared to advance the notion of full liberty of conscience, local church autonomy, the separation of church and state, and, with these, a wariness of any form of creedalism. Regarding the lattermost, some staunch soul is reported to have asserted "To cram a creed down a man's throat is rape of the soul!" (Shurden, 1972, p. 15)

Ironically, in spite of this remarkable and liberating heritage, unity in Southern Baptist life was threatened perennially by doctrinal squabbles. Freedom lived in tension with responsibility; or, more specifically, liberty, even in the pursuit of truth, was never free of the hound of orthodoxy.

In no other realm was the confrontation more conspicuous or passionate than over the Bible. Sometimes colleges and schools, but generally the seminaries were the scenes of the hottest fighting.

Conflicts on Campus

According to Bill Leonard (1988, Fall, p. 38)
Almost every period in the Convention's history includes a controversy regarding theological education." The examples which follow are cited for their general import to Southern Baptist life, or for their particular consequence to Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary.

The Founding of Wake Forest College. In 1832 North Carolina Baptists voted in session to purchase a farm for the purpose of the training of young men for the ministry. That two thousand dollar investment secured property which once was the residence Wake Forest Institute, then College, and today the home of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary.

The viability of the initial project was in doubt, however. While officials of the Institute pressed the House of Commons of North Carolina for a charter, determined resistance was brought to bear against it. Young describes this (cited in Miller, 1992, Winter, p. 8).

The house voted to grant such a charter; but the senate vote was lobbied via a pamphlet written by a "hard-shell" Baptist pastor named Clod Hopper. Said Hopper: "Such theological schools are more dangerous than a Spanish Inquisition." Preachers
educated in such schools are "ready to rob the poor, drain the coffers of the rich, and are the most dangerous robbers and murderers that ever readied to cut throats." The presiding officer of the senate voted, and the charter was granted. Nevertheless, it is not certain, of course, that anti-education and anti-intellectual sentiments were dispelled.

Toy, the Bible and Science. Crawford H. Toy was professor of Old Testament at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. His comparative study of the early chapters of the book of Genesis and Babylonian stories led him to conclude that there was significant appropriation of the latter material by the Hebrew people while in exile which was interwoven into the sacred texts.

Toy also boldly asserted that there were portions of the Bible which simply could not be reconciled with contemporary science. The implication was that in some matters science must take precedence, though most assuredly not in faith.

At the founding of Southern Seminary some years before, Basil Manley wrote a confession of faith called
the "Abstract of Principles." Faculty were required to
affirm this document as representative of their faith.
Despite Toy's protestations to the contrary, it was
felt that he was teaching outside of the Abstract. Toy
was asked to resign in 1879. He eventually went to
Harvard to teach, and in continuing his faith
pilgrimage eventually became a Unitarian. (Hefley,

Whitsett Controversy. The Toy story simply
anticipated further confrontations born of a burgeoning
interest on the part of the theological community in
the objective, even scientific study of the Bible,
religion, and church history. The "historical critical
method" or "biblical criticism" is an examination of
the origins, history, and changes in a document; the
social context out of which a document emerges; the
author's intent, its artistic and social value then and
now. Inevitably certain popular myths would be swept
aside.

For instance, some persons sincerely believed that
the history of Baptists, and particularly the practice
of immersion, could be traced in direct succession to
the time of Jesus and John the Baptist. The research,
of course, increasingly discounted this theory and
scholarship ran directly into the full fury of sectarian elitism.

Dr. W. H. Whitsitt, the President of Southern Seminary, first countered the "successionists" in a series of anonymous articles. The controversy raged white-hot from 1896 to 1899. When Whitsett decided to publish his sentiments with name attached the lightning coalesced on him. Several state conventions threatened to withdraw all financial support from the seminary and certain powers were primed to move the dissolution of all relations between the SBC Convention and the school at the 1899 Convention. Whitsett resigned his post. (Shurden, 1972, p. 29 - 31)

Poteat and Evolution. When William Poteat became president of Wake Forest College in 1905 he periodically taught a freshman biology course in the old Lea Laboratory, now Broyhill Hall of SEBTS. Poteat was sympathetic with evolutionary theory. Evangelist T. T. Martin preached and wrote bitter diatribes against this and the fact that Baptist money was supporting this heretical teaching. Even J. Frank Norris, the fiery preacher of the First Baptist Church, Fort Worth, Texas, attended the North Carolina Baptist Convention to protest the teaching of evolution at Wake
In 1922, speaking before the North Carolina Baptist Convention, Poteat defended scientific inquiry as faithful Christian activity, warning against "the fear that the Spirit of truth will not guide us into all truth," and admonishing his listeners to welcome truth, and not to "stop to calculate the adjustment and revision her fresh coming will necessitate" (S.C. Linder, cited in "Academic freedom and tenure Southeastern," 1989, p. 44).

On the eloquent statement of Poteat, the NC Convention voted its overwhelming and resounding support of the institution and its faculty. This outcome was not appreciated universally.

Detente came to the Southern Baptist Convention on entirely different terms than in North Carolina. One year after the celebrated Scopes trial in Tennessee in 1925 climaxed the great debate in American life, Southern Baptists were still thrashing it out at their annual meeting in Houston, Texas. George W. McDaniel, pastor of First Baptist Church in Richmond, Virginia, and president of the SBC, concluded his keynote address with the statement, "This Convention accepts Genesis as
teaching that man was the special creation of God, and rejects every theory, evolution or other, which teaches that man originated in, or came by way of, a lower animal ancestry." The Convention later adopted this statement and another which "called for all employees of Southern Baptist agencies and institutions to subscribe to the McDaniel statement" (Shurden, 1972, p.99).

The Battle of Lexington Road. Duke McCall served Southern Baptists as treasurer (executive secretary) from 1947 - 1951. While he had scholarly credentials, his gifts and reputation were as an administrator. When he accepted the invitation to serve as president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, the trustees also blessed a radical reorientation of the administrative processes of the institution. After nearly one hundred years of comprehensive faculty participation in decision making, the office of the president assumed all administrative responsibility. Many faculty perceived this as authoritarian and a departure from the worthy traditions of the institution. One faculty member of a dissident group declared:

Not one of us considers himself to be a "rebel" or
a "warrior," momentarily or constantly, against the constituted authority, much less the denomination. But we understand these terms to place us in this dilemma: either to surrender our minds and conscience to him (the president), or to be asked to resign. To do either of these, or by silence to acquiesce in them, is to be less than Christian men. If we consciously accept the first alternative, we reject our Christian freedom. If we quietly accept the second, we reject our responsibility as Christian stewards....In the Christian community we don't have superior-inferior relationships. We believe in differences of function but not of status. As adherents to the priesthood of all believers, we reject a hierarchy. We have no bosses; we have only leaders (Ramsey, 1958, p. 999).

Thirteen faculty members left the seminary on Lexington Road, most to serve elsewhere in Southern Baptist life. Among them was Morris Ashcraft, who became dean of the faculty at SEBTS in 1981 and served in that capacity until 1987.

The Genesis Commentary. Ralph H. Elliott, a professor at Midwestern Theological Seminary in Kansas
City, wrote a commentary on the book of Genesis for the Baptist Sunday School Board of the SBC. Elliot asserted that the Old Testament stories were symbolic, quite able to lead one to deep insight, but not to be regarded as historical events. Grammatical, scientific, or historical errors in documenting the stories or their transmission issue from human frailties, but in no way derail the message or purpose of God through them.

Elliot's position reflected decades of refinements in the study of the scriptures through literary and historical criticism. The Southern Baptist Convention was not to this point, however. Publication of the book in 1961 precipitated a hailstorm of criticism.

While the issue dominated the 1962 Southern Baptist Convention, the body did not directly ban the book. However, it did commission others to do the hanging.

Our abiding and unchanging objection to the dissemination of theological views in any of our seminaries which would undermine such faith in the historical accuracy and doctrinal integrity of the Bible, and that we courteously request the trustees and administrative officers of our
institutions and other agencies to take such steps as shall be necessary to remedy at once those situations where such views now threaten our historic position" (Hefley, 1990, 17).

Collapsing under enormous pressure, the Baptist Sunday School Board leadership reversed its earlier position and ceased publication of the book. A special committee of the board of trustees of Midwestern Seminary collaborated with Elliott on a statement which preserved honor for all, but it was rejected. Then, a nine point ultimatum was put to the beleagured professor. Interestingly, Elliott felt he could affirm them all. However, a tenth was added requiring him to not attempt to republish the book. Then, the language was altered slightly to compel the author to volunteer to not republish, an attempt by the board to escape the charge of "book banning." Elliot refused and was fired, ostensibly for insubordination.

Morris Ashcraft, now a member of the faculty at Midwestern and confidant of Elliott's, wrote to friends.

It is incredible that Elliott was dismissed for refusing to do what the Southern Baptist Convention had refused to do in June, the Sunday
School Board had refused to do in July, and MIdwestern's board of trustees had refused to do in September. They all refused to ban the book, but Elliott was dismissed because he refused to (Cited in Elliott, 1992, p. 125).

Ashcraft notes in the foreward to Elliott's book that Elliott had no protection in terms of tenure or by due process because Midwestern was not yet accredited (p. xiv - xv). Nor were the implications of the Articles of Faith found in the seminary bylaws, or "all acceptable academic standards used as a guide for educational institutions" brought into play according to Elliott (p. 125 - 126).

Dale Moody. Longstanding faculty member Dale Moody earned fundamentalist ire for his position on apostasy. He professed the possibility of falling from grace and losing eternal salvation. In spite of scriptural support for his opinion, this sentiment falls outside of the seminary's Abstract of Principles, to which the faculty are compelled to adhere. The Board of Trustees failed to renew his contract in 1983.

In a November 18, 1982, letter to President Honeycutt, Moody observed, "As I calculated, a thorough examination of the 20 articles of the
Abstract of Principles [of Southern Seminary] would leave me with a grade of 99. Do you know of any person who could make a higher grade on the Abstract of Principles than I can? Can you make a higher grade than that yourself? (Barnhart, 1986, p. 12)

Barnhart concludes that Moody "was relieved of his position not because he denied the infallibility of Scripture but because his interpretation of Scripture did not agree with large groups of Baptist ministers..." (p. 9). Essentially, the Moody case points to the precedence of political power over theological inquiry and debate.

The Anxiety Continues on Campus. In 1968 and 1969, members of the SBC Executive Committee staff held interviews with the presidents and faculties of the six seminaries, the purpose being to "secure a better understanding of seminary goals and problems" ("Report On," 1968, p. 1). In section C. the report identifies "Threats Felt By Seminary Professors" (p. 25 - 32).

1. The Threat of Advanced Education in Tension with the Established Stability of the Denomination. ...Our students are often warned by people back home, "Don't let them tamper with your
faith." "It is quite obvious that there is a suspicion of seminary education--we are not trusted...."

2. The Threat of the Uneducated Pastor. One natural threat the seminary professor feels is that his years of learning and his elaborate education gives him no immunity from the criticism of men and women who have only a fragment of his knowledge....

3. The Threat of the Denominational Power Structure.....
   = The mistrust of seminaries is seen in the Committee of Faith and Message which did not have a trained seminarian on it.
   = The Executive committee could be a threat under different leadership....
   = The power structure of the denomination is the pastors' conference and the evangelistic conferences--this makes us open-ended theologically.
   = One of our plagues is old American unit system politics--this means dominant control by individuals of the elite--this is the greatest threat I see to our denomination.
4. The Threat of Anonymity....One man systematically searched the SBC Annuals and documented a decline in the use of seminary professors on Convention programs and committees and boards. This lack of use, some feel, has led to a widening gulf between them and the mainstreams of the life of the denomination.

5. The Special Threat of Today's Student....Some professors have noted that "there is an inclination of students to want to check on your orthodoxy in the middle of classroom lectures...." Teachers are sometimes told by students that they are not telling the truth about their freedom to teach. In some cases, students report on the professor's lectures to extremists in their home community and in this way invite harsh criticism...."

7. The Threat of Limitation of Prophetic Freedom.... "I am not threatened by (loss of) what is usually called academic freedom; I am in a denominational school and I accept it, but I do want prophetic freedom. Southern Baptists judge me and confuse my support or lack of support of a particular person or a particular view for lack of
support of the denomination." The fear that professors have of the loss of freedom is generated outside the seminary setting. It does not lie so much with individuals as it does with an atmosphere generated by the extremists, or as has already been noted, it lies in the "exorcistic spirits." It is not so much felt in the classroom as it is in writing. It does not arise out of a situation over which the professor has control, but out of talk conducted beyond his personal reach. Most professors feel that they have complete freedom in the classroom, though some find it necessary to build hedges in order to establish their personal faith before discussing controversial subjects. Others find it bothersome to have to be anticipating students who may magnify and distort what is said. Almost universal fear exists of extreme right wing fundamentalism that could secure rigid SBC rules that would make classroom freedom impossible.

= There is the need for a deliberate theology of freedom.

= The churches must understand that if we are to serve the denomination we must be given the
9. **Some Miscellaneous Threats.** a) Most seminary professors are wary of trustee relationships, and fear the effort of denominational factions who may try to control trustees. Most would like dialogue with trustees on important seminary and theological matters.... c) Frustration in communication is a threat to some. Some feel that pastors stand in the way of communication with laymen. Others feel that most pastors have a deaf ear to theological ideas....

10. **Some Random Quotes on What It Means to Be Threatened....**

   = If people know me, I am not a liberal; if they don't, I am....

   = I am more threatened than challenged.

**Conclusion.** On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, an unidentified editor penned romantically, that the seminaries have "contributed significantly to denominational unity, loyalty, and the spirit of cooperation that prevails among Southern Baptists today" ("Southeastern Observes," 1976, p. 65). While this is doubtlessly confirmed in many meaningful ways,
the noisier evidence suggests that the seminaries have long been a trying, divisive battleground for all parties in Southern Baptist life.

Political Machines and Machinations

The tide of religious fundamentalism swelled worldwide in the 1970's. In the United States linkages were made with right wing politics through conservatives such as Richard Viguerie, Jerry Falwell, and Edward McAteer. The mutually shared agenda attacked the equal rights amendment, abortion and pornography, and fought for the teaching of creationism and a constitutional amendment for prayer in public schools.

While Southern Baptist ministers like Charles Stanley, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Atlanta, and Adrian Rogers, pastor of the Bellevue Baptist Church, Memphis, were being recruited to the Moral Majority, political craftsmen like McAteer worked closely with Southern Baptist conservatives in pressing for Convention resolutions which reflected new right sentiments ("An updated chronology," 1987, p.1). Meanwhile, others of the new right had higher aspirations, the takeover of the Southern Baptist Convention.
For some, the socio-political issues named above were just cause for holy war. No doubt a great many rejected the bureaucratic, good old boy network which long frustrated fundamentalist aspirants to positions of influence and preserved what they perceived as a thinly veiled liberal status quo. Generally, the drive for control followed the flag of biblical inerrantism against historical and biblical criticism. Finally, and quite specifically, they sought to redeem to fundamentalist orthodoxy theologically wayward agencies and institutions of the Convention.

According to Southern Baptist Convention by-laws, the president appoints a committee on committees about four months before the annual meeting. This committee

1. The "historical critical method" of the study of the Bible or "Biblical criticism" is an examination of the origins, transmission, and changes in a document of the Bible; the social context out of which a document emerges and how it relates to and compares with other writings; the author's intent as compared with the reader's interpretation; its relative worth to the church, as well as its literary and social value, then and now.
nominates the Committee on Nominations to the Convention. The Committee on Nominations chooses the slate of recommendations to each board of the SBC, including the trustees of the seminaries, and proposes their election to the Convention the following year. A successful take-over of the Convention would be secured if a series of presidents of their persuasion could be elected, who then appoint sympathetic persons to the Committee on Committees, and, through them a Committee on Nominations of singular purpose: the election of fundamentalist trustees to all Convention agency boards.

The chief strategists for the advance were Paige Patterson, president of the new Criswell Center for Biblical Studies, and Paul Pressler, a Texas Appeals Court Judge from Houston. These itinerant evangelists of the fundamentalist agenda "spoke to conservative 'rallies' in 15 states during the fall of 1978 and the spring of 1979, urging them to bring messengers to the 1979 Houston convention and elect a president who would act..." (Hefley, 1990, p. 24) Never was the agenda more clearly enunciated than a short time later at a gathering in Lynchburg, Virginia, when Pressler said:

We are going for the jugular. We are going for
having knowledgeable, Bible-centered, Christ-honoring trustees of all our institutions, who are not going to sit there like a bunch of dummies and rubber stamp everything that's presented to them. (Cited in James, 1989, p. 11)

The simplicity of the plan could be grasped by all the foot soldiers and was carried out with military precision. In 1979, with the election of Adrian Rogers, the fundamentalists began a string of election victories through which they began to hammer away at the achillies heel of a pure democratic process. With few exceptions, they employed the nomination process as a "winner take all" spoils system. Only loyal party adherents were appointed. (Ammerman, 1990, Baptist Battles, chapter 6, "Mobilizing the Troops: Resources and Liabilities," pp. 168 - 211; Hefley, 1986, The Truth in Crisis, chapter 5, "How the conservatives Kept Winning," pp. 75 - 97)

The cries on the battle-field were: in support of purity on the one hand and fairness on the other; appeals to democratic ideals and allegations of tyranny; indictments of both orthodoxy and diversity; complaints of creeping creedalism on the one hand and creeping liberalism on the other; accusations of
oppression and appeals for openness from both sides; assertions of godless, heretical liberalism, as well as mind-bludgeoning fundamentalism; and, where the Bible was concerned, the hammering forth of the inerrancy of the "God-breathed" Word of God, versus allegations of Bible-idolatry, pure and simple.

There were frequent calls for dialogue, but none occurred. Dialogue and compromise were antithetical to the we/they, win/lose dichotomies of the fundamentalist paradigm. It appeared fruitless, even counterproductive for moderates to give fundamentalists still another platform. The wheels kept turning in the fundamentalist direction and before long the new brand of trustees came through the system.

The Seminaries in the Hot Center

Why the seminaries?

James P. Boyce, the first president of Southern Seminary, once urged that "upon no point, upon which the denomination is divided, should the Convention, and through it the Seminary, take a position" (Cited in Leonard, 1988, Fall,a p. 36). This appeal was as unlikely as ever to be heeded. The seminaries were the earnestly desired high ground.
While Southern Baptists are generally not anti-education, they often seem anti-intellectual, suspicious of any educational program which might raise confusing questions about scripture, history, theology or ethics. Institutions which provide theological education will always be subject to controversy, seeking faithful adherence to their confessional statements while promoting open inquiry and freedom of thought...(Leonard, 1988, Fall, p. 37)

It does not seem far-fetched to conclude that controlling the seminaries would go a long way to ending the dissonant, liberal buzzing in the minds of fundamentalists. Ammerman clarifies this point.

From the beginning the seminaries had been the most visible target for fundamentalists who wanted change in their denomination. They had correctly discerned...that the staff and graduates of the three "liberal" seminaries (Southern, Southeastern, and Midwestern) formed the backbone of their opposition, and writers from those seminaries were the most common targets of fundamentalist speakers who wanted to demonstrate the presence of liberalism in the denomination.
Since seminary professors are likely to write books on the Bible, on the church, and on theology, their ideas made them the most vulnerable to attack.

In addition, seminaries were the institutions in the Southern Baptist social structure that seemed most directly linked to the churches. Churches wanted to be sure that when they sent their most dedicated youth to seminary, those youth would return with faith intact. They also wanted to know that when they went looking for a pastor, they could trust people with degrees from Southern Baptist schools. Fundamentalists wanted to assure Southern Baptists that what was being taught in their seminaries was true to traditional beliefs. So it was in those institutions that the battle for control of the hearts and minds of Southern Baptists was most dramatically fought. (Ammerman, 1990, p. 243)

Wuthnow (1989, p. 34) comments on the general cause and effect of the "increasing role of higher education in differentiating styles of religious commitment." The G.I. Bill rocketed the education of young adults past that of their families. From the
1950s to the present patterns emerged with startling clarity in students. With higher education individuals became increasingly tolerant of other religions, religious observance was less and less disciplined, and belief in a literal interpretation of the Bible eroded dramatically. On the other hand, those who had not been to college were markedly more traditional in belief and practice.

Conservatives, evangelicals, and fundamentalists nevertheless did catch subsequent waves into undergraduate and graduate education, but ran head-long into cultures radically different from their own. In response, some built their own Bible institutes, colleges and ministerial training centers. It was simply a matter of time before attempts were made to re-take institutions traditionally associated with conservative denominations.

Added pathos and passion was supplied in the testimonies of those who made their way through the higher education system, even to terminal degrees while retaining a fundamentalist perspective, but were never allowed to enjoy the full privileges of academe or denomination because of their theology. Some were bitter over exclusion from desirable chairs on seminary
faculties.

Furious appeals were made on behalf of impressionable young seminarians. One SBC leader "criticized seminary...professors who `rape' the faith of their students through liberal teaching." (Jerry Vines, cited in Warner, 1986, January 29, p. 12). Others expressed similar sentiments. James Draper went so far as to identify the prospect this way:

Every generation of students tends to take the teachings of its professors farther than the professors themselves. If there is an opening, if there is a loophole, if there is someplace to go with the teaching, they will go. Once we depart from divine revelation, we have at least opened the door to whatever deviation a person chooses to engage in. (Cited in Lavenue, 1989, p. 10)

Draper's view of student inclinations, a negative "fall from grace" and into apostasy, only enhanced the esteem of a few "survivors" of so-called liberal seminary education. These offered emotional testimonies of excruciating experiences in the valley of deep faith doubts, in milieus where their faith experience was devalued and even ridiculed.

In short, the fundamentalists were motivated to
capture the seminaries.

The Objective

The initial appeal was for faculty members of an inerrantist persuasion. Party leaders publicly considered dividing up the seminaries. While parity might indeed have been the original objective, as momentum developed for the fundamentalist agenda the notion of a political deal to balance on faculties or among seminaries was quickly abandoned.

After his election reporters asked Adrian Rogers if he supported a "witch hunt" in SBC seminaries.

No, but I will support an investigation by a fair and balanced committee. I am not against anyone or anything except the devil and sin. But I'll always be in favor of a (seminary professor) being replaced when it is proven by his admission that he doesn't believe the Bible to be the Word of God. (Hefley, 1986, p. 71)

Therefore, an amazing irony evolved: "an argument about doctrine in a faith that for more than a hundred years (had) prided itself on not imposing doctrine" (Stewart, 1988, September 11, p. 11). Moreover, Baptists, who historically abhorred the imposition of creeds, were about to compel a test of fellowship of
their employees.

It increasingly appeared that there was going to be a tremendous capitulation or terrible confrontation. Fundamentalists could find no pockets of resistance representing the liberal or moderate camp at Golden Gate, New Orleans, or Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminaries. While there were skirmishes at Midwestern and Southern during the decade, 1979 to 1989, the decisive theater of the war was Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary.
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

Introduction

The main thoroughfare loops obediently around the campus which undeniably dominates the town. A stone wall built by a former Wake Forest College president and an employee encircles the 450 acre park-like lawn studded with cedars, magnolias and pines. Brick walkways discreetly dissect the circle, making their way from one classic Georgian structure to another. It is a classic southern campus for an institution of higher education. Yet the old Wake Forest Baptist Church commands one distant, rounded corner of the campus, an autonomous, but constant reminder of the larger purpose of the institutional mission.

Founding

From 1925 to 1950 the Southern Baptist Convention had increased in membership sixty-seven percent (Roth, 1976, p. 79). The need for additional seminaries clearly apparent, hopes rose that a seminary might be
placed in the region of the old south where the Convention had its beginnings. When Wake Forest College accepted the offer of the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation in June of 1946 to relocate to Winston-Salem, NC, North Carolina Baptists lobbied passionately for Southern Baptists to take advantage of this fortuitous circumstance in Wake Forest, NC.

September 18, 1947, Casper C. Warren of Charlotte, NC, presented the following rationale to a joint meeting of the North Carolina "Committee of 15," charged with the task of considering the disposal of the property of the College, and the Southern Baptist Convention's "Committee to Make Investigation Concerning Theological Education."

The Need for a Southeastern Baptist Seminary

1. We need a Southeastern Baptist Seminary for the preservation of our Baptist message in the eastern section of our Southern Baptist Convention. Hundreds of our most promising young ministers are going to northern theological schools that do not believe, teach, nor practice New Testament truth as we interpret it.

2. We need a Southeastern Baptist Seminary to stabilize and maintain our Southern Baptist
solidarity.

Unless steps are taken to safeguard our distinctive tenets in this section, the day will come when theological differences will estrange western Southern Baptists and eastern Southern Baptists in the same manner which they now divide Northern and Southern Baptists.

3. We need a Southeastern Baptist Seminary to meet the increasing demand for trained Baptist ministers....

4. We need a Southeastern Baptist Seminary because we have the field for student pastorates and religious activities....

5. We need a Southeastern Baptist Seminary because of the large number of God-called men in this section who are eager for theological training....

6. We need a Southeastern Baptist Seminary because others will seek to meet the need in the event of Southern Baptist failure....

7. We need a Southeastern Baptist Seminary with the departments of religious education and music second to none, to supply the demand for pastor's assistants, educational directors, ministers of
music, and church secretaries....

8. We need a Southeastern Baptist Seminary to enlist, inspire, and challenge the Baptists of this section to a greater denominational loyalty.

Southern Baptists cradled their beginnings in this section; but, when her institutions went west, they took something from the hearts and lives of the people here that is sorely needed now. (Warren, 1947)

It is not difficult to spot the appeals to denominationalism and regionalism, as well as some flag waving to orthodoxy, not lightly salted with anxiety. Perry Crouch went on to describe the availability of the Wake Forest campus, its strategic location, adaptability and value, as well as its proximity to mission, evangelism, and preaching opportunities, as nothing less than a "miracle" (1947, p. 1).

Powerful sentimental forces enlivened the matter. In 1832 Baptists had purchased the 615 acre plantation of Dr. Calvin Jones in Wake Forest, North Carolina, in order to build a college for the instruction, training, and the support of ministers of the gospel, for it was a working farm college. Over time, as with most sectarian colleges, the purpose of Wake Forest College
was broadened to include a great many other disciplines. That a seminary should retake the campus effected a winsome, romantic sense of closure on the occasion of the college's exodus.

This proposal appeared stalled, then completely abandoned late in 1949. Privately a Southern Baptist Convention Special Committee revived its interest in February, 1950, when a subcommittee on an eastern seminary considered and approved the offer of the Wake Forest College Board's Executive Committee on March 21 of the same year. This surprising turnabout displeased some and enthused others.

Within six weeks both the board of trustees of Wake Forest College and the Executive Committee of the North Carolina State Convention met and approved the sale to the Southern Baptist Convention. Thirteen days later the Convention met in Chicago, Illinois, affirmed the recommendation, and named it the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Inc. Articles of incorporation were adopted and a board of trustees elected.

At their second meeting, December 7, 1950, the trustees formally approved a charter and bylaws. Article VIII of the bylaws required that all faculty
members subscribe to a set of "Articles of Faith" to be adopted by the board. Faculty were to sign these "Articles" at the opening of the session at which they entered their responsibilities. These articles were originally prepared by Basil Manly, Jr. and adopted by the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, founded in 1859. (See appendix)

Because there would be a season in which the college and the seminary would share the campus, detailed discussions were held and letters exchanged regarding issues of classroom and office space, library and recreational facility use, housing and other services. The administration promised to treat seminary personnel and students on the same basis as those related to the college. Having been satisfied regarding the logistics of a shared campus, the seminary trustees voted to open registration for classes in September, 1951. Eighty five registered for classes in that first semester, prompting first President Sydnor L. Stealey to comment that he believed it to be "the largest first year class ever to open a new seminary in America." For five years the seminary and the college shared the Wake Forest Campus, until the college moved to Winston-Salem in the summer of 1956. (For a
detailed account of the founding of SEBTS, see Roth, 1976, pp. 69 - 79.)

**The Ethos**

Randall Lolley described the venture as follows. It was born in the exuberance of an idea whose time had come: to establish an open, progressive Baptist free-church seminary in the heartland of the original Southern Baptist Convention territory, along the Atlantic Seaboard, on the east coast of the country, on the west coast of the world....

Dr. Sydnor L. Stealey, the seminary's first president, and Dr. Olin T. Binkley, the seminary's second president, laid the foundations for a fresh start in Baptist free-conscience, free-church, free-classroom theological education. (Cited in "The Seventeenth Alexander Meiklejohn Award," 1988, September-October, p. 44).

Dr. E. A. McDowell, one of the early members of the faculty, wrote "We were conscious that we were laying the foundation of a new seminary and charting the course of an institution that would be free in spirit and loyal to the truth as revealed in Jesus Christ" (Wayland, 1988, p. 6).
It is possible that the setting on the east coast, in the midst of a Baptist experience one hundred years older than in the frontier states, had something to do with this fresh ethos. Undoubtedly, a sense of regional heritage impacted the fledgling institution. Faculty and students from the states of the original colonies were familiar with the Baptist fight for religious freedom.

The first and essential faculty came from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Others were added, reflecting quite a spectrum of experience: New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Princeton, Yale, Harvard, Oxford, Union Theological Seminary in New York, and so on. This was perpetuated because the Seminary never offered a Ph.D. program from which to tap its own for appointment. Seen for its larger import, the breadth of exposure appeared to activate a more ecumenical milieu from the very beginning. In the words of Claude Stewart, a faculty member from 1978 to 1987:

In its brief history Southeastern Seminary had taken a place in mainstream of Protestant scholarship...it was self-consciously pluralistic; the faculty was drawn from all kinds of
institutions; self-consciously open, searching, reformist minded, as well as committed to preserving the best in Baptist life. (Personal Communication, September 9, 1992.)

The dream was ambitious. With experienced, exemplary faculty; a record breaking matriculating class; and 50% of Southern Baptist churches within 350 miles of the seminary; there may have been some justification for the intoxicating optimism. Ed Young reports:

Dr. Syd Stealey was president when I was a student...and he said to us [the student body] on more than one occasion: "Our dream is to build here a divinity school with the model being that of Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Vanderbilt or Emory." Southeastern had that kind of dream in its beginning.... (Cited in Miller, 1992, p. 8 - 9)

Therefore, in the estimation of Dr. Elmo Scoggins, a faculty member from 1955 - 1985, "From day one, the seminary was the kind of place that nobody wanted to leave. It was almost like the Garden of Eden...It was such a happy place....We had the best of all worlds when it came to faculty environment (Personal communication, July 30, 1992).
Growth, and Governance

Growth. In 1958, and in record time, the Seminary received accreditation from what is now the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada. By the time President Sydnor Stealey retired, enrollment was already 575 and the school had 28 faculty members. Olin T. Binkley, the second president, undertook major renovations of the campus, increased the total degree granting programs to seven, and, at his retirement in 1974, enrollment expanded to 663.

The third president and first alumnus elected to be its president, Dr. Randall Lolley would serve Southeastern for fourteen years. In his administration, the library was modernized, married student housing built, classroom and office space constructed and renovated, and the old Gore Gymnasium transformed into the Ledford Student Center, with athletic center, lounges, book store, exercise rooms, and sauna. Enrollment peaked in 1982 at 1,535, placing it fourth on the list of ATS member schools. It was a remarkable achievement in a little more than thirty years.

Governance. Dr. Stealey grew up to reject his
fundamentalist origins as an Oklahoma Baptist. An open-minded individual with clear sympathies toward the faculty, he cultivated openly a sense of freedom of inquiry and interchange of ideas. It appears he intentionally put aside the new Southern Seminary/Duke McCall model of centralized governance in favor of an inclusive, university style administration, with heavy participation on the part of the faculty in academic affairs. Malcolm Tolbert, faculty member from 1979 – 1989, goes so far as to say, "The kind of thing the 13 Southern professors were ousted for were just sort of taken for granted at Southeastern" (Personal Communication, October 30, 1992).

The Bylaws appear to confirm the high level of faculty integration in the seminary program.

Article IV, President of the Seminary, Section 1

He shall be responsible for the discipline of the Seminary and for carrying out all measures officially agreed upon by the faculty concerning matters committed to them by the Board, and for executing such measures concerning the administration of the Seminary as the Board of Trustees may authorize or adopt (p. 4).

Article VI – The Faculty, Section 4.
The faculty at their discretion may elect a chairman who will preside at faculty meetings and chapel services in the absence of the President and perform such other duties as requested by the President (p. 5).

Obviously, the Bylaw stipulations above allow for and even imply a structure which anticipates a substantial role on the part of the faculty in the academic and academic related affairs of the school. Article VI, Section 3 specifies that the faculty will do some managing of faculty concerns when it says, "They shall make such rules or procedure and provide for such committees as may be required." Finally, Section 5 specifies:

The faculty shall prescribe, subject to approval by the Board of Trustees, requirements for admission, courses of study, conditions of graduation, the nature of degrees to be conferred, and rules and methods for the conduct of the educational work of the Seminary. (p. 5)

It was, however, the perception of some, in perjorative terms, a "faculty run" school. To which Keat Wiles responds:

It is a faculty run school in the sense that there
are faculty committees that have quite a lot to say about just about everything that happens at Southeastern, but the administration makes the decisions. Always has....

[The election of faculty provides a case in point.] There were occasions when in the faculty selection process and a name would be spewed out, that Randall would kick it back and say, "Try again." There was not any carte blanche...that the faculty could do whatever they darn-well pleased. Randall was president and he knew he was president and he knew the difference between being president and dean or professor of New Testament theology. He knew he was president and he acted presidentially in a number of regards. (Mark Caldwell, former trustee, made this observation in a personal communication, October 26, 1992.)

In fact, Wiles went on to report that the faculty selection process was exactly that of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. In time, however, the new fundamentalist trustees would proffer that the idiosyncratic and problematic nature of SEBTS was due to this system dysfunction: it was a "faculty run school."
**Personalities, Predicaments and Perceptions**

**Bultmann Controversy.** In 1960, several faculty members alleged that Drs. Bill Strickland, Harry Oliver, and R.C. Briggs, all in the Biblical area of New Testament, were disciples of Rudolf Bultmann. The six or eight accusers protested their singular championing of Bultmann's historical-critical method of study and interpretation. Some thought the faculty presented a far too liberal perspective in their classrooms (Hefley, 1989, p. 145).

Jim DeLoach, a student at the time, criticized the three.

I had a real problem with R.C. Briggs, Bill Strickland, and Harry Oliver... because the material was presented in such a way as though Bultmann was right... and therefore if you are not bright enough to pick up on that then you are a dump and something is wrong with you. (Personal Communication, October 26, 1992).

An investigation by the trustees and administration warned that it appeared the three "might have embraced too much that sounded like Bultmann" (Hefley, 1989, p. 145). At the same time, the heretofore pervasive climate of freedom became
uncharacteristically tense.

Instead of quiet settlement, factionalism arose. A constant whispering campaign hurt faculty and student morale....There are indications that the real issue among the professors was personal rather than theological, although it eventually took on theological terminology. (Seminary Professors Resign, 1965, p. 101).

Lyman Ferrell, a student at SEBTS in those troubled days, remembered.

Perry Crouch [a trustee] was quoted in the paper as saying "You don't have to worry about what's going on at Southeastern. This is a theological problem that is being ironed out in a healthy way." Olin Binkley was quoted in the newspaper the same day as saying, "There is nothing theological about this disagreement." (Personal Communications, July 30, 1992).

In 1965 the three faculty members resigned. An editorial in the Christian Century railed against the unpleasant affair.

Seen in the larger Southern Baptist context the controversy at Southeastern appears to be a product of the anti-intellectualism which has for
so long dominated Southern Baptist thought and
southern mores in general....

The flight of professors from Southeastern in
1965 may be different from what happened at
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in the late
1950s or from what happened at Midwestern more
recently. But each is an instance of the south's
and Southern Baptists' struggle for and against
the 20th century. Once more - it seems from here
- the prophets have fled under pressures which
became for them intolerable. But their influence
remains and there will be more prophets.

Dr. J.T. Wayland offers quite a different
perspective.

According to Dr. James Blackmore in the
Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists a "1965
statement from the trustees reported that 'no
formal charge of deviation' from the Abstract of
Principles had been made against any member of the
instructional staff and expressed profound
gratitude for 'the devotion and faithful work of
able and dedicated teachers who comprise the
faculty' and 'unqualified confidence' in the
personal integrity and professional competence of the seminary's president. They declared that from the beginning of this inquiry, the principle of responsible academic freedom had been observed with utmost care." Thus, by the proper use of the procedures at hand the problem was solved by Christian gentlemen, and the seminary continued on its path of service to the Kingdom and the denomination. No outside help was needed. Some good men were lost and went on to do quite well in other institutions. (Cited in Wayland, 1988, p. 8).

However, a mark was clearly left on the school. As late as 1985, Dr. Randall Lolley was maintaining that a great deal of the "liberal" reputation of Southeastern among conservatives was dated, harking back to this incident ("Response of the Board," 1988, A-6).

Brewery Blessing. Bill Powell, editor of the independent Southern Baptist Journal, used that periodical to rouse fundamentalist sentiments and incite action. His favorite subjects were SBC programs of which he was critical, as well as the indiscretions of denominational leaders. Among the latter, was the
man to whom he referred as "Dr. Brewery Blessing Lolley."

Before he became the president of Southeastern Seminary, Randall Lolley was the pastor of the First Baptist Church in Winston-Salem. Lolley reports that a neighbor invited him to a luncheon at the dedication of the new Schlitz Brewing Company in that city. Lolley had been requested to offer a prayer. According to Lolley, "As it turned out, my prayer was called an 'invocation,' but was surely never in any case considered by [my neighbor] or by me as a prayer of dedication for that brewery" (Cited in Hefley, 1986, p. 60).

Nevertheless, Powell made the brewery prayer a cause célèbre at every Convention. "Such scandal-mongering, in my opinion, greatly hurt Lolley's image among SBC conservatives," says James C. Hefley (1989, p. 146). Indeed, it was considered a topic of some concern as late as February 4, 1986, on the occasion of a visit to Southeastern of a sub-committee delegation called the Peace Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Liberalism. The early days of SEBTS left quite an impression on young Edwin Young, then a student and
today (1993) the president of the Southern Baptist Convention. By his report, "We doubted our salvation, questioned our call from God, and wondered what kind of Bible we had left to preach" (Cited in Miller, 1992, p. 9). With memories as tenacious as Powell, above, former fundamentalist students like Young were unforgetting and unforgiving.

The general report on Southeastern among fundamentalists was: "not very evangelistic,...not very conservative, not very pietistic....They developed an ethos that wasn't mainstream, flowing evangelistic, mission minded, pietistic, Southern Baptist, if what I've been told is true," said Lewis Drummond (Personal Communication, July 10, 1992).

Hefley called it "the more liberal child of Southern" (1988, p. 148). That Southern's Articles of Faith were adopted which do not clearly affirm the inerrancy of the Bible, and that a great many of Southeastern's faculty possessed doctorates from non-Southern Baptist graduate schools was looked on with suspicion.

Robert Dale, former faculty member and director of advanced degree programs at SEBTS, poses another possibility. In the effort to become the "Yale of the
south," SEBTS directed a great deal of energy into becoming a great academic institution. However, theological education was experiencing a metamorphosis in the 1950s and 1960s, developing emphases in practical ministry.

Some of the emphasis on academics without a matching emphasis on practicality came back to haunt Southeastern. It built for some people a reputation of the school as an "egg-head" institution, a place where scholarship was valued over practice. It wasn't until Randall Lolley came as president in '74 that there were some really strong overt steps made to create a stronger emphasis on preaching, evangelism, leadership, some of those things. (Personal Communication, May 11, 1992).

Those closest to it were quite positive about the evolving curriculum at Southeastern, its character, and, in particular, its openness. Jim Good reports: When I first arrived here you could find at Southeastern every element of Southern Baptists from the very conservative to the most progressive....I think the students could find whatever they wanted or whatever they had
experienced. (Personal Communication, August 26, 1992).

Roy DeBrand contests the liberal reputation which dogged the school.

I think it's a perceptual problem. I've not even seen tinges of liberalism among my colleagues. I've even had board members tell me, "Well, there are people on this faculty who don't believe in the virgin birth." I said, "Name them. If they don't believe in the virgin birth it would be known. That's preposterous." "Well, there are people here..." "Well, who are they?" They couldn't name them, but they had heard that there were. So it was a perceptual problem. It wasn't an actual problem. (Personal Communication, July 31, 1992).

Former trustee Mark Caldwell goes on to point out that SEBTS was certainly not representative of the classic liberalism of the 19th and early 20th century. The faculty there was a strongly evangelical faculty that believed deeply in sin and amazing grace. The evidence of that over the years could not be challenged....The character of the men and women the institution was turning out in terms of
their belief in redemption and God's grace and love in a world that was broken, fragmented, in some ways fallen was just incredible. How we talked about that fallenness and that brokenness and fractured nature of ourselves would be a bit different, but I think the school had that. The faculty had that strong sense of Christian grace, God's grace and mercy. I saw it in chapel events, I heard it in preaching, in music, in great hymns of the church...(It is) a matter of style, a matter of evangelism and revival styles versus a more mainline Protestant style of the...church. A survey by Suzanne Lavenue appears to support this perspective.

Of seventeen replies [of faculty from Southeastern], twelve (71 percent) declared a balanced presentation of Scripture before the controversy began, and eleven (65 percent) opted for the same choice today [1989]. Only three respondents (18) labeled the school as moderate-liberal either before or after the controversy. These figures sharply contrasted with Southern in which thirteen respondents (41 percent) acknowledged a former moderate-liberal position
while nine (28 percent) teachers believed that the seminary presently has adopted this position. (Lavenue, 1989, p. 55).

**Conclusion**

Two occasions, similar in import, speak parabolically to the issue of Southeastern's history and legacy. The first involves former Baptist Sunday School Board chief executive Lloyd Elder on a visit to the campus, and the second George Worrell when he was first appointed vice-president of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. Both gentlemen were quite late to their appointments at Southeastern. Each called for directions. Both were approximately two hours west of the institution in the city of Winston-Salem. Two, who should have known, missed the mark, for they had associated the Seminary with the College, now University. They did not know where it was.

The evidence suggests that the predispositions of a great many persons were likewise founded in rather dated evidence or inaccurate heresay. On the other hand, the Southeastern ethos of diversity and freedom was akin to that of the college or university and absolutely antithetical to the demand for an orthodox training center envisioned by its critics.
The faculty and administration appears to have shared a vision, which, in time, pharaohs who "knew not Joseph" would subject to spirit testing strain. It was to be, moderate Leon Smith predicted, where "the donnybrook of the whole Convention struggle is going to be worked out" (Hefley, 1989, p. 145).

Confessional Statements

Introduction

The crux of the matter became the confessional statements. Confessional statements are not new to Baptists. That Southern Baptists would use them as tests for employment is another thing entirely. James Draper, a fundamentalist, establishes the new position.

We need to have a consensus among Southern Baptists as to the irreducible minimum theology that a person must subscribe to in order to be acceptable as a professor at one of our schools....(1984, p. 105)

A church can call anyone it chooses as its pastor, but if a person wants to teach in a Southern Baptist Institution..., then it seems reasonable that he or she be asked to subscribe to these biblical parameters" (p. 107).

The Baptist Faith and Message
Out of the troubles of the 1920's, Southern Baptists came forward with a confessional statement, the first Baptist Faith and Message (BFM) (1925), but nobody paid any attention to it. It was not until 1963 that our part of the Baptist family seriously adopted a confession of faith, and it was a revision of the 1925 Confession. The Baptist Faith and Message of 1963 is a serious statement. It is not serious so much on its merit as a statement of Baptist theology; it is serious because Southern Baptists began to take it seriously.

[Heretofore,] most Baptists were/are unaware of the history of Baptist confessional statements. Our churches have ignored them for the most part. We have had a loose theology. Experience has been the rite of entrance to our churches...Experience was elevated above theological exactness. Now times are changing. (Sherman, 1988, p. 11)

The appeal of fundamentalists was for "more integrity" on the part of adherents to the BFM (Hefley, 1986, p. 29). On the surface, this has merit, but it quickly encounters a host of difficulties inherent in confessional statements.
As with all statements of this kind, it is the product of compromise, which hardly makes it an inspired document. No one is entirely satisfied, but it becomes a place for all to stand. Of course, the "all" to which we refer is not only just the majority, but the majority of persons at a particular place and time. Bodies in convention cannot legislate for individuals in the hinterland, according to Baptist principles.

Second, as a confessional statement becomes normative, meaning must be ascribed to sentiments which employed language in another time and place. In other words, an interpretation must be made of the interpretation. Third, of course, if it has multiple parts, there is the problem of equitable treatment of all components of the confession.

For instance, during the Southern Baptist controversy, the first article on the nature of the scriptures took precedence over the last article on religious liberty and the freedom of conscience. This and the pressure to clarify inspiration in terms of inerrancy was without regard for the preamble. Prior to all that the followed, the Preamble of the Baptist Faith and Message clearly established that:
[The Committee] concurs in the introductory "statement [of 1925] of the historic Baptist conception of the nature and function of confessions of faith in our religious and denominational life...."

(4) that the sole authority for faith and practice among Baptists is the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Confessions are only guides in interpretation, having no authority over the conscience.

(5) That they are statements of religious convictions, drawn from the Scriptures, and are not to be used to hamper freedom of thought or investigation in other realms of life....

A living faith must experience a growing understanding of truth and must be continually interpreted and related to the needs of each new generation. Throughout their history Baptist bodies, both large and small, have issued statements of faith which comprise a consensus of their beliefs. Such statements have never been regarded as complete, infallible statements of faith, nor as official creeds carrying mandatory authority. (pp. 4 - 5).
The astonishing irony, then, is that this group of people who identify themselves as Baptists, would compel of their employees what they themselves have historically found unconscionable.

Regarding the Bible, the BFM characterizes it as having "God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter."

These words were borrowed from the 1925 Statement of "The Baptist Faith and Message," which, in turn borrowed them from the 1833 New Hampshire Confession of Faith; but they were not original with that statement.

According to Hugh Wamble (Midwestern Seminary) they are found in a letter written in September 1703 by the English philosopher John Locke. A young preacher wrote him asking advice as to how he might have a successful ministry. Locke wrote him to preach the Bible for "it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter." (Hobbs, 1988, p. 19)

A terrible irony presents itself here as well, for "In religion, Locke advocated the toleration of a wide diversity of beliefs...." ("Locke, John," 1964, p.
Furthermore, in a study of Baptist confessions of faith, Gordon James concluded:

Biblical inerrancy is a concept that was never affirmed nor incorporated into the confessions or into the Constitution of the SBC.

His evidence is persuasive for he cites more than 25 Anabaptist, Baptist and Southern Baptist confessions of faith, beginning with Hubmaier's *Eighteen Dissertations* (1524) and concluding with the *Baptist Faith and Message* statements (1925-1963) - all together containing over 700 separate articles - as well as the Constitution of the SBC. All of these documents have one characteristic in common, James declares: "not one mentions inerrancy." Inerrancy, therefore, can only be regarded as an imported theory to Baptist theology, history and heritage. (Cited in Neely, 1987, May, p. 8).

**Abstract of Principles**

While a great deal of pressure was brought to add other pledges, strictly speaking, only adherence to the "Abstract of Principles" was required of the faculty of Southeastern during the period of this study. The
Abstract was perceived variously: as a weak document, a creed that demanded too much, an adequate document which simply needed to be enforced, and an historical reference point in the ongoing stream of faith.

Moderate trustee, Christine Gregory, quipped:

I think, where Abstract of Principles are concerned, most men who talk against it cannot spell it...Those last five years that I served on that board of Trustees I saw men who came on that board who spoke out against the Abstract of Principles who did not have the vaguest notion of what was in them. I mean that seriously...I dare say that is true today. (Christine Gregory, trustee from 1982 - 1992, in a personal communication, October 19, 1992.)

Dr. Richard Hester perceived the criticisms of the trustees differently.

Their understanding of theological education is indoctrination. You have a job to do to put these ideas in people's heads....

I think they willfully misunderstood [the Abstract]. I dont think it was accidental. I think they were deceptive in their responses. Ideology was everything and relationships were
nothing, nor were the traditions of the school. That meant nothing to them. It was a totalitarian way of thinking. (Personal Communication, November 4, 1992).

Ambiguity invited apostasy in the minds of fundamentalists. The new trustees, increasingly, desired to employ the Abstract and, later, other documents as litmus tests to work at Southeastern. This understanding of the purpose was not generally held by the faculty. The Abstract of Principles "was very clear as far as the wording was concerned but...had a lot of room in it for differences of opinion. It was a basic statement of basic faith without pinning people down to any specifics" (Jesse Chapman, trustee from 1980 - 1990, in a personal communication, October 16, 1992). Academic and personal freedoms and protections were woven into the garment. Professor Malcom Tolbert went so far as to say:

If I had felt when I was asked to go to the seminary that I had to subscribe literally to the Abstract of Principles I could not have signed it. It was made clear to me and to all of us who went at that time that this was an historical document.
that gave us a sense of orientation, a supposedly
good Baptist belief. Nobody believes you ever
have the truth nailed down in a statement. It was
very clear that this did not take away our
freedom. (Malcolm Tolbert, personal
communication, October 30, 1992).

Dr. John Durham, former professor of Old Testament
described the terms of the agreement among faculty.
It was a way of saying to the constituency, you
know, "We're o.k. We believe in the good
stuff...." It was never restrictive. Nobody ever
said to me at any time while I was there, you
realize that you've got to interpret Article 6 or
Article 2 or whatever in the following manner. It
was sort of a gentlemen's agreement. Where we
stood in terms of academic freedom and where we
stood in terms of being Christian, first of all,
and Baptist, second of all, was, I would say,
assumed, as much as anything else. Nobody spent a
lot of time exegeting [sic] or reading the
Abstract, but it was there and it was there with
the understanding that before you became a fully
elected member of the faculty you read it, you
thought about it, and you prayed about it and you
signed it. Then we had an understanding, if at any point we came to the place where we no longer in good conscience could say that we supported that Abstract, we would notify the administration and take the appropriate steps. I think people played fair with that....

Alan Neely continues with a personal anecdote which suggests more reservation than the rest.

When the President invited me to the faculty and told me, at the time of my installation, what I would be expected to do, he mentioned this statement of faith, and I said to him at that time, "I have never in my life signed any statement of faith that somebody else has written. I don't want to sign a statement of faith now." I think what Randall did is what every president of Southeastern had done, and what I think presidents had done for a long time at Louisville. Mainly, they said, you sign this with the understanding that you interpret what it means—somebody else doesn't determine what it means; you interpret what it means. And I said, "Well, I will sign it, but I want you to know I do not feel good about it, and I would prefer that we not have this kind

Concluding observations

The Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure adopted in 1940 by the American Association of University Professors and endorsed by the Association of Theological Schools and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools included what has been identified as a "limitations clause." It advised that "Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment." Currently, the Limitations Clause is viewed by the AAUP as a departure from the principle of academic freedom and no longer needed. In fact, the more significant the limitations in the form of a covenant, creed or confession, the more it constitutes an encumbrance to the success of the mission of seminary education.

Ironically, Michael Hawn, once the president of the AAUP chapter at Southeastern, encouraged the retention of the "limitations clause." At the 1989 national meeting he speculated:
An appropriate confessional statement can help to define the vision of the theological school....Matters of religious faith and practice may require such "limitations" within many denominational traditions in order for serious theological inquiry to exist at all. (1989, June 16-17).

However, in a letter dated May 16, 1993, Hawn advised the following.

I would no longer defend the Limitations Clause of the AAUP. I would now vote to rescind it from the national documents. In my opinion, you either have academic freedom or you don't. I would never sign another restriction on my teaching. You might want to read Walter Rauschenbusch's essay, "Why I am a Baptist." In it he says, "Now we Baptists have no authoritative creed. Our ministers and professors are not required solemnly to declare that they adopt some obsolete statement as their belief and will always teach that." (In Sydnor Stealey, A Baptist Treasury, p. 181)

Southern and SEBTS have done just that -- signed an obsolete statement of 1859. It did not protect us. It was twisted to hang us....I spent a lot of
time on the...statement [to the AAUP National Convention], but I no longer support my conclusions. (Personal communication, May 16, 1993).

It is time to describe what actually happened at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary between 1979 and 1989 which precipitated the revision in Hawn's mind, and raised concerns regarding the viability of academic freedom at once so free and optimistic an institution.
The Contest Commences at Camelot: 1979 - 1985

On the Offensive. The distant thunder drew near to this theological Camelot and the proverbial birds stopped their singing. Dr. Tom Halbrooks, a former Southeastern faculty member, intimates that for a long while Southern Baptist scholars had been acutely and pragmatically aware of the sometimes treacherous environment in which they wrote and spoke. He believes the academic community "sort of put a muzzle on themselves. They didn't want to cause trouble...That became increasingly the case following '79" (Personal Communication, June 3, 1992).

The watershed feature of 1979 was the election of fundamentalist president Adrian Rogers. Sometime later Rogers publicly avowed that the denomination "has many professors who do not believe the Bible is historically, philosophically, scientifically, and
theologically without error" (Hefley, 1986, p. 87). This blanket accusation by the leading elected officer of the convention assumed a great deal of importance and not just because of the source. Rumors danced fretfully about the campuses that Paul Pressler, a fundamentalist leader, kept files on every person in Convention life who did not embrace the agenda of the new movement. In 1984, Paige Patterson, another fundamentalist party chief, confirmed this, saying, "Any time these people talk, we have someone there listening and sending us tapes" (Cited in James, 1989, p. 31).

Former SEBTS faculty member Alan Neely reports that a certain pervasive self-consciousness descended on the classroom.

By 1982, I had begun to feel a little bit of indirect pressure....I would catch myself in the middle of a sentence in class--a thought coming to me just this instant --"Should I say it this way? I usually didn't change; I would say 99 times out of 100 I wouldn't have changed what I would say--what I did say--but for the first time in my teaching career, I caught myself calculating the impact of what I was going to say and how that
could be used against me or against the Seminary. And I didn't like that...I kept asking myself the question, "Are you now beginning that slow process of compromising your own integrity for reasons that might be defensible? (Personal Communication, September 25, 1992).

Dr. Claude Stewart, once also a member of the faculty, believes that the contest was decided in these early years when the faculty was at a loss as to what to do.

We did not have any effective mode of response. We were in a situation in which to do nothing meant that the seminary would simply be taken over. What we had going would be lost. On the other hand if we struck back, spoke out, we were regarded as insubordinate because we were opposing the owners, opposing the people who perceived themselves as the rightful captains of the ship since the seminaries are owned by the Southern Baptist Convention, not by local agencies. Our only spokespersons were the administrators,...but their hands were tied, they could not speak out vigorously beyond a certain point because they would be accused of insubordination. To do
nothing we lost; to fight back we lost. (Personal Communication, September 9, 1992).

Their antagonists felt no such inhibition. Harold Hunter, pastor of the North Jacksonville Baptist Church, Florida, alerted fellow conservatives in passionate, graphic terms.

Liberals are mean as snakes. Anybody who'd deny the Word of God doesn't even know God. If Jesus were standing here today, he would tell you his word is inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired, plenary, the Word of God. I am absolutely convinced of that. (Warner, 1985, December, p. 1)

Hunter's blast is representative of a barrage-like media blitz and regional precinct campaigns conducted by the seminary's antagonists.

[Public attacks of seminaries] encouraged students to disrupt classroom and teaching procedures; it raised suspicions and distrust which militate against effective instruction; it encouraged letters, phone calls and visits from "disturbed" Baptists who demanded the time and energies of teachers and administrators to "explain" various matters, thereby requiring them to utilize their best time in putting out brush fires rather than
in doing their primary tasks. (Ashcraft, 1988, Fall, pp. 48 - 49).

The fundamentalists had the early jump on the faculties and administrations of the seminaries, targeted and pressed the advantage thoroughly.

Spies Among Us. During those years students were recruited and prompted by fundamentalist leaders to collect information the latter could use against faculty members (Ashcraft, Personal Communication, August 25, 1992). Alan Neely describes the modus operandi of the heresy hunters.

It was clear to us by that time that people were in the class with agendas other than learning what they could...in the class experience. The agenda was, "What can we gather in the way of concrete evidence that we can turn over to the Pressler/Patterson coalition and their principal representative in North Carolina, [Robert] Tennery? What concrete evidence can we gather that these people are liberals and should not be on the faculty of any Southern Baptist seminary?"

The evidence for that was patented; it was overwhelming: the way they would phrase questions, the belligerency,...the notes, sometimes, they
would write you unsinged. I found one on the
podium one morning when I went to start the
lecture. And then to learn at the end of the
semester, that one student...had secretly tape
recorded every lecture I had delivered by coming
in, sitting down, opening up his
briefcase,...flipping on his tape recorder that I
could not see...without ever saying to me, or
asking permission...I assumed from that moment on
that everything I was saying was probably being
recorded....

They were zealots....All they needed was the
ordination by the judge [Paul Pressler] or by
Paige [Patterson] or by somebody on that level to
go do what they were doing. (Personal

Eventually this fundamentalist group organized
formally under the name "Conservative Evangelical
Fellowship" and, surprisingly, was granted official
recognition on campus by the administration. As such,
they enjoyed all the liberties of other groups, but "no
other brought highly controversial speakers to campus
without notifying the administration according to the
guidelines of the institution" (Ashcraft, 1988, p. 58).
It was their use as advance investigators which enhanced the siege mentality on campus, and eventually made for several confrontations between fundamentalist leaders and faculty.

CEF complaints were many. In their opinion, conservative theology received no sincere hearing in class. Similarly, it seemed to them that liberal lecturers and chapel speakers abounded, but rare exemplary conservative exponents were to be found on the docket. Conservative speakers on campus drew precious little support from the seminary community. They regretted the overwhelming support for women in ministry as evidenced in faculty and administration policies and were aggravated by the general antagonism toward the right wing political and conservative religious movements (Hefley, 1988, 148 - 149). These students were the spiritual descendants of fundamentalist students like Ed Young and Jim DeLoach, now SEBTS alumni, who mourned the apparent liberalism at Southeastern in an earlier day.

Early Countermeasures. Some students resisted recruitment measures by fundamentalist leaders, but with some cost to their careers. On March 26, 1985, Dr. Robert Dale began his class, "Survival Skills for
Ministers," with a prayer request period. The Convention controversy was immediately put forward as a concern. A student confided to the class that he'd "lost a friend because of the situation." He then volunteered that he had been asked to spy on faculty members at Southeastern.

Three days later Dale met with the student in his office. At that time the student indicated a friend, a Maryland pastor who served on the SBC Committee on Boards, "asked for notes/quotes of unorthodox statements made by SEBTS professors in class." The pastor desired them in order to convince some doubters on the Committee just how liberal the school was. The student offered that he declined "on ethical and personal grounds." He "didn't think spying was appropriate and didn't want to get on a side in SBC issues." The net result was the student was black-balled from leadership opportunities at the pastor's church. The snub assumed, "if you aren't strongly with us, then you must be with them" (Compiled from Robert Dale's personal notes of March 29, 1985).

In response to their sense of approaching peril, students organized a group by the name "Southeastern Students for Academic Freedom." These students were
loyal to the heritage and polity of the school, and the faculty and administration in particular. The growing number of fundamentalist trustees, "with their particular view of authority, made it clear that they considered this type of student response little short of rebellion" (Ashcraft, 1988, 58).

The ethics committee of the student council at SEBTS initiated a drive to attach signatures to a "Statement of Appreciation" in support of the "faculty and administration of the seminary for their unwavering stand for academic freedom of each believer." Four hundred and sixty students signed the petition in two weeks. ("Southeastern Students," November 27, 1984).

**Emerging Pattern of Pressure.** Southeastern Seminary President Randall Lolley covenanted to "stand in the breach, defending all that's defensible" (Dale's notes of faculty meeting, July 3, 1984). How long Lolley could do so was in doubt, however.

We knew that the protection a Seminary president could offer was not unlimited. By that time, it was clear...the Board of Trustees was being packed and...how long you could depend on the trustees to protect academic freedom was seriously threatened, their ability to protect was threatened, and their
willingness to protect was in doubt. (Neely, Personal Communication, September 25, 1992)

In 1984 the president tapped Dr. Robert Bratcher, former dean at Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, to teach a summer course. Almost instantly Lolley and Bratcher began to receive "hate mail." The harassment was such that the adjunct professor declined to accept the appointment. (Robert Dale's Faculty meeting notes, July 3, 1984)

By far the most significant skirmish of these early years pertained to a Sunday School Board commentary on a series of lessons about the book of Job by Southeastern professor John Durham. Trent Butler of the Board staff contacted Durham about doing the five lessons because of the sensitivity which the series would require in the tempestuous milieu in Southern Baptist life. Butler believed Durham could do just that, having authored 45 lessons previously. However, very shortly Butler was moved off the project and no editor replaced him. Durham was on his own.

Durham believed the devil to be "very real, personal, and supra-personal" (Correspondence from Lolley to Dr. Jim Henry, September 18, 1986). However, the Satan of the book of Job is clearly an agent of
God's purposes, not a Miltonian enemy of God, let alone the personification of evil described in later Jewish writings.

When a manuscript of lessons is supplied to the Sunday School Board, they actually buy the rights to it. If substantial editorial changes are introduced, the editor and writer collaborate on the final copy. Durham did not see the final draft and assumed there were no changes of consequence.

Durham states that the week after the lesson was released, Sunday School Board administrator Lee Porter called to advise that the commentary had stirred up a hornet's nest. Durham's recollection of the affair follows.

[Porter said,] "For three days now I've been arguing with the powers that be that we ought to do the right thing by you, that the seminary professors have enough grief and enough attacks on their own without our adding to it. What I have to tell you is your material was farmed out to an outside editor and the editor changed it." He said, "Turn to page...." I did. The fairly reasoned argument that I had tried to make setting the context for this had been dropped out. In its
place had been put this statement that went something like this, "The devil of the book of Job is not the devil of the New Testament."

Obviously, that's a red flag. That's very different than the kind of explanation I tried to give. I think if they had left it alone it still would have offended some people but it would have been my stuff....

[Porter continued,] "There are people here saying that we ought to just let you take the gaff for this. But we changed it. I believe, having looked at your material, if we had not changed it, it would have been o.k. In any case, what we want to do is take responsibility for making changes in your material and take the heat off you and the heat on us which is where it belongs...I finally won. I'm calling to say, this is the position we're going to take. When people begin calling you about it, refer them to us and let us handle it. We don't want to involve a seminary in this any more than we have to. (Personal Communication, November 4, 1992).

However, the extent of the negative response was more than the Board anticipated. Over one hundred and
fifty letters poured in, "more calls than...anything they'd ever had calls about in the history of the Sunday School Board except when they shifted from the King James to the RSV [Revised Standard Version of the Bible]" (Durham). As the fundamentalists brought increasing pressure to bear on the agency, the Board ascribed increasing responsibility to Durham and "apologized for the publication, calling it an incorrect interpretation of Satan and a departure from traditional Southern Baptist teachings" (Overton, 1985, August 18, p. 33A). Durham was never invited to write again for the Baptist Sunday School Board. (John Durham, personal communication, November 4, 1992)

According to Randall Lolley, he, Durham, and Academic Dean Morris Ashcraft:

Spent hours together working on this [the issue as it related to the ATS manual and seminary documents] to improve it because we really wanted it to be a model of things to come because we knew that we were going to have a struggle every time anybody put anything in print. (Personal Communication, August 26, 1992)

The Board of Trustees of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary insisted that the Job Sunday
School lessons be placed on the agenda for the October 15, 1985 meeting. Consequently, a statement by the board was adopted which identified the difficulties of dealing "exhaustively with every facet of complex biblical truths," and provided a summary of Durham's position on the Satan. It also observed that the doctrinal statement of SEBTS, the Abstract of Principles included no article on Satan though in "The Fall of Man" there is mentioned "the temptation of Satan." Nor does the Baptist Faith and Message (1963) include an article on Satan or the devil. Only Article III, "Man," speaks of the temptation of Satan, but not in any exhaustive manner. Durham, Lolley, and Ashcraft attached their names to the article. (Included in correspondence from Lolley to Dr. Jim Henry, September 18, 1986)

Lolley concluded:

They ended up with a mild censure of John [Durham] for not making...clear his belief, in a personal devil for example, and John and Ash and I settled for that because we felt they misunderstood him and we didn't push it beyond that. (Personal Communication, August 26, 1992)

In spite of hopes that the matter was concluded,
it resurfaced the next spring in a visit by an investigating committee of the Southern Baptist Convention.

**Is Peace Possible?** Two sharp prongs emerged on the horns of the SBC dilemma. The first pertained to doctrinal orthodoxy, especially as it has to do with Biblical inerrancy.

Fundamentalists rejected the accusation that the import of their agenda was an implied creedalism. Larry Lewis, a fundamentalist who eventually became president of the SBC Home Mission Board, differentiated between an attempt to determine doctrinal integrity in a faculty member of an institution and creedalism.

Creedalism would be an effort to force a doctrinal position on persons joining a local church. A few members of my church have some weird doctrinal ideas, but I don't think they should be removed for that. But I cannot consent to someone teaching Sunday School who does not believe the Bible is the infallible Word of God. You cannot maintain the doctrinal integrity of a church if you just allow anything or everything. The same is true of the teachers...of our denomination.

(Hefley, 1986, p. 85)
However, as Lewis and others of similar persuasion chalked out their interpretation of the doctrinally correct position, notably on the nature of the scriptures, their decision to do so and their definition of orthodoxy evoked vehement resistance at Southeastern. President Lolley spoke specifically:

Your seminaries are not perfect, but we use the best tools of scholarship in our seminaries and they do not lead us to doubting Scripture; they lead us to loving Scripture as the Word of the Lord. (Hefley, 1986, pp. 110 - 111)

The second point of consternation regarded the issue of a political settlement of the theological representativeness of the faculties of the seminaries. In an April, 1985, visit to Southeastern while serving as president of the Southern Baptist Convention, Charles Stanley spoke to this.

Addressing more than 300 students and faculty in the seminary cafeteria, Stanley said, "If it's a Southern Baptist seminary, it should be balanced in its theological approach. If you're going to have liberals, you need strong conservatives...." "A lot of folks feel it's [Southeastern] not balanced. I don't know this because I don't know
the condition of the seminary that well. But if it's not balanced, why shouldn't we balance it?"

He indicated he would hope to see different points of view represented.

"If you've got people here who don't believe the first eleven chapters of Genesis, you need people who do," he said. "If you've got people who don't believe in Old Testament miracles, you need people who do. If you've got people who don't believe in the virgin birth, you need people who do," he said. (Winston, 1985, p.2)

Fundamentalist trustee Jim DeLoach and President Randall Lolley had been classmates at Southeastern. DeLoach recalled many conversations between the two about the theological composition of the faculty. He reports that when he became a trustee of the institution he advised the president in no uncertain terms of his position.

Randall, I want you to know my agenda has never changed from the time that you and I were students here. That is, I do not feel that this seminary has ever had balance. That's what I want to see. I'm not for firing anybody. I'm not for... hindering anyone's teaching according to their
convictions, but, I'll tell you this, there is another agenda. We're looking for balance.

At the SBC Convention in Dallas in June Randall Lolley admitted he did not know if he had any faculty who would identify themselves as inerrantists, but indicated he was open to the possibility. (Hefley, 1986, p. 134) Earlier that year, in an interview with Rod Byard, editor of the SEBTS publication, The Outlook, Lolley established his sentiments in more detail.

Someone asked me the other day, "Can you ever see the day when a convictional inerrantist is a member of the faculty of Southeastern Seminary?" My answer is, absolutely. It will come whenever there are enough qualified convictional inerrantists with the credentials for it and our faculty and trustees together conclude that this is the right person for it. We're not going to go looking for a person only on a doctrinal basis. We don't add faculty like that...in the election of faculty, we have a very precise process. Every conceivable element in this school is involved at some point. And whatever kind of teacher that process yields, we're going to have on the
faculty. And I can tell you now that a person will not be on the faculty because of one doctrinal position, whatever that position be. (From a Memo dated January 28, 1985, to Faculty and Administrative Officers, from Rod Byard)

Former trustee Jim DeLoach remembers the disposition of the administration and faculty quite differently. "We were told privately and we were told in no uncertain terms that no inerrantist would be appointed to that faculty because that would create division on the faculty" (Personal Communication, October 26, 1992). Some faculty members actually did believe that to concede to fundamentalist appeals for parity in faculty appointments was simply to open Pandora's box. Indeed, some concern was legitimate, for the trustee temperament was changing. There appeared to be a certain inevitability to the ultimate solution of the fundamentalists. Comments by Robert Crowley, a trustee of the new wave of inerrantists, confirm this.

When I came on they laughed at me...in fact, one of them said, "This is really something. Before Crowley came on board we were talking about parity, and now he's talking about every single
member of the faculty being an inerrantist." I made this statement and I took all kinds of heat...that I would never vote for anybody that was not an inerrantist...In the providence of God parity is laughable. We don't want parity anymore. We want to teach truth. And if you are teaching truth parity doesn't enter into truth....Either we are absolutely and totally wrong or they are absolutely and totally wrong. (Personal Communication, October 19, 1992).

Alan Neely of the faculty asserted that the fundamentalist trustees were duplicitous. "On the one hand they were publicly reassuring; privately and surreptitiously they were showing you clearly...they wanted you out of there, and the sooner, the better" (Personal Communication, September 25, 1992).

The accusations of liberalism and the move on the part of fundamentalists to purge the seminaries was met with simmering resolve that would grow white hot. Finally that resistance engendered "more vocal, active opposition...per square inch...than at any other one location, seminaries as well" (Rod Byard, Personal Communication, September 24, 1992).

The Peace Committee. Desperate for a solution to
the dilemma which was steadily knotting the Convention into a spasm, Southern Baptists decided to delegate. Charles Pickering, a lawyer from Laurel, Mississippi, former Republican state senator and president of the Mississippi Baptist Convention, proposed a committee which would investigate the trouble in which Southern Baptists found themselves in order to propose a strategy out of it. Franklin Paschall, a former SBC president and pastor of the First Baptist Church, Louisville, KY, formally proposed the committee at the 1985 Convention. The action requested:

This committee [to] seek to determine the sources of the controversies in our Convention, and make findings and recommendations regarding these controversies, so that Southern Baptists might effect reconciliation and effectively discharge their responsibilities to God....

That this committee follow the 1963 Baptist Faith and Message Statement in regard to theological issues, and operate within the Constitution and Bylaws of the Southern Baptist Convention; and

That to accomplish its work, this committee shall recognize the role of trustees and shall
work with and through appropriate boards, commissions, and agencies of the Southern Baptist Convention...The trustees, boards, and agencies of the Southern Baptist Convention, and their officers and employees, shall fully cooperate with the committee to accomplish the purposes outlined in this motion. (Report of the Southern Baptist Convention Peace Committee, 1987, June 16, p. 3)

The idea appeared to be a good one at the time. The great uncommitted center in Southern Baptist life longed for peace. Further disruption in the grand "cooperative program" was unbearable.

At least two largely unrecognized flaws were inherent in the proposal. Sometime before the Convention, Morris Ashcraft, Dean at Southeastern, was asked by Southern Baptist statesman Owen Cooper how he would feel about the proposal to form a Peace Committee to do some work on behalf of the Convention with the agencies, and in particular, with the seminaries. Ashcraft said he was profoundly opposed to it because there was no provision for such a dialogue in the documents of the school nor the bylaws in particular. It would force the employees to relate, not to one (trustees), but to two groups, a fundamentally
untenable position from the beginning. (Morris Ashcraft, personal communication, August 25, 1992)

The second achillies heel in the plan was that while the group was from the beginning identified as the "Peace Committee," it was made up, not of the mediators and reconcilers of the Convention, but those who represented the warring factions. In particular, it included persons who were the harshest critics of the seminaries. William E. Poe, a partner in the prestigious Charlotte law firm Parker, Poe, Thompson, et al., and a former president of the North Carolina State Convention, remembered.

At the very first meeting of the Peace Committee...we sort of went around the room and people gave their philosophical underpinnings or their positions from which they were coming. I'd say, after that meeting, which was a very long meeting, it was very easy to know who was picking on what as a cause of the difficulty. In that discussion with the 22 members of the committee, there were at least a half a dozen who singled out the seminaries as the real cause of the problem. Those folks, I'd say, were unrelenting in their criticism and their objective of doing something
about those seminaries: Adrian Rogers, Jerry Vines, Jim Henry,...Dan Vestal, Jodie Chapman, who is the wife of Morris Chapman and Ed Young from Houston.... Oh, I don't want to leave out Charles Stanley. Charles Stanley, Adrian Rogers, those two were the most adamant, most outspoken. Jerry Vines was a close second. (William E. Poe, personal communication, September 9, 1992).

According to Poe, the Committee yielded to this predeliction to identify the seminaries as the root of the problem by making them the object of what amounted to the only significant investigation it really did in his memory. Subcommittees were assigned to make visits to the campuses and return to report to the whole committee.

Charles Fuller, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Roanoke, VA, and chairman of the Peace Committee drew up the assignment for Southern Baptists this way.

That Southern Baptists have been, and are, theologically diverse is undeniable. That we will continue to be diverse is predictable, and no Biblically-sound, thinking Southern Baptist would attempt to prohibit that diversity. It is simply consistent with the nature of personal conversion
and the individual indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

"The issue is not, 'shall Southern Baptists be theologically diverse?' It is rather, 'How diverse can we be and maintain a legitimate denominational fellowship and a trustworthy base upon which to combine our support for mutual ministries?"

Fuller added: "Southern Baptists must decide in how much accountability can a Christian be held for ministry's sake and not violate the liberty of the Holy Spirit within that Christian."

He said such efforts to define the limits of diversity are not aimed at Southern Baptists in general, but at those who are employed by denominational agencies and institutions. "This is not a matter of a dual standard, but it is a recognition of the fact that when someone works for Southern Baptists, they in a sense do represent them."

He added he believes the committee "can find some wording which will reflect" a balance between the accountability an employee owes to his employer and the accountability a believer owes to God and be acceptable to the convention."
Many Southern Baptists employed at Southeastern did, indeed, see this as a double standard. Nevertheless, lest they be guilty of uncooperative spirits in the peace process, as well as insubordination, the seminaries could not help but cooperate. Fuller reported that each agency head he contacted "was positive, favorable and supportive of the idea. Several of them had certain questions mainly in regard to procedure, but in no case did I encounter anyone who felt the idea was improper or wrong" (Martin, 1985, December 13, p. 1).
Cries for Peace, and There is No Peace: 1986

The pressure on the faculty builds. The fundamentalist force marched irresistibly onward to Atlanta, Georgia, and the 1986 Southern Baptist Convention. The sources and the extent of the hope to reverse their fortunes varied among the faculty at Southeastern. Dr. Tom Graves, a faculty member at SEBTS, remembered his colleague, the late Dr. John Steeley, insisting that the Women's Missionary Union, an autonomous and powerful force in Convention life, would rise up and deflect the onslaught. Others waxed philosophically, that while the fundamentalist resurgence had threatened to swamp the Southern Baptist boat many times before, in time, things always seemed to return to an even keel. (Graves, personal communication, June 1, 1992) The conditions increasingly troubled others, however. The behavior of the faculty suggested increasing anxiety.

A case in point was the publication prowess of the faculty. Dr. Robert Dale notes, "For a period of time while I was on the faculty at Southeastern there was a two or three year period where our faculty outpublished
every other faculty in SBC life." In contrast, Tom Graves reports that eventually, during the time he served as the editor of Faith and Mission, a faculty publication of SEBTS, a new tentativeness took over.

I got turned down on ideas for more than one article, by more than one person...saying, "I'd better not print that because of what is happening in SBC life." There wasn't anybody saying that to them. [It was] kind of a self imposed censorship, not wanting to go through the battle. (Personal Communication, June 6, 1992)

Graves went on to say:

[There was] an awful lot that could have been printed that never has been. There are books that were written seven years ago that still aren't finished, because of persons not wanting yet to get those published. (Personal Communication, June 6, 1992)

The teaching environment also deteriorated progressively, initially in caustic asides on the part of students outside, but also within class. Dr. Elmo Scoggin, a SEBTS professor, remembered.

Some of the more thoughtful and careful students would come to say to me, "You know, this morning
in class you said, so and so. And the guy that
was sitting next to me said "If that's not heresy
I never heard it." (Personal communication, July
30, 1992)

Yet the bold confrontations initiated by
fundamentalist students escalated still further. A
student became upset that he did not receive a grade of
"A" in Dr. Bill Clemons class.

He had gotten a "B" instead, because he had not
completed some work, as I told him, as a
requirement for the course. He wrote a letter and
sent it to me by registered mail, saying that if I
didn't change his grade, he would write bad things
about me. That's a quote. I had him come in and
Alan Neely and I...tape recorded the conversation,
which I still have, in which he accused me of not
giving the grade because he was conservative.
That was the accusation. He was a conservative
student, so I had discriminated against him
because he was conservative. I told him I would
not change his grade.

Later, ...[he] made an accusation in printed
fashion. The accusation...was that I loved the
poor more than I loved the lost. That was his
accusation. I said, "Put it on my tombstone -- I love that --it's a pretty good epitaph." But that was the climate. (Personal Communication, July 31, 1992)

"Epitaph" may have been exactly the thing the fundamentalist students had in mind. Mrs. Bettie Clemons, the spouse of faculty member Bill Clemons, recalls.

We had a group over for supper one night and a missionary who was teaching on campus on furlough, [Roy Wyatt,] who said, "My students tell me that they're going to have all of your offices."....Roy was upset...."This thing is serious!" (Personal Communication, July 31, 1993)

The evidence suggests nerves were razor sharp. Subtle nuances in speech and demeanor carried massive energy laden import. In an effort to be fair, some teachers did attempt to imbue their course curricula with some conservative, evangelical and fundamentalist readings and reflections in lectures (Stewart, Hewett, et al., personal communications). In retrospect, confessed Claude Stewart, this was an excessive sacrifice of professional expertise.

The biggest compromise I made in general was that
I included among readings and treated with a seriousness positions that I really regarded as almost, in some cases, as foolish and in some cases as subpar...In that sense I was shaped. (Personal Communication, September 9, 1992)
The faculty was peppered through the mail. For example, Rev. Dan Phipps wrote Dr. Alan Neely.

Dear Dr. Neely,

...The Moderates have lost and will continue to lose the political struggle (which I detest) because of The Issue of Trust, not church politics. Allow me to give you a theological laugh - a lady in South Carolina told me personally that she heard those liberals wanted to take out the red-letters highlighting the words of Jesus. Now, before you burst into a theological uproar, hear the psychological message - "Seminary and educated professors cannot be trusted to hold dear the faith of Christ."

Before you write me a theological thesis on how the fundamentalist movement has poisoned her mind, hear the words of a pastor and therapist - "She hits the issue squarely on the head."
Theological professors are so far removed from the
everyday life of the local church that a climate of mistrust has silently arose [sic]. While our conservative brother [television preacher Charles] Stanley appears weekly to the average church member, this is untrue of our professors. What layman knows of Dr. Neely? (Correspondence from Dan Phipps, Minister of the Franklin Heights Baptist Church in Kannapolis, NC, to Dr. Alan Neely, SEBTS, dated August 8, 1986)

It did not look good. In short, "The general sense was that they were closing in on us and we'd better get the wagons in a circle...." (Claude Stewart, Personal Communication, September 9, 1992)

**Peace Committee subcommittee visit.** A visit of a subcommittee of the Southern Baptist Convention Peace Committee was scheduled for February 4 and 5, 1986. Resistance to this inquiry was evident in both camps of the board of trustees of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. Jesse Chapman, chairman of the board at that time, called it a "breach of the understanding that the trustees serve as a protection of the institution against outside influences" (Personal Communication, October 16, 1992). James DeLoach vowed that he "resent[ed] the Convention having
a committee to do what we are by our charter required to do" (Personal Communication, October 26, 1992). Robert Crowley volunteered:

I'm going to get in trouble with some of my [fundamentalist] brethren because they really thought the Peace Committee was the panacea. But I felt...they were actually usurping the right of the trustees. If there was going to be an investigation of our faculty, that's the trustees' responsibility.

I'm not sure...that it had any real definitive purpose...I was not an enthusiast of the Peace Committee...I thought to myself, if you are talking about peace, this is not going to cause peace. This is going to cause war. (Personal Communication, October 19, 1992)

On the other hand, it was impossible for most Southern Baptists, reared in the monolithic, centralized structure of mother church, to imagine resistance to such a proposal. After all, the Convention founded the seminary and provided for two-thirds of its operating budget. There was also the sense in which to derail the vehicles for peace was to imply heresy already. Convention bureaucrats, even
SEBTS president Randall Lolley, seemed to believe that the SBC, like an outraged parent, would settle down and become sane again if you went along with it. Finally, and after all, the Board of Trustees did officially pledge cooperation with the Peace Committee.

It goes without saying, that as a whole, the administrators and professors of SEBTS were never quite at peace with the notion of an outside group relating directly to seminary personnel, without employing the Trustees as the interface group or actual investigating or reporting committee. They were never comfortable with the fact that those who were licensed with the assignment were some of the institution's bitterest antagonists. There appeared to be no hope of a fair hearing. In particular, the required openness of spirit smelled like a trap, and some intuited that the permission granted the Peace Committee to discuss and inquire might mutate into the power to investigate without appropriate restraint.

Finally, in retrospect, some, like Lewis Drummond of the Southern faculty, felt that the clergy/laity/faculty mix on the visiting teams should have been tipped in favor of those who knew best the nature of the seminaries. "When they went to the theological
institution, there should have been a heavying up, as it were, of the academics side of this. Theological seminaries are strange animals that a lot of people do not understand" (Personal communication, July 10, 1992). There were no faculty or former faculty assigned to go to Southeastern.

The four member subcommittee assigned to visit Southeastern included: Dr. Jim Henry, FL (chairman); Dr. Jerry Vines, FL, Dr. Robert Cuttino, SC, and Mr. William Poe of NC. The first three were pastors. It was generally assumed that the first two were sympathetic to the fundamentalist movement, and the latter two to the moderate party. In keeping with the suggested guidelines of the visit, Dr. Charles Horton, chair of the board of trustees; Dr. W. Randall Lolley, president of the seminary; and Dr. J. Morris Ashcraft, dean of the faculty, represented the institution. Dr. Lolley's request that Dr. Jesse Chapman, vice-chair of the board, also be present was denied. Dr. Henry similarly denied a request of the student government to be granted an audience with the committee.

According to the guidelines drafted by the Peace Committee, the visit was to be characterized by a spirit of mutual support, honesty, and genuine
dialogue.

The subcommittees will go in the spirit of love and candor and with the major purpose being to sensitize agencies to Convention concerns and to solicit their active participation with us in the peace-making process. The subcommittees will state at the outset that the purpose is not to accuse but to express concerns which committee members have and which have been conveyed to the committee by Southern Baptists in general. The purpose is to establish honest dialogue and communication. Agencies to be visited shall be given an opportunity to express their concerns. Agencies shall also be encouraged to express what they perceive to be the greatest needs in restoration of trust in SBC life. ("Response of the Board," 1988, Exhibit O)

The issues discussed included the 1963 Baptist Faith and Message document, the SEBTS Articles of Faith, "the nature of the Bible, women in the ministry and at Southeastern, faculty appointments and accountability; and churchmanship among faculty, staff, and students" ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, p. 36).

Mr. Poe remembered the first session essentially
consisting of "[Jerry] Vines, [and] Jim Henry to some extent, asking questions of Randall Lolley to explain certain things that they had been told or heard about certain professors" (Personal communication, September 9, 1992). Ashcraft assessed the general tone of the meeting in these terms: "The...prosecuting-type of questioning by an unfriendly member, the frequent affirmation that they 'love us' and the serious treatment of trivial "concerns" made it a difficult ordeal" (Ashcraft, 1988, p. 51). Poe elaborates even more specifically.

It's pretty clear to me that the two members of the committee, Vines and Henry, were of the opinion that some of the teaching that was going on at Southeastern Seminary was inconsistent with their view of Baptist doctrine. They wanted it stopped. If necessary, they wanted the faculty members who were doing this removed from the faculty. (Personal communication, September 9, 1992)

Throughout the visit and in subsequent discussions and exchanges, the word "concern" was employed instead of "criticism" or "charge." Nevertheless, the demeanor of some of the investigators and the gravity of the
issues presented colored the whole exchange in dark, accusing, negative terms. (Ashcraft, 1988, p. 51) In the particular tack taken by Vines and Henry, the issue had quickly become, not a sharing of a mission of renewal in reunifying the Convention, but theological orthodoxy, integrity, and heresy.

Presumably, [concern] is a kinder word and less damaging than "charges." Under normal circumstances, it may be preferable. When, however, an institution or the reputations or careers of faculty members are in the balance, one may find legitimate objections. Charges are more formal and require formal, official action. It is customary, however, to follow due process in dealing with charges. Concerns, on the other hand, are often anonymous, not always clearly stated but, while intended to be informal, can result in very formal, official and damaging actions. Church people can pretend to be folksy while they deal with "concerns" in an informal way, but can at the same time destroy reputations and careers. (Ashcraft, 1988, p. 51.)

Had the concerns been charges, the stated procedures at the seminary for due process (they
follow recommendations of the Association of Theological Schools, which in turn refer to AAUP's recommended procedures) would have been triggered. ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, p. 37)

Dr. Robert Cuttino, one of the subcommittee members, left the meeting February 5 at 11:00 a.m. to catch a private plane home in order to conduct the funeral for a member of his church. On the way, Cuttino advised President Lolley of a meeting the night before between three members of the subcommittee and students and former Southeastern students involved in the Conservative Evangelical Fellowship.

This startling revelation "seriously damaged the meeting" in several respects (Ashcraft, 1988, p. 50). First, it was held during an official campus visit, yet the host was not notified or invited to attend. The particulars gathered in an atmosphere of secrecy for even the organization's advisor was unaware of the gathering. In due course, it became known that the meeting lasted almost four hours, almost as much time as the representatives of the school were given. It was an unusual amount of time for a group of the minority opinion on campus, when other individuals and groups who had used proper channels to request a
hearing were denied it. Nearly every one of the concerns which had been presented at the official conference arose from the conversations between subcommittee members and the students (Lolley, 1986, May 10, p. 5).

The previous evening, February 4, Jim Henry surprised his hosts, the Lolleys, by abruptly leaving the president's home almost immediately after dinner. Vines arrived late that evening, escorted to his hotel from the airport by the seminary's communication officer Rod Byard. After watching the conclusion of a basketball game with Byard, Vines quickly excused himself, saying he had a meeting to attend. Cuttino had not arrived.

In spite of not feeling well, Poe went to the dining room of the Plantation Inn where they were staying for supper. There he was surprised to encounter the other two subcommittee members and a group of approximately 15 students. A member of the subcommittee, Poe nevertheless asserts in the clearest terms that he arrived absolutely unaware there was to be a meeting. At that point he was invited to join the gathering. Poe stayed about 30 minutes before retiring, physically ill and none too comfortable with
the nature of the meeting itself as well.

James Bradshaw, then president of the Conservative Evangelical Fellowship, had requested the opportunity to meet with the subcommittee, which chairman Jim Henry in turn accepted. (Hefley, 1989, p. 147) Later, one of the students, Fred Hilder, appealed, "We fully expected Dr. Lolley and some faculty members to be there" (Puckett & Martin, 1986, February 21, p. 6). Henry subsequently admitted that he did not advise the administration nor invite them.

Poe describes the fraction of the meeting he witnessed as follows.

It was obvious the student group who was there were people who were out to get certain professors. I mean they were obviously loaded for bear in that regard. It was mainly stories of what professors had said in the classroom, all designed to show they didn't believe in the first 11 chapters of Genesis literally. That's what these people seemed to want to talk about more than anything else. (Poe, Personal communication, September 9, 1992)

The students had in hand copies of pages of articles and books authored by faculty, notes of
classroom lectures, and what they described as "Official Seminary Tapes" of speakers. (Hefley, 1989, 147) "The Southern Baptist Convention had encouraged Baptists to express such concerns about the denomination and its agencies over the preceding months, but nothing relating to Southeastern beyond one article and one letter had been received prior to February 4" ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, p. 36). Therefore, this haphazard collection of documentation offered by the CEF students, in almost singular fashion, gave rise to the aggressive, if otherwise ill-prepared, agenda of Henry and Vines the next morning. Ashcraft was outraged.

If I had been president instead of the dean I would have walked out of our meeting at one point and simply said, "I cannot be a part of this because it is not a good faith operation...." I don't think [Lolley] made a mistake in meeting with them. It may have been a mistake when we went on after we found out they had met privately with our worst critics. From that point on, we may have all made a mistake. It may have been better if we had just at that point said we'll have no more to do with it. Then they would have
fired us sooner. (Personal Communication, August 25, 1992)

Randall Lolley summarized the details of the subcommittee concerns this way in a "Report to the Trustees" (March 10, 1986).

The subcommittee shared twenty-seven (27) specific, written concerns. Seven (7) of the concerns were accepted although they were anonymous. The other twenty (20) concerns came from (7) persons, five (5) who are presently student members of the Conservative Evangelical fellowship (CEF), and two (2) who are recent seminary graduates, and members of the CEF. These concerns involved a total of fifteen (15) seminary faculty members, one (1) visiting teacher, and one (1) retired Southeastern Seminary teacher.

Apart from the seven anonymous concerns, eleven others came from two recent graduates, and all other concerns were submitted by representatives of the CEF at the meeting on Tuesday evening, February 4th.

It appears that although for seven months (June-January) the Peace Committee encouraged Southern Baptists to communicate their concerns,
the subcommittee received all their documented concerns, apart from one article (Tom Rush [1985 alumnus of SEBTS and former president of the Conservative Evangelical Fellowship (CEF); pastor, Lake Park Baptist Church, Lake Park, Georgia; in Baptist United News, December 19, 1985]) and one letter (Bill Clifton [a 1984 Southeastern graduate and charter member of the CEF; Minister of Education, First Baptist Church, Altamont Springs, Florida; letter to the Peace Committee]), at the meeting the night before the discussion with the president, the dean, and the chairman of trustees.

Furthermore, every concern except those received anonymously has come from members, past or present, of one student organization. (p.5,6) Lolley accused the Peace Committee group of not following the process described beforehand. (Hefley, 1988, p. 149) The Chairman of the Peace Committee, Charles Fuller, countered that there were no specific guidelines in this regard, and as such, the committee could not be criticized for a judgement call. However, Fuller did advise one of the students in the CEF group that because they represented an organized group on campus, there was a different set of protocols.
The Student Council of Southeastern issued a statement, exclaiming they felt "betrayed" in the affair. The resolution asserted that "guidelines were violated, that a hidden agenda was carried out, and that no single elected representative of our student body was given the opportunity to present genuine concerns of the entire student population" (February 11, 1986).

In response, the CEF issued "An Apology...." It expressed regret that: the unannounced meeting engendered such fiery response, their purpose had been "misunderstood," other student groups had not been allowed equal time, and, that such conditions existed as to compel them to meet with the subcommittee in the first place. (February 20, 1986) There was no apology for having done so, however.

This defense was perceived as largely unrepentant, apparently justifying a sense of mistrust on the part of the larger seminary community. The hostilities on campus were further exacerbated when it was learned that a CEF member student had borrowed the Old Testament class notes of Nancy Petty, a student who did well in the class, ostensibly for a friend having
trouble with the course. In actuality, Charlie Waller employed them in the Plantation Inn meeting as evidence against Professor Sam Balentine. Waller was forced to return the notes. Charges were leveled against him according to the institution's formal judicial procedures. Lolley also placed the CEF on probation. Petty suffered harassment, however. Four or five CEF members followed her about, pressuring her to sign a document promising not to prosecute. (Petty, personal communication, August 26, 1992)

At the February 18 SBC Executive Committee meeting quite the opposite interest was articulated, that conservative students were subjected to intimidation tactics by seminary faculty. Nancy Petty suspected that if Waller and his peers were called to task in any more significant way, the whole issue "might blow up," so no further action was considered with regards to the previous offenses. On the other hand, Lolley did advise her and her antagonists that if the harassment continued the police would become involved. (Petty, personal communication, August 26, 1992)

The sixteen professors identified in the Peace Committee Subcommittee questioning were: Morris Ashcraft, Sam Balentine, William Clemmons, Robert

In many cases, there was no more evidence offered than a supposed quotation of a professor. No reference was given as to context of the thought, nor was there support offered by collaborating witnesses. Articles and chapters, even a few pages, from books were frequently cited, yet with no clarification regarding the particular question or nature of the criticism. (Morris Ashcraft, personal communication, August 25, 1992) None of the "concerns" which arose from the student initiative were couched in terms of their relevance to the Baptist Faith and Message Statement of 1963, the supposed parameter for the inquiry of the Subcommittee. Rather than being an "official seminary tape," at least one identified concern was an unauthorized tape of a classroom lecture by Richard Hester (Payne, 1989, p. 7).

Some were misunderstandings of what the professors had actually said. Some were trivial or worded so vaguely that one had to guess at the meaning. For
instance, one student was concerned because a professor "endorsed women in leadership." The concern did not mention ordination or ministry. (Ashcraft, 1988, p. 52)

Professor John Steeley, the supposed offender, had no idea what was implied.

Max Rogers was accused of making some derogatory remark about Paul. He reminded the group he teaches Old Testament. There's no point in his getting into a discussion about Paul. It turned out that the student who made that complaint had not been in Roger's class. He was picking up on some hearsay material. (Thomas Bland, personal communication, July 31, 1992)

Alan Neely was assumed to be a proponent of liberation theology (Rush, 1985, p. 4), much to the consternation of these conservative students, because he pursued the subject as a scholarly interest, wrote about and taught courses in it. Neely was arguably the "best known and best prepared Southern Baptist missiologist...on the subject" because he knew the literature and he knew personally the writers of it throughout Latin America" (Randall Lolley, personal communication, September 25, 1992). Neely, for what it
was worth, did not place himself in that school of thought at all.

Several of the accused faculty members were cited for lack of absolute and uncompromising faith in the miracle stories of the Bible, and, in a larger sense, the authority of the Bible. Individual positions regarding divorce and homosexuality, the nature of the atonement and salvation, were suspected to be out of the mainstream and pursued as heretical.

Lolley and Ashcraft called the 16 faculty in and said that the "concerns" would be kept private. But the faculty members protested saying that the balance of the faculty knowing was important in that they needed them to understand and stand with them. Lolley shared the details with the whole faculty, then promised access to the verbatim minutes which were kept. But Charles Fuller, the chairperson of the Peace Committee, subsequently told Lolley the minutes were to be closed up in a vault for 10 years.

In other words, the sixteen faculty members never did actually get to see the charges. (Lolley, personal communication, August 26, 1992) Furthermore, they were censored because of a haphazard "scrapbook of xeroxed things given to the subcommittee" by a "rump group" of
students (John Durham, personal communication, November 4, 1992).

When we had a faculty meeting following that, Randall [Lolley], referring to that list, noting that a lot of us were on it, said [in jest], "I want to know what was wrong with the rest of you guys. Why didn't you get on the list?" (Claude Stewart, personal communication, September 9, 1992)

The guidelines for the subcommittee visit to SEBTS allowed, "If any faculty member...wishes, he or she shall be given opportunity to speak or present a written statement." However, the subcommittee demanded responses. Lolley believed the request had to be taken seriously given the trustee resolution on cooperation with the Peace Committee. The sixteen generally abhorred the idea, but an overriding interest in supporting the president as he sought to mediate the dispute prevailed. As John Durham said, "I gagged a bit and held my nose and did and wrote out a response" (Personal communication, November 4, 1992). The responses were forwarded to Jim Henry, Chairperson, Southeastern Subcommittee, Peace Committee, as well as included in a report to the trustees dated March 10 ("A
In correspondence for the committee dated August 5, Jim Henry asked for further clarification from all the faculty, communicating that in large part their efforts were insufficient. Strangely enough, he volunteered:

We appreciate your understanding while we read the material that was returned to our subcommittee. We've met on two occasions, once before the convention and we simply did not have the time needed to study it and look at the responses, and the second time was during our last Peace Committee meeting. (Henry to Lolley correspondence, August 5, 1986,)

The faculty took this rambling confession to mean that they were being asked for clarification on responses which the subcommittee had not even reviewed. Furthermore, it was never certain the Peace Committee itself ever read their initial reactions at all.

In his response in September, forwarding the additional statements by the faculty fingered in the probe, Lolley expressed consternation that no response had been issued by the subcommittee or its parent committee, although news releases had exonerated three
other seminaries from further investigation.

So far as Southeastern Seminary goes, we are perilously near the greatest of all ironies -- being held hostage, without information, response, or charges, in of all things, a process seeking peace. I am sure that you and your colleagues can understand with what gravity I view, on behalf of the seminary, this extraordinary situation.

(Lolley correspondence to Henry, September 18, 1986)

No response ever came and the files of the Peace Committee were sealed for ten years. The accused "heretics" never knew if they were on or off the hook. In summary, the inquiry went nowhere, constituting nothing more than a form of harassment in the minds of the 16 faculty members (Richard Hester, personal communication, November 4, 1992).

In a letter to Alan Neely, Cecil Sherman, a member of the Peace Committee and friend of those holding out at SEBTS, confided:

After some careful reading, I have come to the conclusion that Jim Henry and his sub-committee are not going to be pleased with anything serious scholars offer them. If ever there was an
Illustration of "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life" this is that proof. These people are not going to be pleased until you give them the small answers they want and until then, you are going to be guilty. (Sherman to Neely correspondence, September 3, 1986)

In retrospect, the Southeastern faculty and administration of 1986 agree "it was unwise for us to submit to this inquiry because of its threat to the school's integrity and academic freedom" (Hester et al., January 19, 1988). No lawsuit was entertained on their part because no formal charges were actually filed by the subcommittee or Peace Committee. Furthermore, in the early going, no one publicly protested. Sometime later Alan Neely shrugged and offered:

Does it do any good to protest a missing horse after the barn door's been opened? I don't think any of us realized, but that, I think, was the first fatal mistake, and it was one that all of us have to share some responsibility in. (Personal communication, September 25, 1992)

Unity in Diversity? In February, 1986, the Peace Committee issued a statement on theological diversity
in the Southern Baptist family. It was not based on any statistical survey, but arose as a product of the conjecture of the Committee. They illustrated with four examples.

1. Some accept and affirm the direct creation and historicity of Adam and Eve while others view them instead as representative of the human race in its creation and fall.

2. Some understand the historicity of every event in Scripture as reported by the original source while others hold that the historicity can be clarified and revised by the findings of modern historical scholarship.

3. Some hold to the stated authorship of every book in the Bible while others hold that in some cases such attribution may not refer to the final author or may be pseudonymous.

4. Some hold that every miracle in the Bible is intended to be taken as an historical event while others hold that some miracles are intended to be taken as parabolic. ("Report of the Southern," 1987, p. 6)

Fundamentalists celebrated this statement as vindication of their cause. In their mind, there was
one orthodox position, especially where the Bible was concerned. Diversity, then, is the tell-tale sign of heresy. Influential Memphis pastor Adrian Rogers remarked matter of factly, "Theological diversity is never strength, it's always weakness" (Simpson, May 27, 1986, p. 6).

Chairman Charles Fuller was asked if the statement would put a "smoking gun" in the hands of those who had long been critical of SBC-supported theological education.

"The Peace Committee does not see that as the purpose of the statement. I think we would ask the people to handle this statement with care. To mishandle it is to forfeit whatever opportunity we have to build upon it," Fuller said. (Martin, 1986, February 28, p. 2)

While the document purported to describe all of Southern Baptists, and no matter the disclaimers of Fuller, the timing of the diversity statement could not escape incriminating the seminaries. The recent events at Southeastern were still boiling hot on campus and in the press. A pleased Paul Pressler, a leading fundamentalist party protagonist, concluded:

I don't think it's necessary for us to prove the
problems we have any longer," he said. "The Peace Committee came to the only conclusion that it could come to, and that is that we have people in our schools whom we are paying to teach our young people that the Bible contains errors. That sows the seed of destruction for our denomination. (Knox, 1986, April 25, p. 3)

On July 28, 1986, a special group of the Peace Committee met. Moderates hoped a settlement might still be negotiated. Included were Charles Fuller, Charles Pickering, Adrian Rogers, Paul Pressler, Paige Patterson, Jim Slatton, Winfred Moore, and Norman Cavender. The fundamentalists were uncompromising in their agenda. Cavender summarized this meeting of these key party leaders this way in a letter dated August 2, 1986.

1. Slatton, Moore, and I tried every way we could, every idea we had, to find room for both sides to work together. The fundamentalists rejected every such attempt. They did not budge a millimeter from their goal of imposing strict inerrancy upon every aspect of SBC activity and structure. Examples of our attempts to find some point of compromise:
What if inerrantists controlled half our seminaries; would you accept us in the other half? Answer: No.

What if you controlled five seminaries; would you accept us in the sixth? Answer: No.

What if you controlled 90% of all seminary faculty; would you allow us 10% in one of the seminaries? Answer: No.

What if you had five seminaries and a system for designating your support to only those five; would you allow us to support, at our expense, one seminary? Answer (here is insight!): No, because the graduates of that seminary would be totally unacceptable in the mission fields and other areas of SBC service.

What if some plan of basic fairness could be devised; would you be interested? Answer: We consider anything that allows a moderate presence in SBC agencies and institutions to be unfair.

2. We met from 8:00 pm until past midnight. Slatton, Moore, and I provided the total effort to find reasonable solutions. The fundamentalists did not offer a single idea, suggestion, or move toward genuine peace. They put absolutely nothing
on the table, and rejected every concept we put forth. Their position was rigid: every person who rejects the inerrantist position must, in one way or another, be removed from any Convention-supported role. That is their bottom line, and they would not yield in the slightest.

3. One of their prominent spokesmen, with evident agreement from the others, made the statement that 100% of the faculties at Southern and Southeastern and 90% of the faculty at Southwestern failed to support the "conservative" stance! They made it clear those seminary employees would be required to change their positions or be replaced.

(Correspondence from Norman Cavender to Cecil Sherman, August 2, 1986)

Hope dimmed as options were exhausted. The faculty finally recognized, with Lolley, that the extent of the power of the president of the seminary to protect the heritage and ethos of the school was limited. Desiring that the faculty become a more significant partner in the defense of academic freedom and the traditions of the school, professor Alan Neely made a motion at the May 8, 1986, faculty meeting.

In view of the time in which we live and work, and
with the conviction that we need to act positively and courageously in seizing the initiative from our detractors and adversaries, I move that the Faculty respectfully request the President to consider naming a Task Force composed of representatives from the Faculty, Administration, and others he may deem wise, to bring periodically concrete proposals to the Faculty as to what we can do to maintain unity and morale, present positively and aggressively our story, correct misunderstandings and intentional misrepresentations and suggest a strategy (ways and means) to facilitate the doing of the work to which we have been called.

This motion carried. (This action is detailed in a memo from the president to the new members of the task force dated May 22, 1986.) The task force considered: employee contract arrangements, pastoral support for faculty and their families, legal counsel, strategies for and coordination of response to the crisis, especially in terms of harassment and denominational politics.

The Glorieta statement. In the meantime, the seminary presidents, very much in the crucible, felt
still more pressure to find some workable compromise. Cecil Sherman, then pastor of the Broadway Baptist Church, Fort Worth, Texas, and a member of the Peace Committee, confided to Alan Neely, as though a premonition:

The Seminary presidents are going to meet with Henry, Born, Crews, Pickering and Fuller sometime in the month of September. If they are not very, very careful - if they don't choose their words with greatest care, they either will look like they are hiding liberals, defending them or they are going to cash in serious theological education. (Correspondence from Sherman to Neely, September 3, 1986)

The presidents met in Kansas City to discuss the next summit conference with the Peace Committee to be held in Glorieta, New Mexico. They very much wanted to beat the next initiative of the fundamentalists to the bargaining table. Lolley, in particular, could not be any more certain that the report of the subcommittee which visited his school was going to be unfavorable.

The seminary administrators came knowing that the Peace Committee was planning to cross-examine some professors at the two seminaries, Southern and
Southeastern, that had not been "cleared," something not done on previous sub-committee visits to the seminaries. There were fears that these seminaries, along with Midwestern, which was back on the Peace Committee's list, might encounter great trouble at the 1987 convention. (Hefley, 1987, 117, 118)

Their actions suggest the presidents must have agreed to stand together, "believing that without a solid front their cause would be lost" (Neely, 1986, October, p. 6). The planning and preparations in Kansas City left the six presidents in a surprisingly euphoric mood, believing they finally had come to a consensus statement which might be embraced by the Peace Committee. (Lolley minutes of the meeting)

A memorandum dated October 6, 1986, from the SEBTS Task Force Secretary, Glenn Miller, solicited assistance on the part of faculty for the president in drafting a realistic document. However, until the final document was revealed none of the faculty or administration at Southeastern had seen it, an anomaly where Lolley's participatory management style was concerned. Dr. Mahan Siler, pastor of the Pullen Memorial Baptist Church in Raleigh, NC, and friend of
Lolley said:
Randall is a team player....[But,] I wonder why Randall didn't get on the phone before he fully agreed to that, and talked with Morris Ashcraft or Dick Hester, [and] said, "Hey, this is what's happening, help me think through it." Randall was not using consultation. (Siler, personal communication, August 26, 1992)
While no confirmation has ever authenticated the story, rumors have it that the draft of what became known as the "Glorieta Statement" was written by Landrum Leavell, President of New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, and amended by Milton Ferguson, President of Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, and Russell Dilday, President of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary (Hefley, 1987, 118). What they came up with at the October Prayer retreat rocked the campuses. The six presidents affirmed belief:
1. In the "supernatural...origin and history of Christianity" and that "the miracles of the Old and New Testament are historical evidence of God's judgment, love, and redemption."
2. 'That the Bible is fully inspired...'God-breathed,' utterly unique....The 66 books of the
Bible are not errant in any area of reality."

3. That the seminaries are "fulfilling the purposes assigned" by the SBC, though "not perfect."

They committed themselves:
1. To "reaffirm our seminary confessional statements" and "enforce compliance by the persons signing them."
2. To "foster in our classrooms a balanced, scholarly frame of reference for presenting fairly the entire spectrum of scriptural interpretations represented by our constituency."
3. To "respect the convictions of all Southern Baptists...."
4. To "commit ourselves to fairness in selecting faculty, lectures, and chapel speakers across the theological spectrum."
5. To "lead our seminar[ies] in spiritual revival."
6. To "deepen and strengthen the spirit of evangelism and missions on our campuses...."
In everyone's eyes the presidents had conceded there were problems in the theological perspectives represented in their faculties. They spoke the words the fundamentalist's most wanted to hear regarding the Bible. Fundamentalist party leaders, Paul Pressler and Paige Patterson, capitalized on the opportunity immediately with a "Statement of Appreciation and Affirmation" (Unpublished position paper).

1. We greet with enthusiasm the statement of the Seminary Presidents in Glorieta and appreciate their recognition that there is "legitimate concern" about the seminaries and that the teaching of inerrancy has not been given "a fair shake" in the schools....

5. ....We ask that there cease to be discrimination against those voicing concerns about our institutions and that none be excluded from admission as students, selection as faculty, or appointment as administrative leadership, because they have expressed their heartfelt concerns....Individuals should never be penalized for expressing what are now recognized both by the peace committee and the presidents' Glorieta statement as legitimate concerns.
7. ...We are grateful that increasing numbers of Southern Baptists are now recognizing that these problems can no longer be disregarded and that we must have our institutions operate from the predicate that the Bible is "truth without any mixture of error" and "not errant in any area of reality...."

11. ...We call on all Southern Baptists involved in the controversy to address the issue and all of our seminary professors and other denominational employees to address forthrightly and honestly this issue in such a way that there are no ambiguous phrases or hidden meanings. (1986)

The complaints of fundamentalists had been legitimized again. It sounded to those on the campus in Wake Forest, NC, as though the lynchings were about to begin. Clearly, Lolley and the other presidents intended to steer a middle course toward political compromise. When it was done, Lolley, particularly, found himself many miles off course, estranged from his faculty, with his friends unable to muster a defense on his behalf. At the next faculty meeting, Neely recalled, Lolley "breezed in" as though everything was fine.
I just remember that I felt [like I was] about to be sold a bill of goods. Snake oil was in his pocket and he was going to try to pawn it off as a healing potion. And he started telling us what all this meant. "It was okay. We were going to get through it. We had to make some concessions."

The faculty was so angry. I think they were stunned. I'm not sure all of them really knew, at that point....The only person who spoke was Gene Puckett, and he was not even on the faculty...But the essence of what Gene said...was, "You've given the fundamentalists exactly what they wanted...." So then Randall said, "Well, I'm sorry. I'm going hunting for 2 weeks in Nebraska." And he walks out....He didn't give us any time to process what he had told us, and he had a lot of hurting, wounded, angry faculty and staff. (Personal communication, September 25, 1992)

When Lolley returned from vacation, the faculty had formed their interpretation of the Glorieta Statement. According to Allen Neely, they were ready for him. The SEBTS Task Force on the Convention formed the initial and most punishing gauntlet. Neely smiled as he recollected, "after his little song-and-
dance...we beat the hell out of him." Tolbert and Ashcraft were especially caustic. However, Neely attested, "he didn't lose it....He took it. He took it like a man. And I think his star began to rise a little again" (Personal Communication, September 25, 1992).

While they did not ever approve of the Glorieta Statement, Lolley's faculty and friends eventually reaffirmed his good intentions, however misguided. "It was probably something that was made in a euphoric situation that under different circumstances wouldn't have been made," offered Christine Gregory, a trustee and Peace Committee member (Personal communication, October 19, 1992). "I think he got pressured in," said Mahan Siler, a friend of Lolley and pastor of Pullen Memorial Baptist Church in Raleigh, NC. "I'll bet that was a hot box. I'll bet he wasn't that clear about himself at that point" (Personal communication, August 26, 1992). Professor Richard Hester offered a similar analysis.

I know how it happened because I've seen these people work. This group psychology that would take the guy you're trying to persuade and get him on his knees with you and hold hands and talk
about what God wants us to do. It's a form of brain washing. That's what happened to Randall.
(Personal communication, November 4, 1992)
Nevertheless, the faculty struggled in the no­man's land of disagreeing with their own president's public statement, a fact which intensified the perception that "they were pretty far out" if they couldn't even agree with their president (Russ Bush, personal communication, July 8, 1992).
Lolley backpedaled rapidly.
This negotiated statement was meant to be a positive, proactive, personal statement by the six individuals involved....
As I see it, we have spoken to tolerance, balance, and fairness in our classrooms....
The paragraph on the Bible is crafted as a non-technical, non-emotional, convictional statement about the Bible as an instrument for God's redemptive purposes....
Setting the polarities as "not errant" and "errant" we want Southern Baptists to know that we do not perceive the Bible as purposively and by design "errant." Rather, as a book of redemption, it is "not errant in any area of reality...."
This simple statement is not the same as a far more technical set of polarities such as the "inerrancy" or the "dynamic" doctrines of the inspiration of the Scriptures. These are complex theological formulations...

In short, the perfection of the sixty-six books of our Bible derive from their purpose as books of redemption.... (Lolley, 1986, November, p. 3)

What we came up with was a much shorter document, which became a political statement more than a theological one. Anyone who reads it can tell it's a political statement. None of us felt good about how short it was. All of us wanted to add paragraph after paragraph of explanation, but we felt that that would defeat the purpose. But we knew we would have a good bit of time with the Peace Committee - a whole morning (at Glorieta) - to discuss the statement with them....

Here's what has happened. You see, almost six days - two in Kansas City, almost three in Atlanta, and another day in Albuquerque the day before we met in Glorieta - went into the preparation of that document. And there is no way
that anyone picking up that page and a half could understand all the nuances of meaning that went into each sentence. I can see that now. I got away from it for a while, didn't pick it up, and when I do now it doesn't even read like the same document....(Haywood, 1986, November, p.2)

You have to bear in mind that we were not writing for the seminary community. We were writing to the average man and woman in our churches. We were writing to help them understand this controversy. We were trying to convey to them that the Bible they hold in their hands is not a misleading or misinforming book in its redemptive purpose. We want them to know that we do believe it is inspired and absolutely trustworthy as a book of redemption. That is its purpose - redemption. That does not mean that it speaks with authority on such matters as science, math or history, because those things fall outside its purpose. Scientifically we know much more about things than the writers did then and our views on science have changed. But that does not subtract from its being inerrant in its purpose. By inerrant we mean the Bible's absolute
trustworthiness. Some of us would prefer to use the words "perfect" or "true." (Haywood, p.8)

In time, such statements ushered cynicism into the place of exuberance on the part of fundamentalists. Yet, they did retain the useful document, for at a particular place and time, the presidents of the seminaries unwittingly raised another justification to increase the pressure on seminary personnel who did not capitulate to the ordinances of their movement. "What [the Glorieta Statement] did was heat up a very hostile environment for academic freedom" (Richard Hester, personal communication, November 4, 1992).

Furthermore, the presidents, and especially Randall Lolley, having given ground in apparent retreat, had little remaining power except as spokespersons for a form of theological education which was waning in Southern Baptist life.

**Bringing it home to the campus.** Tipping their hats to the Biblical interpretation "not errant in any area of reality," the seminary presidents blessed the Glorieta Statement as a litmus test of faculty orthodoxy. The notion of "balance" on the faculties empowered the resolve of fundamentalist trustees to make changes on the faculty by attrition, dismissal,
and appointment.

There would be even more fundamentalist trustees now. Some 40,000 Southern Baptists had gathered in Atlanta in June, 1986. Adrian Rogers, Memphis pastor and eloquent spokesperson for the fundamentalist movement, was reelected president with 55 percent of the vote. This assured the appointment of new, and increasingly assertive, fundamentalist trustees. The people at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary did not expect the new breed of trustee to just live and let live.

By 1986, the administration and faculty at Southeastern built a "Maginot Line" against the changes that were taking place in the SBC process, so that when the shift in the majority of the Board of Trustees took place, there was already the defense mechanism in the administration and faculty against the new majority of the Board. Therefore, there was in place an immovable object. The new majority of the Board approached the issue as an irresistible force. ("Response of the Board," 1988, p.7)

Moderate trustees barely won the first skirmish at the fall meeting. Dr. Jesse Chapman, a physician from
Ashville, NC, supported by moderates, barely won election as chairman over James R. DeLoach, associate pastor at the huge Second Baptist Church, Houston, TX. Chapman won by a 14 to 13 margin.

However, fundamentalists did make progress in commandeering the faculty appointment process. Previously, the trustee instructional committee engaged in the selection process only after a single candidate emerged from the president's process with the faculty. The new plan allowed the instruction committee to review the application materials of the top five or six candidates and comment on their preferences. This partial "sunshine law" might have been applauded under other circumstances, but among the faculty it meant still another forum to bring pressure to bear for a radical transformation of the school.

Shortly thereafter, Randall Lolley received the report of the Southeastern Subcommittee of the Peace Committee. Their assessment concluded that there was a lack of balance on the faculty. Specifically, "the conservative viewpoint is not adequately represented." Furthermore, the course reading lists and special speakers evidenced "insufficient representation of the conservative viewpoint." A "Proposal" followed.
1. That the administration and the Trustees of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary to [sic] take into consideration the impressions of our subcommittee....

2. That the administration and Trustees be requested to enter into dialogue with the faculty concerning each faculty member's interpretation of the phrase that the Bible has "truth without any mixture of error for its matter."

3. That the administration and Trustees be requested to carefully review the concerns addressed by our subcommittee to determine if the specific views expressed by some professors are within the Baptist Faith and Message Statement on Scripture.

4. That we make available to the administration and Trustees our records of concerns and responses relative to specific professors. ("A Response of the Board," 1986, pp. A-12, A-13)

Clearly, the text beginning "truth without error..." in 2, above, was a new test for inclusion on the faculty, a test not evident in the primary documents of the seminary. Item 3 imported the Baptist Faith and Message Statement of 1963 as a discriminating
instrument, a document never adopted by SEBTS. In spite of these limitations, item (3) encouraged action as grievous as an investigation. They also promised records which were purported to be locked up for ten years, records denied the faculty when they were compelled to respond blindly to the "concerns" of the subcommittee.

It does not appear that the faculty censored are identified, which made for a peculiar circumstance. Usually cases of this kind are brought against individuals. Specifically, in higher education, tests of orthodoxy and freedom (academic freedom) usually pertain to individuals whose position or perspective is unusual or even eccentric. The subcommittee was licensing an investigation of a whole faculty.

Lolley apparently never shared the report with the trustees until Jim DeLoach asked for it months later, and may not have ever shared it with the faculty. The trustees later supplied that this omission exonerated them from the charge that the inappropriate influence of an external body precipitated actions on their part.

Finally, it is noteworthy that the Peace Committee's Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary Subcommittee, and not the full Peace Committee, was
taking the initiative to communicate a plan of action to the trustees. The illustration points to the expectation that the SEBTS administration relate to its trustees plus multiple external bodies, all purporting to have authority over it.
The Firestorm: 1987

Faculty appointment process. The Southeastern trustees of the new inerrantist agenda realized with deep frustration a conspicuous failure in their kingdom conquering dream. It was the part of the plan which came to matter most. They continued to be stymied in the appointment process of professors. Fundamentalist professors, well thought of potential faculty in their own circles, were not getting through the system to Southeastern positions. Fundamentalist trustee James DeLoach saw clearly what they had to do.

I could see that the only way that we were ever going to really get input is...to change the faculty selection process. Even though this created a great deal of consternation on the part of the dean and on the part of Dr. Lolley, we still made it clear, if it causes hell to freeze over, we're going to do this.... Randall had told us all the time that as long as you do due process then the trustees can do whatever the trustees
want to do because they are the legally recognized, and document recognized power by which these things come. (Personal communication, October 26, 1992)

The savvy, political skills of Randall Lolley which had navigated many narrow straits in the past were now tested to the limit. An impasse presented itself. Bill Delahoyde, a fundamentalist trustee from Raleigh, North Carolina, understood Lolley's predicament.

Sometimes I'm sympathetic with him and sometimes I know that he was manipulating us. I can see that...he was caught a little bit on a dilemma. On the one hand he knew that this thing had to broaden or these people were going to demand inclusion, but on the other hand, he knew that his tradition and his faculty was not going to...They believed in their own mind that inclusion of those people was a denial of something they stood for. They weren't going to do it. That creates a real problem. (Personal communication, November 4, 1992)

To ascertain the source of the faculty's resistance to change is not difficult. Their
appointment process was generally in keeping with almost all of higher education. They knew it and desired to retain every bit of that kinship.

Justification for perpetuating the traditional faculty role in the appointment of new faculty, however, ran deeper than this. "The faculty appointment process...was a behavioral mechanism that perpetuated the sense of community, [a] strong academic family. When that was stopped, it meant the family would not grow or perpetuate itself" (Elizabeth Barnes, personal communication, October 16, 1992).

If not growing, then the community was dying, and that underlies a great deal of the grief and anger expressed by that militant family in defense of the clan. They desired to perpetuate an ethos which was absolutely antithetical to the mores of fundamentalism.

A test between these resolute camps arrived quickly enough. The Committee on Instruction (CI) of the Southeastern Board of Trustees met February 20 and 21, 1987, to interview two nominees to the faculty. Dr. Elizabeth B. Barnes of Cary, NC, had been teaching on administrative appointment for three years at SEBTS. An alumnna of Southeastern, she earned her bachelor's degree from Meredith College, a small Baptist women's
college in Raleigh where she was serving as trustee at the time of her nomination. Barnes earned her Ph.D. from Duke University. The Committee was to consider her appointment to assistant professor of systematic theology.

Dr. Roy DeBrand was to be considered for appointment as professor of homiletics (the branch of theology dealing with the writing and preaching of sermons). A graduate of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary with both Master of Divinity and Ph.D. degrees, DeBrand was teaching at North American Baptist Seminary in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. DeBrand was considered a theological conservative.

Offered at the same time, they might have represented an arrangement of mutual interest where one candidate of certain conservative persuasion would come through the appointment procedure, if one of the moderate perspective did as well. As with all "Missouri Compromises," it might have worked well in theory, but neither side regarded it as satisfactory.

What the fundamentalist trustees did not know was that while DeBrand believed in theological propositions like the virgin birth, the New Testament miracles, and so on, he was certainly not in league with SBC
fundamentalist party politics. In fact, quite the opposite, DeBrand was a part of the early resistance movement to the takeover of the Convention through a network called the "Gatlinburg Gang" with other denominational progressives. Once he actually served in the same position Randall Lolley had filled as the associate pastor at the Broadway Baptist Church in Fort Worth. That staff included such moderates as J.P. Allen, Milton Ferguson, and John Claypool. In DeBrand's words,

I was a good find for Lolley because I satisfied some of the people on his board who were in the fundamentalist camp, but he knew who I was and he knew I was o.k. I mean, it wasn't any attempt at deception. I am who I am. But some of them just didn't ask the right questions. We didn't volunteer information. (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)

Both candidates were thoroughly tested as to their position on inerrancy. Yet, as a woman, as a teacher who encouraged the use of gender inclusive language in her classroom, and was undeniably identified with the moderate camp, Barnes was clearly headed for a more difficult time. While DeBrand's interview lasted a
little over an hour, Professor Barnes' conference lasted over three hours.

Barnes paints a picture of hypocritical cunning on the part of her antagonists on the Committee on Instruction. "It was all done in the context of solicitation and compliments and a trying to surface a pretense of cordiality and concern for me. But what they were looking for was a reason to jettison me" (Personal communication, October 16, 1992). She indicates that there was absolutely no interest in the nature or progress of her scholarship. She was questioned over and over about the status and authority of scripture, the historicity of Adam and Eve, the reality of the miracle stories in the Bible.

She was asked by Mr. Crowley about her views on abortion and if she would counsel a young woman in marital difficulties to seek a divorce. During the interviews [with the candidates] Mr. DeLoach invoked the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy, which has no recognized status at Southeastern, as the standard for judging the biblical stance of the two candidates.

("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, p. 37)

Dr. Morris Ashcraft described the Barnes interview
as "horrible...brutal treatment" (personal
communication, August 25, 1992). Dr. Barnes admits it
was so grueling as to cause her to forget.

    I have blocked most of that. I have repressed.
It was about a three hour interrogation. It's
been described as an interrogation. I don't think
that's being too melodramatic...with a ten minute
break for bathroom for everybody. And they kept
coming back around to the same question, sort of
the way an interrogation is conducted as I
understand it, coming back again later to the same
question again so to trip me up. So I remember
that kind of general experience, but I have
repressed and I think it shows how painful it was
for me. (Personal communication, October 16,
1992)

DeBrand was approved unanimously and Barnes by a
vote of 4 - 1, Crowley's being the only dissenting
opinion. However, there were those who were not yet
finished. One trustee, not on the CI Committee, called
to request an interview with Barnes on campus. He
desired to inquire further regarding matters already
addressed in the original interview. The unusual
request was denied by Dean Ashcraft, and that decision
was confirmed by the chairman of the board and the chairman of the committee (Ashcraft correspondence to DeLoach, dated March 20, 1987, found as addendum in Hester et al., 1988).

On Monday evening, March 9, 1987, before the Committee on Instruction would make their proposal to the whole Board of Trustees, the committee met again. A movement was afoot to jettison the recommendation of Barnes because she was a woman and not an inerrantist. While Lolley was present, Ashcraft was neither invited or aware of the gathering, though his job description matter of factly charges him with acting as the seminary liaison person in all academic tasks.

Ashcraft later chastened the committee chairperson, Jim DeLoach, and the Committee for meeting without him, for the attempt to reverse votes, for mixed feelings in the presentation of a candidate, and for misleading candidates regarding their intent to appoint. Furthermore, he was still seething over the fact that DeLoach had employed an article not in the fundamental documents of the school, the Chicago Statement, to test the orthodoxy of potential faculty. (Ashcraft to DeLoach correspondence, March 20, 1987, included as addendum in Hester, et al., 1988)
DeLoach countered that the Glorieta statement was a "legitimate and practical tool," and the Chicago Statement as reasonable a definition of inerrancy as he could find. The meeting was "not some sinister gathering." Ashcraft was not notified because of the "press of time" (Jim DeLoach to Morris Ashcraft, April 21, 1987, included as addendum in Hester et al., 1988). The committee chair bristled at what he described as Ashcraft's attempt to intimidate, and shot back that there were precedents for rescinding action of which he himself was aware. He added,

*I KNOW* that as a member of the Instruction Committee *I would never have voted to recommend* either Dr. Elizabeth Barnes or Dr. Roy DeBrand to become faculty members at Southeastern *unless both of them had affirmed the Chicago Statement or some other firm definition on inerrancy.* Since both of them did, I voted to recommend them. (Jim DeLoach to Morris Ashcraft, April 21, 1987, included as addendum in Hester et al., 1988)

Jim Henry described the session as appropriate and unofficial in import.

We all knew that this meeting was for information and discussion prior to our Tuesday morning
meeting. We all knew there was no "official vote" or action we, as a Committee, could take. We could only talk about the rumors we had heard. (Jim DeLoach to Morris Ashcraft, April 21, 1987, included as addendum in Hester, et al., 1988)

C. Frank Jordan of the committee disagreed entirely with the chairperson's report.

That Monday night meeting was a special called meeting to take official action. We did not need to discuss anything before the Tuesday meeting. Our work had been done a few weeks earlier. As far as the so-called "rumors" are concerned, I heard none that night. Your letter to the Dean brought that term to my attention for the first and only time. No so-called "rumors" were mentioned that night. As Chairman of the Instruction Committee, I really think you are aware of this.

I was told after dinner Monday night that we were going to have a special called meeting at the Plantation Inn later that evening. At the risk of sounding more important than I really am, let me say that I was the prime target for that special meeting. My life-long friend, Bob Crowley, told
us there was new evidence against Dr. Barnes. I thought that rather strange, because I was not aware she was even on trial. Then the pressure was applied—to me. The objective was to get me to change my vote. I could not do that. In February I had voted for her, and I was not about to change it in March.

You [DeLoach] said in your letter to the Dean that we were all aware there was no official action or vote we could take that night. Jim, I don't know where you were. The whole idea was to get me to change my vote and then we, as a committee, would reverse our decision and not recommend that Dr. Barnes be hired. Someone even mentioned that there was precedent for a committee doing just such a thing as that at the last minute.

You mentioned your leadership of the Instruction Committee. If you really did not know what was behind that Monday night meeting, then I suggest you have no leadership. If you did know, then your letter is not truthful. I know of no other way of saying this, but in light of this perhaps you should give serious consideration to
giving up your position as chairman.

I voted for Dr. Barnes in February. When the secret ballots were cast in March, I did so again. I also signed my ballot. I could not change just because of some theologian in Washington, D.C. [Carl F. H. Henry] or some judge in Texas [Paul Pressler]. I take orders from no man....I still feel the knots on my head that I received that night. (Correspondence from C. Frank Jordan to Jim DeLoach, May 12, 1987, included in Hester et al., 1988)

A slim majority to recommend Dr. Barnes held, nevertheless. The candidates were presented the following day. DeBrand was approved by a vote of 25 to 2; Professor Barnes by a vote of 14 to 13. According to Dr. Robert Culpepper, a trustee who was recovering from surgery left his bed prematurely to attend the meeting and cast his vote affirmatively, which provided Dr. Barnes with this, the slimmest, but adequate margin for appointment. (Personal communication, July 29, 1992)

Barnes' victory celebration in Broyhill Hall contained a bit of pathos, however.

I was indirectly censured the very day I was
elected to the faculty...after the vote was taken and the trustees, most of them, had left, [trustee] Jerry [Holcomb] was still there celebrating with those of us that were glad that I had squeaked by....During that time, Jerry said, "Elizabeth,...would you walk down the hall with me? I want to talk with you privately for a minute." So, of course, I said "Yes." We went into one of the smaller rooms down the hall. Jerry and I sat down at the table and he said, "Elizabeth, I just have to tell you one thing." He said, "We almost lost it. We almost did not pull it out. The one thing that just about did us in was your insistence on inclusive language." That sounds phenomenal, that such a thing as inclusive language would have been the thing which almost did us in, but that's what he said. And he said, "Some of the trustees said, after the vote was taken, in my presence, 'Well, she might have been voted in, but she will never get tenure.'

And I knew that. I knew that from the first day. There wasn't a prayer, even at that time, in the spring of '87, that I would ever be granted tenure, and for such a reason that I endorsed and
recommended the use of inclusive language in my classes. I think that was an infringement of academic freedom. (Personal communication, October 16, 1992)

Also at the March Trustee meeting Randall Lolley advanced a proposal entitled "A Covenant, A Plan, A Prayer." It was designed to deal with the Peace Committee concerns on which the trustees were sure to demand action.

John Durham, former member of the Southeastern faculty, says the problem with the Glorieta Statement was not unlike the old Arab proverb: "Don't ever let the camel get his nose into the tent. If he does, the first thing you know the whole camel's going to be in here." (Personal communication, November 4, 1992) If anything, Lolley's proposal was an attempt to give the camel a whiff of something that might lead it back out of the tent. The Plan attempted to leave the responsibilities in the hands of the administration and faculty, and stem interest in active trustee intervention.

The "Plan" pledged responsible action when faculty members are accused of deviation from the Articles of Faith. It pledged fairness in seeing balance
in the presentation of various viewpoints. It promised balance in the selection of speakers, lecturers, etc. It also pledged that the SEBTS community would "emphasize and exemplify afresh the distinctive doctrines of our Baptist heritage." (Ashcraft, 1988, p. 53)

After some discussion and revision, it was adopted by the name "Plan of Action." However, just as the Glorieta Statement had, this, too, frustrated faculty members and trustees alike.

Some faculty members were angered...presumably for the implied criticism of the seminary's record on the question of fairness, while the plan did not go far enough to satisfy the most militant of the trustees as a good-faith effort to implement the Glorieta Statement. ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, 38)

In particular, the trustees were angered that Lolley did not prepare them for the statement or allow them to be involved in its development. They also felt "it did not include a commitment to make Southeastern's faculty representative of that [SBC] constituency" ("Response of the Board," 1988, p. 9, 10), and, consequently, compelled no meaningful changes at all on
the part of the administration and faculty. These reasons led trustee Bill Delahoyde to quip, "It really was the plan of inaction" (Personal communication, November 4, 1992). Not surprisingly, perhaps, the "Plan of Action" was never addressed again.

The hard line stiffens. The Conservative Evangelical Fellowship at SEBTS invited Paul Pressler, an architect of the fundamentalist movement in the Southern Baptist Convention, to speak on campus February 6. Dr. Alan Neely, professor of missiology at SEBTS, asked Pressler if those not associated with the fundamentalist takeover and/or not of that theological perspective would have a place in Convention life.

"You have said that 90 percent of the Southern Baptists believe like you do," Neely said to Pressler. "I don't think that's correct, but let's just say it is. What happens to the other 10 percent who don't believe in inerrancy?...Do not the 10 percent deserve to be represented?"

Neely asked this at least three times, as Pressler sought to avoid the question. After the meeting, Neely said, "The answer is 'we don't' according to Pressler. He just won't say it" (The Enquiry, February, 1987, p. 1, 8).
Soon after, Adrian Rogers, president of the SBC, jabbed, "If Southern Baptists believe that pickles have souls, then professors must teach that," (Hefley, 1987, 106). "If we believe pickles have souls and they can't teach it, then they shouldn't take our money" (Winston, 1987, February 23, p. C-1). Rogers quickly followed up that he did not believe pickles had souls, but the cavalier manner in which he established the theological parameters of instruction burned the faculty community. (p. C-1)

In St. Louis that summer (1987) the Peace Committee was scheduled to make its report to the Southern Baptist Convention. After 15 meetings, agency visits, press conferences, correspondence, and almost a quarter of a million dollars spent in Cooperative Program monies, the report almost did not happen. The committee met all night until 4:15 a.m. on the Tuesday it was to be presented.

The president of the Convention insisted that the vote be taken on the same day, in spite of the fact that copies of the report were not available to most messengers (delegates) until late in the day of the vote. Many if not most did not get to read it, or only in parts. A scant 30 minutes was consumed in
discussion before 96 percent of the voters approved the report by secret ballot. (Hefley, 1987, chapter 5, St. Louis: The Watershed Convention)

The report itself is graphic evidence that the fundamentalists had succeeded in framing the problem as a theological concern (and specifically, seminary problem), and not a political coup. This kept the onus of responsibility on the moderates and the theological schools, and not on the authors of the fundamentalist takeover.

Even as a compendium of several reports, it is knotty with contradiction. The report blesses the Baptist Faith and Message Statement of 1963 and is commissioned to follow it "in regard to theological issues" (p. 3), but clearly scorns the BFM preamble on the limitations of confessions which it rejects as infallible statements (p. 4). Otherwise lost to the Peace Committee is the BFM's unsuitability for "authority over the conscience" (p. 4), and, that the BFM notes with expectation new understandings of truth in each generation ("The Baptist," 1963, pp. 4, 5). The same BFM article on scripture is exalted and employed as a test for SBC employment (p. 18), while the articles on "Education" and "Religious Liberty" lie
unaddressed. The article on scripture is defined specifically in terms of inerrancy, when, earlier in the document, the Committee advises that it is apparently not the only belief among Southern Baptists. Even the conclusion, "Where the Bible speaks, the Bible speaks truth in all realms of reality and all fields of knowledge," appears to contradict the earlier pronouncement, "The Bible is a book of redemption, not a book of science, psychology, sociology or economics." ("Report of the Southern," 1987, p. 11). The report notes the diversity of thought in Southern Baptist life and promises cooperation with those Baptists of differing persuasion than their own, but bases and advances all recommendations on beliefs the Committee purports to be held by the majority of Southern Baptists (yet without a shred of scientific evidence) (pp. 16 - 19).

The report also implies that Baptists abhor creeds, yet the committee demanded conformity of faith to the BFM and the Glorieta Statement on the part of agency employees (p. 18). These new requisites increased pressure on the Southeastern faculty to conform to fundamentalist principles while they continued to believe they were liable only to the
school's Abstract of Principles. The institution's provisions for dealing with those who deviated from the Abstract were already professionally and legally defined by due process described in the primary documents of the seminary and, in particular, the faculty manual.

The Peace Committee (PC) proposal for peace rested essentially on the capitulation of the moderates. "The cause of peace within the Southern Baptist Convention will be greatly enhanced by the affirmation of the whole Bible as being 'not errant in any area of reality'" (p. 10). The Peace Committee report did actually exhort future presidents, and members of the all important Committee on Committees and the Committee on Boards "to select nominees who...are drawn in balanced fashion from the broad spectrum of loyal, cooperative Southern Baptists, representative of the diversity of our denomination" (p. 12). But many, like Professor Richard Hester did not believe that would be the case with the party in power.

In successive agencies of the convention - the Home Mission Board, the Executive Committee, the Sunday School Board - fundamentalists are insisting on a single-minded doctrinal position
that permits no dissent and chills freedom of speech and expression. We can read the writing on the wall. If it happens here, we would cease to be an educational university. (Ackerman, 1987, October 12, pp. 1C, 4C)

Sociologist Nancy Ammerman concluded, "The Peace Committee report finally provided the legitimate mandate for [the] task" of returning the schools and agencies of the Southern Baptist Convention to biblical principles (1990, p. 223). In particular, the Peace Committee report signaled the wholesale metamorphosis of Southeastern Seminary as Professor Hester and others at Southeastern had known it.

Indeed, on his election, Adrian Rogers appointed the hardliners to those two influential appointment boards named above. Five more fundamentalist trustees elected that year were on their way to Southeastern for their first meeting in the fall, and five more would follow them in 1988. The slim majority held by moderates had just tipped over. Time had run out.

Attrition sets in. The controversy took its toll in battle fatigue and distraction from the original mission of the seminary. Students began to bail out. Many who stayed reported to their faculty advisors the
inability to read with any concentration or study with any focus. (E. Barnes, personal communication, October 16, 1992)

A trickle of faculty resignations ensued. Tom McKibbens, Associate Professor of Preaching, had resigned in 1986. Tom Graves, Associate Professor of Philosophy of Religion, noted on his return from sabbatical that things had not changed since he left and that was not good news. In fact, their fortunes were worse than ever. Graves' politicking for the moderate side of things that year pressed the realization home. "Flying into Fort Worth for the national meetings of the political network and hearing the actual vote report is a very awakening experience." He emphasized, "The votes weren't there," and, therefore concluded, "I can't fit anymore in Southern Baptist life" (Personal communication, June 6, 1992). Graves left in December, 1987, to serve in the pastorate.

Trustee Christine Gregory reports that while no one was censored directly, two in particular came close. However, both resigned before the axe fell. They were professors Claude Stewart and John Durham. (Personal communication, October 19, 1992)
Stewart departed for personal reasons.

I grew up in a fundamentalist church with a fundamentalist, authoritarian father. In order to survive [I] had come to some measure of personhood. [I] had to rebel against that.

The takeover at Southeastern was a reviving of old wounds. These were the discarded father figures moving in to spank us and control us. So I was angry and wanted the hell out from under those circumstances.

Personal and professional stuff was all mixed up for me. On the one hand I thought very highly of the colleagues, administration and faculty. They had my respect....We had a lot of good students. But I couldn't abide falling under the tutelage of the closed minded fathers again.

(Personal communication, September 9, 1992)

John Durham, whose commentary on Job had been a key flashpoint in the current struggle, was simply weary of the struggle and predicted a nasty, and imminent conclusion.

I said to Randall [Lolley] in January of 1987, "I am simply not going to put up with this. I've been reasonable about what I've written and what
I've said. I've made no bones in class or out of class or anywhere else about how I feel about the freedom with which we must operate in an academic institution. I had said publicly that I would defend the right of W.A. Criswell to write a literalist book as long as I have the same right to approach it from a different point of view...."

He said, "Look, we can't afford to lose you. We'll go to the wall with you," which was a very kind thing for him to say....I said, "Randall, the fact is, yes, I believe you would do that, but I think before the year's out you're going to be gone." "Oh, no." he said. I said, "Look, I have been a contributing person at this seminary. I believe I've brought credit to it. I am now in a situation in which I am increasingly going to be a liability." Because, in addition to the fact that I'd been on the hit list for twenty five years I now was having a domestic difficulty. My marriage was falling apart. I said, "That will just give them another stick to beat me with....I see that in a short period of time, at least within two years and possibly within one year we're going to be told what we can and cannot talk about and say and
cannot say in class and that is intolerable to me. That is intellectual bondage to which I will not submit myself." (Personal communication, November 4, 1992)

Durham recommended the faculty leave en masse. Some advanced the notion of the faculty founding their own seminary, as did the Concordia, MO, faculty which started Seminex, suggesting "seminary in exile," during similar circumstances. While some enthusiasm existed for this option, it never became more than talk. The knowledge that the Seminex experiment wilted within a decade certainly did not serve to embolden the troops. It was going to be rough to stay, and their options were dwindling.

It was a time of fear and fury, frayed nerves, and friends of many years exploding in shouting matches in public. (Graves, personal communication, June 1, 1992) Something had to be done, or something had to give.

After Keat Wiles joined the faculty in the fall of 1987, he reports that he was walking up the stairs to his office. On those stairs he met professor Glenn Miller for the first time. Miller introduced himself and asked, "How does it feel to have bought deck passage on the Titanic?" (Wiles, personal
A strategy materializes. An evening in November of 1986, Dr. Alan Neely joined Orlando Costas of Andover-Newton Theological School for dinner. Costas inquired as to the state of affairs at Southeastern.

We were very good friends, and I knew I could talk with him candidly. I said, "Orlando, they're closing in on us. It's a matter of time until they have a majority of trustees, and we're not going to have any defense." I remember vividly. He looked at me as if he were looking through me, and, frankly, I was uncomfortable. I didn't know what he was doing, because he had never been reticent to express himself and he certainly never lacked for words....He said, "Do you have an AAUP chapter?" And I said, "What's that?" I didn't even know what it was. So he explained to me what AAUP was. He said, "Do you have a faculty manual?" I said, "I think so; I'm not sure. I think we have a faculty manual." And then there was another long, long pause, and he just kind of looked across the table at me. And I think what he was saying was, "Should I tell Alan this?" (Personal communication, September 25, 1992)
Costas went on to describe Andover Newton's predicament in which they were being sued by two former faculty members because the latter were discharged without following due process procedures described by their accrediting body, ATS, and the AAUP, to whom the faculty members had appealed. Sometime later Neely confirmed the story and the implications of the Andover Newton debacle with George Peck, the late President of Andover-Newton. Then Neely wrote a memo to Randall Lolley, dated January 15, 1987, advising the President of the Andover-Newton trouble, and the invitation of Peck for Lolley to call him.

In the meantime, Neely thought that Professor Richard Hester was in the process of disengagement and getting ready to leave Southeastern. Over a private brown bag lunch he confronted him. Hester admitted this was his intent, offering that the battle was over.

This meeting wasn't to get him into the AAUP. I told him about my conversation with Orlando, and...with George Peck. And you know Dick. Dick doesn't show much excitement. I think a lot of stuff goes on internally. But he was pretty blase about the conversation...I really didn't know whether I had done any good or not....
About 2 or 3 days later, [Hester] called, and he said, "Alan, I was over at St. Mary's this afternoon and I saw a poster of AAUP and it had an 800 number in Washington, and I called so-and-so there and they are very anxious to help us...[the president of the state chapter will] come down here at their expense to tell us about AAUP and to tell us how to organize." And I said, "Well, let's do it." So really, at that point, Dick took over...He took it and ran with it....

We began a process of talking to faculty, one at a time, and trying to get them to say, "Yes, we'll support the organization of an AAUP chapter, and we'll become members." It wasn't easy. There were some who, by nature, are very cautious and felt this would be inflammatory, it would be counter-productive, would bring the wrath of the trustees down upon us unnecessarily, and that the best thing to do would be to hunker down and wait for the storm to blow over. (Neely, personal communication, September 25, 1992)

When Randall Lolley gave the chapter his blessing, the hold-outs cast their lot with the chapter. The Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary Chapter of
the American Association of University Professors was recognized by the national body in June, 1987, with all the regular faculty joining as members. At their founding the chapter pledged,

In forming a chapter of AAUP, Southeastern faculty members expressed their commitment to theological education characterized by reverence for biblical authority and respect for open inquiry and responsible scholarship. ("Southeastern Seminary," June, 1987)

The chapter allowed a place for gathering on the part of faculty without the encumberances necessitated by the by-laws of the institution. With this organization the faculty could finally take firm hold on the fate of their own professional and personal lives. They began a fund-raising campaign to raise $10,000 for legal fees and secured the law firm of Barrington, Smith and Hargrove, attorneys with experience in AAUP litigation and outstanding trial records. Eventually, the national office made the local chapter an "uncommon" grant of $3,500 (Hester, personal communication, November 4, 1992). They contracted with a professional press agent and began to issue news releases on the state of affairs at SEBTS,
particularly in terms of academic freedom.

The enthusiastic response by Lolley to the formation of the chapter and the positive action on the part of the chapter revitalized the faculty. But these were not the only factors. Professor Tom Graves identifies one in a person.

The one crucial thing, if I were writing the history of the crisis of 1987, ...would center on the moral integrity of Morris Ashcraft [Academic Dean]. That was the key. He's the one who refused to buckle. He did that for the faculty. He did that for Randall, saying "No more."

I was chairing a faculty committee that was asked to bring a response to the faculty on the issue of the crisis....There was argument by [Professor] Al Meiburg that we should adopt the Baptist Faith and Message statement as the document ruling our work at Southeastern. Although that was published in the catalogue, it was never adopted by the faculty as an official document....There was argument among the faculty about giving a little more. I had some hesitation in that committee, but I was convinced, "O.K., let's take this step and maybe...."
I remember going to Ashcraft with the conclusion of the committee work and he said, "You're not going to do that. That is not going to happen. We're not going to give anymore."

If Ashcraft had not been in that position and did not make that insistence I wonder what route the faculty would have followed. From that point on, the faculty made no conciliatory gestures that I know of to try and soften their stance for the sake of the crisis. (Personal communication, June 6, 1992)

Even trustee Jim DeLoach of the fundamentalist persuasion concurs in this regard. After a point, Ashcraft would not allow Lolley to continue to play politics.

The dean was the one that would not let Randall move.

If Morris Ashcraft had had any kind of spirit of reconciliation and had said to Randall, "Randall, you and I have got to work this out.... I can see where this is leading us. We've got to close ranks and we've got to find a way to make this work. (Personal communication, October 26, 1992)
But the Dean did not. He did not want to compromise.

Still another factor, and perhaps the most pivotal in the minds of some, was the development of Richard Hester, Professor of Pastoral Care and Psychology of Religion, as the key facilitator and spokesperson for the faculty.

If we had combed the United States with a profile and a rigorous process...and references and all of that...we could not have found a person more ideally prepared,...inately and experienced and emotionally to do what needed to be done. He's articulate on his feet under pressure, when many of us would kind of fumble for words, and be unsure as to what we should say, and sometimes not say the right thing, or even worse, say the wrong thing. When he is under pressure, he is at his best. (Alan Neely, personal communication, September 25, 1992)

A great deal of Hester's readiness for the task was bound up in his course preparations for that fall.

In the fall of '87 I was teaching a course [at Meredith College] involving pastoral care of families and using a text I had by Edwin Friedman,
Generation to Generation. The main thrust of the book is: the central issue in leadership is self-definition. The goal of a leader is to help an organization, or to help a family...to clearly get itself differentiated, so you know where the boundaries are. You know what the function of this particular [part] is...what [is] the other part's...That increases the effectiveness of the communication among the parts and also [with] the outside world....

In preparing for that course, the work that I thought we needed to do was to get differentiated from the rest of the institution as a faculty and clearly define ourselves as "What's the consensus with which we're going to meet the trustees when they come in in the fall?" That was the hardest work of all. It was much easier to deal with the fundamentalists than it was to get this consensus....

The form of the consensus was that we would not let ourselves be investigated without due process, we wouldn't sign anything, that we would follow the existing documents of the school, be faithful to them, and only the president of the
chapter would speak for the chapter, a very important criteria. The faculty held to that. The trustees did not. They had 30 spokespersons. We had one. (Richard Hester, personal communication, November 4, 1992)

This self-clarification and self-definition exercise began with individual faculty members. A great deal of tension had existed concerning issues of motive and trust. In its workshop prior to the opening of the fall semester the faculty unanimously adopted a "Statement of Mutual Support."

In the context of current circumstances in the Southern Baptist Convention, we, the Faculty of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, affirm our encouragement and support of one another as Christian professors, administrators, and colleagues....

We affirm our oneness of purpose and our unity of fellowship.

We affirm our mutual support as we seek to be faithful...recognizing our individual responsibility to express freely our understanding of God's calling and respecting the integrity of our various responses to divine leadership.
(Byard, 1987, August 21)

Interestingly enough, this permission to act freely and independently appears, paradoxically, to have coalesced the group. When individuation was blessed, then there was solidarity. The faculty became a tight knit, loyal, healthy unit. (Tom Graves, personal communication, June 1, 1992)

One major task was reorienting the faculty to a new way of responding to the crisis.

I think we all had to get past the denial and that's largely what we were doing in the spring and summer. Contrary to our sister school Southern Seminary where they stayed locked in denial and, in fact, still is in some ways, I think it was difficult...to really challenge the authority that was over us, to say, this is unacceptable. Collectively, we refuse. That's something you don't see in Southern Baptist institutions. The emphasis is on cooperation, doing what is best for the organization, as is indicated by the person who leads it. We had to be ready to do things even though the president of the school and the dean may not like it and the trustees surely wouldn't. (Hester, personal
The new and radical posture the faculty adopted was manifested in the following positions.

We would stand by the documents that were in place when we joined the faculty, we would not submit to any investigation of our beliefs, we would not sign any confessional or creedal statement, and we would actively seek public support for our cause. (Hester, 1987, November 7, p. 5)

Lolley, too, was evolving.

Randall was a winner. He never lost. He started out...as president of his student body...he was number one in his class. He went on to get his doctorate and his first full time church was the First Baptist Church of Winston-Salem. Everywhere he went people loved him. He was charismatic. He had that charm and grace...He never lost to my knowledge, but he was about to lose. (Paul Fletcher, personal communication, August 25, 1992)

Yet the season which had engaged his remarkable bureaucratic and political skills was past. Ashcraft, Hester, and Mahan Siler, pastor of Pullen Memorial Baptist Church in Raleigh, encouraged Lolley to find personal support and to establish his position. For,
as professor Bob Richardson remembered, "Some of the friendly trustees said to Lolley,... "What do you want, time [holding off the fundamentalist trustee agenda] or clarity [in the issues at stake and where people stand]? We can get you one or we can get you the other. We'll buy time here, or we can get real clear." Lolley had been buying time. Now he became very clear.

Throwing down the gauntlet. August 25, 1987, Randall Lolley opened the thirty-seventh academic year with his convocation address, "Quo vadis, Southeastern?" Thirteen years of addresses before, Lolley inaugurated the twenty-fifth anniversary with a speech by the same title. This time he described the Southeastern identity, its "theological chemistry," in unambiguous, combative terms which no longer sought compromise with the fundamentalist party.

Lolley upheld the freedom to engage the study of religion and ministry with the tools of other disciplines in order to build the church. He affirmed the authority of the Bible as rising from its integrity, not whether it is free of errors or not. Lolley defended the ordination of women and defended the ecumenical involvement of Southeastern seminary.

In our Lord's name we who gladly teach and gladly
learn at this place will respond to any legitimate call to lay down weapons. but in His name we must not, and we will not, lay down our tools....

At Southeastern Seminary we do not believe that we pay for the expansion of our minds by the contraction of our hearts. Nor do we subscribe to a theory of theological indoctrination wherein truth is determined always by majority opinion....Prophets do not ask for permission - in the name of prestige or paychecks - for the privilege to be prophets. Southeastern prefers to work on 'the prophetic edge' of our denominational enterprise. Thus our sense of outrage when that dimension is threatened. At this school we know that if we shackle a teacher today, we will shackle a preacher tomorrow. And in that process we will have increased to an alarming degree our prospect of shackling our prophets forever. (Lolley, 1987, pp. 4,5).

Do we define here for the future an institution embracing the Southeastern idea, making it fresh and distinct for the 1980's and 1990's; or do we distort here such an institution, making it express an idea it has never known? (p.
If Southern Baptists desire a seminary in Wake Forest distinct and determinative for these days in our denomination--one like the seminary detailed in the "Plan of Action" endorsed by the trustees last March--then this president will give every tick of his time and every millibar of his energy to producing that kind of institution....

If...Southern Baptists desire a seminary in Wake Forest different and destructive of the idea which this school has sought to incarnate, then this president will give not one moment of the time or one millibar of his energy...to producing that kind of school. (p. 13)

Supporters near and far roared enthusiastically, while the new fundamentalist trustee majority was bitterly critical, characterizing it as "throwing down the gauntlet."

It was not the only trumpet blast. As vehemently as the fundamentalist trustees had raised the specter of heresy over the school, the faculty told their "constituency and the public that academic freedom was under attack by our own trustees" (Hester, 1987, November 7, p. 6). The Southeastern Chapter of the
AAUP issued a news release and supporting packet of materials to the press. The lead article advertised:

Professors and students at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary are facing a threat from forces opposed to the principle of academic freedom. The faculty's right to teach theological students without fear of harassment is threatened by members of the Board of Trustees who want to dictate precisely how and what these professors are permitted to teach. (October 5, 1987)

The materials described how conditions had changed in SBC life, and advised that all thirty-three elected teaching faculty had joined the AAUP chapter, had retained legal counsel, and how and whom to contact for further information.

This prepared resistance force caught the new trustees completely off guard.

They [the trustees] had an agenda in place and I think they were quite surprised that things didn't work out as quickly and smoothly as they anticipated.... I think the surprise was at being revealed. They really thought they could move hardline behind the scenes, [and] nobody would call their hand. Now, when their hand was called
and the press printed what was going on and the newsmedia, the television stations, were there with their cameras, and the national religious press and Baptist Press and others started talking about what was going on, that really did buffalo them....They hated it when a camera came into a room. Whenever they saw a news reporter they just went into apoplexy. (Robert Dale, personal communication, May 11, 1992)

In one sense, the barrage of releases by the AAUP chapter drew the lines of the playing field, which, in the eventual outcome, may have helped the new trustees avoid the mistakes which lead to lawsuits. On the other hand, the openness with which the faculty dealt with the issues at hand significantly slowed the fundamentalist march.

Trustee Dade Sherman cocked and fired at this sign of resistance.

If I were teaching ideas in opposition to the Baptist Faith and Message and Abstract of Principles, I'd be concerned about losing my job, too....What they teach is the bottom line. If they're taking Southern Baptists' money and not teaching a message in accordance with those ideas,
I think integrity demands that they resign. And if they don't resign, I think they should be fired. (Ackerman, 1987, October 8, D1-2)

Generally, however, the new troops on the board held the line, saying they had no intention of firing professors.

"I don't know of any trustee - and I'm as conservative as any of them - that would want to violate the academic freedom of any faculty member," said the Rev. James W. Bryant of Fort Smith, Ark. [sic] "Southeastern has a tradition of academic excellence that I pledge to uphold. My only hope is that as vacancies occur, conservative faculty are hired in order to bring about a better balance of viewpoints." (Ackerman, 1987, October 12, pp. 1C, 4C)

The temperature was rising, the troops were moving, the armor was placed, and, in spite of all, Jesse P. Chapman, chairperson of the board of trustees said he was:

unaware of any plans by the board to make significant changes...And I certainly haven't had any board members telling me that they'd like to see changes. It would be very hard to do that
overnight. (Ackerman, 1987, October 9, p. A1, A7)

The reformers. The fundamentalist trustees who arrived in October, 1987, saw themselves as modern day reformers. Indeed, these agents of change were a departure from the species of trustee with which the seminary was familiar heretofore.

Most of the new appointees have had no prior identification with the institution they were asked to govern and had never before visited the campus....("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, p. 37)

Both [Bob Crowley and Jim DeLoach]...are graduates of Bob Jones University, a well-known "independent Baptist" school in Greenville, South Carolina, which for years has embraced a philosophy of indoctrination rather than education in the teaching of religious subjects.

Two of the new majority have never attended college themselves and yet are chief policy-makers for a graduate professional educational institution.

Six of the sixteen are graduates of seminaries far outside of the Southern Baptist free-church tradition; two of them are
unaccredited schools. ("The Seventeenth," 1988, September-October, p. 44)

One of the new trustee board members was Dade Sherman, pastor of the Benton Heights Baptist Church in Monroe, NC. Sherman was a graduate of SEBTS, once an active member of the Conservative Evangelical Fellowship, and, at 33 years old, the youngest trustee the school ever had. Elected despite being challenged on the floor of the convention, his appointment drew wary glances from the faculty. He was regarded as a man with a chip on his shoulder, a Texan with an "authoritarian, macho style" ("Some Baptists question," 1986, p. 39A).

While he was a student at Southeastern, Sherman served on the Rolesville police force. For a time, he insisted on wearing his firearm to class, saying it was impractical and too expensive a weapon to leave in the car. The days at SEBTS were already tense ones, and this unusual behavior made matters even worse for Professor Claude Stewart and the class. This concern was heightened when it was learned that shortly before he left the Fort Worth police force to attend seminary, Sherman and a fellow officer were questioned regarding the possible "unnecessary use of force." Lolley
ordered Sherman to cease wearing the pistol to class. Sherman initially refused, but eventually relented.

His aggressive manner and "often hostile agenda" ("Some Baptists question," 1986, 39-A) as a student did not serve to create a climate of trust when he became a trustee. When he did, Sherman proved to be an unyielding battler in meetings and aggressive inquisitor of the library holdings in human sexuality. While Sherman's strong style was not especially typical of the rest of the fundamentalist trustees, the earnest zeal for the goal was shared.

The majority of trustees believed the statements and decisions of the Southern Baptist convention were mandates for change. The Peace Committee Report provided the formula; the Glorieta Statement hallowed it. The election results of the last eight years confirmed it. In their eyes, the Convention owned the institution rather than the trustees. The trustees were simply the agent of the Convention.

"But [the administration and faculty] must recognize," said trustee Walter Lonis from Denver, "that this institution is run by the Convention and is not a separate entity. As elected trustees we have a responsibility to see that the wishes of
the convention are carried out as peacefully and
as easy as (possible)" (Hefley, 1988, p. 152).

The showdown begins. The Monday morning Raleigh
News and Observer (October 12), fairly shouted that
this fall trustee meeting would be different in the
headline: "SEMINARY FACULTY MAY REFUSE ORDERS BY
CONSERVATIVES" (Ackerman, 1987, October 12, Cl). Seven
faculty members vowed to reject any trustee restriction
of their academic freedom. They would not teach the
narrowly defined theology defined by the Peace
Committee report. Richard Hester warned the trustees,
"We have no plans to leave the seminary of our own
accord. That's why we formed the [AAUP Chapter] and
hired lawyers" (Ackerman, 1987, October 12, p. Cl).

Posters and banners draped the campus. Trustees
arriving for the 3 p.m. opening session were met by
students sporting yellow ribbons, a symbol of support
for the present faculty and administration, and of
resistance to anticipated attempts to change the school
into a fundamentalist enclave. Opening remarks
criticized the intimidating demeanor of the students
and faculty.

Lolley said the problem was not one of
intimidation but of communication. "The trust
level on this campus is zilch," he said. "The reason is there are people on this campus who don't trust you, and you don't trust them."

(Puckett, High, & Knox, 1987, October 24, p. 12)

The first trump was laid early. By a vote of 16 to 12 (two trustees were ill), the new fundamentalist majority succeeded in discarding the original agenda. It was replaced with one prepared by the new fundamentalist majority at a meeting held in Raleigh the night before. The Plan of Action volunteered by Lolley and endorsed by the board at the spring meeting was not ever mentioned throughout the new agenda.

The second piece of business was to replace the moderate chairperson, Dr. Jesse Chapman, by a vote of 15 - 13. The Ashville surgeon did not receive the chair's customary second term in office, an unprecedented break with tradition. Bob Crowley, a fundamentalist, was elected. It became increasingly clear that this faction held the cards for a sweep in all board action. (Halbrooks, October 20, 1987)

Student council president Beverly Hardgrove presented a resolution signed by approximately half of the student body who "hold the faculty and administration to be persons of deep Christian
she chose to affirm the open, honest theological instruction in the classroom, and, for the student council, "recommend that the Peace Committee report not be [made] a creedal statement" (Hefley, 1988, pp. 154, 155).

Trustee James Bryant asked Ms. Hardgrove if she thought students would object to an anonymous doctrinal survey to "try and find out where the student body is," to see, "if they are learning what teachers think they are." And did she think students would object to faculty being asked to voluntarily sign the Baptist Faith and Message?

"I think (they would object)," she replied. "To have them sign would make the Baptist Faith and Message a creed."

The room rippled with applause and Amens. Trustee Crowley immediately declared, "If such outbursts continue, I will ask for closed sessions."

Professor Richard Hester told the press that Bryant's suggestions to Hardgrove would have "a chilling effect on academics" at Southeastern. (Hefley, 1988, p. 154)

That evening a rally of 1000 alumni and others met
in Binkley Chapel. Moderate Bill Self, an alumnus and pastor of the Wieuca Road Baptist Church, Atlanta, whipped the supporters of the faculty and administration in a stirring speech. Cheers punctuated his fundamentalist-deriding and Peace Committee-chastening address.

The next day, however, the fundamentalist juggernaut advanced on relentlessly. At the afternoon session, on a substitute motion by Cecil Rhodes and seconded by James Bryant, both attending their initial trustee meeting, the report of the nominating committee was put aside. An alternate slate of members was elected effecting a fundamentalist majority on every committee. A first year trustee was elected chair of the Instruction Committee. Dr. Jerry Holcomb, a moderate, was defeated for the position of vice chair by Jim DeLoach. (Ashcraft, 1988, p. 56)

Then they amended the faculty appointment procedures. The suggested purpose was to rein in a system which they implied had taken authority away from the president and placed in the hands of the faculty, a system "inconsistent with Seminary by-laws," according to trustee Bill Delahoyde (1987, November 7, p. 23A).

The appointment process up to this point invited
the area faculty to compose a short list from a pool of applicants provided by the dean. This short list of one to three names was then forwarded to the president for a decision, or to kick back to the area faculty. The new amendment demanded the president to select the pool of candidates after "consultation" with the area faculty, dean and Committee on Instruction.

Introducing the Committee on Instruction earlier in the process allowed them to screen nominees. Requiring Lolley to select the pool of candidates brought the president and the process under the heel of the fundamentalists. Lolley would have to advance their candidates, or be guilty of insubordination.

Rather than increase his power, as the fundamentalists purported was the case, the new process limited his power. It hamstrung Lolley's participatory management style, as well as increased the trustee leverage on the president to advance candidates who would be acceptable to the board. Finally, in the past the president made the recommendation to the trustees through the Committee on Instruction. As it would be, the Committee on Instruction itself would offer the nominations. ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May - June, p. 39)
It would also relegate the faculty position to a rather minor role in the process. They would not filter the applicants, but advise when called. When the amendment passed, it was clear that the faculty had lost their power to define the theological nature of the Southeastern community. Furthermore, a standard practice which symbolized their kinship with most of higher education was swept aside in a single afternoon.

In short it takes the selection process out of the hands of those who know the most about it and are most closely related to the school and places it in the hands of those who know the least and are usually at a distance from the life of the school. (Ashcraft, 1988, p. 57)

The fundamentalists revised the faculty appointment procedure, for all practical purposes removing the faculty from any substantive role in selecting new faculty, thus assuring that their Instruction Committee could see that all future permanent and adjunctive faculty would be of their theological and political persuasion (Halbrooks, 1987, p. 3).

Doctrinal matters now took priority over academic excellence (Ammerman, 1990, p. 250), no matter that the
theological requirements of the new regime were absent from the governing documents of the school. Statements which followed clearly indicated that only inerrantists would be hired. Trustee Chairperson, Robert Crowley said:

"We will hire new faculty who believe that the Bible is without error. We're now able to review people under consideration [as prospective faculty]; that's brand new and our most significant action" (The New York Times, October 19, 1987). Elsewhere [Crowley] is reported to have said: "The one agenda (of the board) is that we will be electing faculty members who agree with the literal interpretation of the Bible" (Greensboro News and Record, October 23, 1987) (Found in Hester et al, 1988, January 19, p. 18).

That afternoon Jim DeLoach asked if the board might go into executive session. The purpose, he offered, was "to discuss...how we can improve the relationship between trustees and the president." Lolley resisted. DeLoach insisted saying, "This is an honest attempt on the part of many of us to affirm Randall Lolley" (Haywood, 1987, October 15, p. 1). The students present refused to leave, until Lolley advised
that, according to the by-laws of the institution, the trustees were in their right to call for executive session.

In short, the session was described as "taking [Randall Lolley] behind the woodshed" (Halbrooks, October 18, 1987). Cited as a breach of the SBC "Peace and Reconciliation Plan" of the Peace Committee were:

1. His intemperate remarks and insinuations in his Convocation Address, August 25, 1987;
2. His failure to oversee and guide the faculty and administration in achieving cooperation and reconciliation;
3. His failure to discourage the alumni and students from activities which polarize them from a harmonious relationship with Trustees.


DeLoach led the pounding.

Dr. Lolley, your Trustees want you to be a strong President!...We are looking to you to administrate this faculty, students, and alumni! If you need our help, ask us! If you want us to say these things in the public forum of this Trustee meeting, say the word and we will do it! But my dear friend, we Trustees, are no longer "rubber
stamps" who will agree to faculty-generated policy! We are determined to "set policy" and we are determined for you to implement it and administrate it! If you are committed to this philosophy, which our major documents mandate, we can have a beautiful future! But, if you choose not to be this kind of President and CEO, tell us now and let's move on from there! ("Response of the Board," 1988, Exhibit P, p. 6)

They were critical that Lolley had been participatory when he should have been authoritative; and, amiable when he should have been disciplinary, especially where the founding of the AAUP chapter and the comments of professor Alan Neely were concerned. Lolley thought it wise to be silent before his accusers. "I never responded. I never said one word in that closed session" (Personal communication, August 26, 1992).

When the interlude was completed and the public allowed to return, Lolley asked that persons not inquire as to the contents of the executive session. More discussion by the trustees of the faculty appointment process followed. One interesting clarification was offered by Charles Fuller,
Chairperson of the Peace Committee, to a question by a trustee.

Trustee W. Ollie Key of Augusta, Ga., asked if, in Fuller's view, the Peace Committee report constrained trustees to hire professors who are inerrantists even if a more qualified candidate is available who holds a differing view.

Asked Key, "Are we bound to hire teachers this way and not get the best teacher we can?"

Fuller answered that trustees are to "pursue persons who are qualified...but they are to represent a posture described" in the [Peace Committee] report. (Bellamy, 1987, October 14, p. 9-A)

Lolley offered the last word.

 Appearing sobered and subdued, he said the previous faculty selection process had worked well...But let me make it plain that the (hiring) process belongs to trustees. I will administer as you advise me." (Hefley, 1988, p. 158).

Showdown summary. To recapitulate the key elements of the meeting might be instructive. Former chairperson, Jesse Chapman summarized the nominating process: "The meeting was a clean sweep for
conservatives....There is no one left in even a partial position of power that is not of their persuasion."

The faculty role in future teaching appointments diminished significantly. The power of the trustees in that process increased substantially. Trustee rhetoric suggested that the power of the president was enlarged, but, in fact, he owned less of the decision on faculty appointments. Future teachers would embrace biblical inerrancy.

Throughout the meeting, conservatives defended the changes as necessary to "correct Southeastern's imbalance."...."If this is balance, they know as much about physics as they do about the Bible," Alan Neely, a professor of missiology, the study of the church's mission activity, said to students in the debriefing session. They applauded loudly. (Ackerman, 1987, October 15, p. 4A)

Crowley called the three days the "beginning of a real reformation" (Ackerman, 1987, October 15, p. 1A). Many in the other camp began thinking it was the beginning of the end. All heads turned to see what the third president of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary would do now.

Lolley, et al., resign. Eight days later, on
October 22, 1987, Lolley called Crowley, asking him to come to the campus and talk about the transition. He would not admit outright in the conversation that he intended to resign. In chapel that morning he announced his intention to terminate his presidency. November 17 he did so formally.

The new majority of the trustees supplied that "The resignation of Dr. Lolley can best be understood as a refusal on his part to play the mediating role between the Convention and the faculty and that the Trustees asked him to assume" ("Response of the Board," 1988, p. 21). Frank Jordan, California pastor, trustee, and longtime friend of Lolley added much more graphically, "They wanted to put the clamps on him so that he had to resign. They couldn't fire him, but it was the next best thing" (Warner & Brymer, 1987, November 5, p. 5). The Southeastern Chapter of AAUP explained further:

President Lolley and Dean Ashcraft have both made it abundantly clear that they will not implement the policies of political fundamentalism now being enacted by a narrow majority of our board of trustees. The President and the Dean have told us they will not serve as agents of persons who want
to overturn this school's distinguished 37 year tradition of competent, open, responsible theological education. They have told us they refuse to preside over a fundamentalist school. (AAUP News Release, October 22, 1987)

In April of 1988, Lolley issued his own summary, saying: "The ultimate issue in all this, my friends, is freedom - free consciences, free churches, and free classrooms." Lolley described the new trustees as lackeys for others that compelled of them a pre-packaged agenda. He then added:

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges has recently released ten measurements of an effective Board of Trustees:

1. Support for the chief executive and the administration.
2. Clear communication of board expectations.
3. Affirmation of the institution's mission.
4. Planning and implementation of agreed goals/objectives.
5. Support of excellence in the educational programs.
6. Financial support -- personal and generational.
7. Support of a climate of intellectual and operational freedom.
8. Help with public/community relations.
9. Creative responses to physical plant needs.
10. A willingness to assess the board's own performance.

So far as I can tell, the new majority of Southeastern trustees were overwhelmingly guided by none of those criteria....(Lolley, 1987, November 17, p.3)

By the time the trustees gathered for the special called meeting November 17, the resignations or early retirements included, in addition to President W. Randall Lolley, Dean Morris Ashcraft; Mr. W. Robert Spinks, assistant to the president for financial development; Mr. John Rich, the seminary attorney; Dr. Jerry Niswonger, assistant to the president for student development; and Mr. Rodney Byard, assistant to the president for communications. In light of this raft of terminations, the out-going president circulated a memo, how serious is not certain, communicating that he would not accept any more letters of resignation.

Response and counter-response. The actions taken in the board room alarmed many Wake Forest townsfolk.
The theological import of the impending changes concerned some, but many wondered just what manner of neighbors and employer the seminary might be in the future. Generally there was regret that the Lolleys, who had made a large impact on the town, would be leaving.

The evening of November 12, concerned residents filled the town hall with the seminary and the Lolley's in mind. A resolution passed by the Wake Forest town board "expressed the desire for continued good relationship with the seminary and appreciation to" the Lolleys. (Allen, 1987, November 12, p. 1, 2) Over one hundred signed the resolution.

New board chairperson Robert Crowley admitted that a new administration would bring changes to Southeastern. He was anxious to define them in a positive light after the negative press supplied the board meeting in October.

We hope and expect that a broader spectrum of views, including conservative theological views, will be included and respected at Southeastern Seminary. These changes will hopefully result in a positive theological dialogue on this campus which will make for a more healthy intellectual
climate of openness and tolerance for alternative viewpoints....

As Chairman of the Board of Trustees, I am committed to see Southeastern Seminary excel in quality theological education in the training of ministers for the accomplishment of the Bold Mission Thrust of our Southern Baptist Convention. For after all, our only reason for existence as the Southern Baptist Convention is that we may cooperate together in an obedient response to the missionary and evangelistic imperatives given us by our Lord Jesus Christ. (Crowley, 1987, November 17, press release)

Similarly, six Southeastern trustees from North Carolina were apparently concerned that, while the battle had been won at the school, the negative fallout might interrupt the fundamentalist quest to take over the North Carolina Baptist Convention. The atmosphere was thick with the expectation that what had been accomplished at SEBTS was intended at every state convention and Baptist institution of higher education. They sent a letter to North Carolina Baptists identifying themselves as "North Carolina Trustees of the Southeastern Board of Trustees." They did not
advise that two North Carolina trustees had not signed the document.

We wanted you to know the facts so that the whipped up frenzy of the false reports might be rejected:

1. Academic freedom is not an issue. No professor at Southeastern has been fired, nor are any firings contemplated by the Board. No one has been restricted or censured for what is being taught....

2. There is no connection between the voluntary resignation of the Seminary President and the election of the President of the Baptist State Convention of North Carolina in Greensboro. While Conservatives generally agree with actions taken by the Board of Trustees, the President of the Convention is his own man who will make decisions based on the situation he faces in North Carolina. Moreover, our State Baptist colleges have their own Trustees who are also autonomous in making their decisions.

For years we have been told that the Trustees of our institutions can be trusted to make decisions in the best interest of both the
Convention and the Institutions. Nothing has happened to change that. The future is bright for Southeastern Baptist Seminary.

We hope that the Baptists who meet in Greensboro will not be stampeded into voting for and against anyone on the basis of highly charged emotional statements about Southeastern Seminary which have no basis in fact. (Hester et al., 1988, January 19, addendum)

Randall Lolley nominated Leon Smith to be president of the North Carolina Baptist Convention. Smith's victory and the moderate's win in Georgia encouraged hopes that the tide might be turned in 1988 at the San Antonio Convention. In fact, such optimism led Dr. Thomas A. Bland, senior member of the Southeastern faculty, to remark at a dinner, December 8, honoring the president and dean: "I firmly believe that the autumn of 1987 was the time, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, North Carolina, the place, and Randall Lolley the man of destiny who began the turn around in the Southern Baptist Convention" ("The Seventeenth," 1988, September-October, p, 45).

Meanwhile the faculty prepared for a series of
rear guard actions. In attendance at the November 24 AAUP chapter meeting, Lolley advised faculty to meet with him in order to clean, clear, and/or collect their files in his office. None trusted the new regime to act from a faculty advocacy perspective.

Crowley said of the new president: "whoever it is, is going to be a person who is an inerrantist -- you can count on that" (Hester et al., 1988, p. 19). This was not a surprise, though the primary documents of the school raise no such feature as a test. He also warned that current faculty may be dismissed if they remain "completely adamant against the direction the convention has voted" (Ft. Worth Star-Telegram, October 23, 1987, found in Hester, 1987, November 7, p. 2).

Such threats confirmed the perspective of Richard Hester, of whom it was reported:

fears that those now in control will squelch divergent viewpoints. He warns that the trustees' primary focus is "to ensure that one theology is taught here - biblical inerrancy. That ideology promises clear and unambiguous answers to complex human problems." Furthermore, he predicts that "the successful repression of freedom here will eventually affect the larger community as future
students are taught that diversity is the enemy of truth" (Hester, in Lavenue, 1989, p. 26).

The faculty, through the AAUP, did not intend to give up without a fight, saying, "We do not intend to give up our prophetic voice. We do not intend to give up our academic freedom" (AAUP Chapter news release, October 22, 1987).

In December, the SEBTS AAUP chapter put forward a news release ("Southeastern Faculty Explores Options," 1987, December 11) which outlined the recent happenings and advised of the creation of a six-member Task Force on Options to explore faculty alternatives. The release indicated:

Three members are studying conditions under which the faculty could continue to work in the current environment. Three members are studying the feasibility of the faculty moving as a whole elsewhere. (p.1)

The release also reported that at the chapter's meeting on December 7, several goals were established, not the least of which were:

2. To guarantee the continuation of academic freedom and responsibility at Southeastern. (p.2)

5. To work to maintain a viable future for the
Southeastern tradition on the present campus and also to explore future options to move elsewhere in the event our position on this campus becomes untenable.

6. To work with the American Association of University Professors, the Association of Theological Schools, and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to insure prompt and thorough investigations of recent trustee actions.

7. To continue to be a public voice in defense of the Baptist heritage of diversity, inclusiveness, and freedom of conscience.

Commenting on these goals, Richard L. Hester, president of the seminary chapter of AAUP, said, "We are not giving up on Southeastern; we are claiming Southeastern for ourselves...We believe the present task of the AAUP chapter is to do all we can to hold the seminary to its proper mission as a mainstream Baptist theological school" (p.3). They also released figures suggesting that January through November 1987 contributions to SEBTS were down 1 million dollars compared with the same period in 1986.

The American Association of University Professors did quickly announce the beginnings of a complaint
process which might lead to censure of the school.
Said Richard C. Barnett, professor of history at Wake
Forest University, "What is taking place at
Southeastern is an offense against all liberal
education. It is a battleground in a long lasting war
in which the authoritarian mind seeks to conquer all"
(Schoenberger, 1987, November 8, p. 33A).

While censure would probably not prohibit or
restrain the current trustees from their purpose of
building an "inerrancy faculty," it would be considered
a black mark against the school, and, under most
circumstances, be a negative factor in the recruitment
of faculty.

Dr. Jim Rogers, executive director of the
Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of
Colleges and Schools, was authorized by the Executive
Council of the Commission, to "send a letter to Baptist
college presidents in the region informing them
accreditation could be in danger if their trustees were
to make drastic changes in the institutions' governance
or academic programs" (Wilkey, 1987, December 24, p.
3). It happens that Rogers is a Southern Baptist
layman and deacon at First Baptist Church, Gainesville,
Georgia. This notice appeared to be a clear response
to the Southeastern experience and the impending threat to other Baptist seminaries and schools.

He remarked that exposure to different ideas and concepts than those familiar to us is a worthy and significant part of an education. Rogers maintained that "One of my greatest concerns as a Baptist layman is with the theological shallowness of many of the individuals in our churches today" (Wilkey, 1987, December 24, p. 3). Shortly, not only SACS, but ATS would investigate the events at SEBTS in order to ascertain if policies and procedures, and certainly academic freedom, were violated.

The radical winds of change had come with explosive power against the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. The resistance movement turned up the heat white-hot. Not undeservingly, Randall Lolley christened 1987 the year of the "firestorm" ("The Seventeenth," 1988, September-October, p. 42). Yet, because the fundamentalists had more reforming and norming in mind, there would be more more storming, to be sure.
Appointment Aggravations and Accreditation Angst: 1988

Lolley on the stump. Randall Lolley, the goat of Glorieta, was now a martyr on the march. Shortly he was called to be the pastor of the First Baptist Church, Raleigh, a premier pulpit in North Carolina, and only a matter of minutes from the seminary campus. That summer he would be named president-elect of the Southeastern alumni association. There was talk of nominating him to the vice-presidency of the Southern Baptist Convention. At their seventy-fourth annual meeting in 1988, the American Association of University Professors presented Lolley with the Seventeenth Alexander Meiklejohn Award for his defense of academic freedom, an atypical recognition for an administrator in higher education.

Lolley did not intend to leave quietly. He was stumping across the south as frequently and more fiercely than ever. The lame-duck president, who did
not act very lame at all, vowed to "return Southeastern to the hands of its 'friends'" (Ackerman, 1988, March 29, p. 1D).

I declare eternal hostility against every tyranny over the minds and hearts of God's people anywhere on this Earth....I commit from this day forward every moment of my time and every millibar of my energy to restoring this school into the hands of her friends and out of the hands of her foes -- so help me God!" (Ackerman, 1988, March 16, p. 1D)

In the spirit of Martin Luther King Jr.'s "I Have A Dream" speech, at the 1988 SEBTS alumni gathering, Lolley said he:

dream[ed] of a day when being a Southeastern Seminary alumnus is an asset in the search for a new president rather than a liability; a day when a Southeastern alumnus who has evidenced a love for the school is the first prospect for a trustee of the school rather than the last; a day when trustees are chosen because of their knowledge of and love for the school instead of their agenda against it; a day when the board members are at least as well educated as the people who sit in the Master of Divinity classes; a day when given a
choice between indoctrination and education, the
governing board will go with education every day.
(Hefley, 1989, p. 155)

Lolley and board chair Robert Crowley were not
more than a couple of weeks into January of 1988 before
a hot exchange of letters warmed the winter air.
Crowley and other fundamentalist trustees were
pressuring Lolley to resign as the school's president
before July 31, the original termination date. Their
reasons included Lolley's continuing resistance to the
movement in word and deed. They accused him of
attempting to mortally sabatoge the school. Lolley
countered, that if compelled to resign earlier than the
agreement, he would say he had been fired. Lolley
accused Crowley of succumbing to pressure to get rid of
him, breaking documented agreements regarding the
transition. (Ackerman, 1988, January 14, pp. 1A, 8A)

Faculty on the defense. In the trenches on
campus, the prospects were grim for every interest in
the school. The seminary lost its reputation in the
theological education marketplace as a niche for the
moderate element in SBC life, and it had not yet turned
the corner in becoming a inerrantist stronghold. At
once the faculty reassured the public that the same
instruction was taking place in the same classes by largely the same professors, while the new trustees professed the school had returned to its original roots. As a dire consequence of this ideological dissonance, contributions dropped like a stone. The enrollment plummeted ten percent from the fall term to the spring semester. (By the fall, it fell another 17.5 percent.) Both the receipts and enrollment concerns constituted the sort of extreme circumstances which even the accrediting agencies might admit were grounds for faculty dismissals to save the institution.

Each successive term witnessed loyal, moderate students disembarking from the academic community. Some graduated, others transferred to other theological schools. Many students overloaded in their last terms in order to graduate early. The balance was beginning to shift to the fundamentalist students, not so much in pure numbers, as in their conspicuous presence.

The evolution in the student body precipitated a widening chasm between the faith experiences, styles, and expectations of the new students and faculty. Roy DeBrand, professor of preaching, received flack from students because he did not devote time to media preachers like Charles Stanley and Adrian Rogers. He
responded, "I don't really know them. I've never heard either one of them preach. Maybe...for five minutes at a time on TV, but they're not my kind of preachers" (Personal communication, July 31).

Lyman Ferrell, adjunct faculty member from 1985 to 1991, experienced harassment from a growing sector in Southeastern life which he perceived as chronically and typically testy.

There have been turkeys over there all the time. You get these guys who come into class...who would contest almost everything you have to say. There were a couple of times when I would finally say, "That's all that I will take of your crap....You are not going to teach this class. If you can get everybody in the class to vote that you teach, o.k., but we have spent 45 minutes on what you want to say today and that's enough. (Personal communication, July 30, 1992)

The fundamentalist trustees, were also increasingly straightforward. "By this time," said Furman Hewitt, professor of ethics, "you had indirect pressures being brought to bear: the occasions,...two or three times, when a trustee would enter classrooms and sit in on the professor's classroom. There is an
implicit intimidation there" (Personal communication, July 29, 1992).

Alternatively, the trustees believed themselves to be the agents of a Convention imposed mandate, with which they themselves concurred. More than one trustee remarked on Lolley's enthusiastic invitations that trustees visit the classrooms anytime they wanted (Crowley, DeLoach, Delahoyde, personal communications, October 19, October 26, and November 4, 1992, respectively). While the faculty may have felt the current context implied changes in the rules of the game, the trustees believed they were simply taking Lolley up on that permission.

Trustee Dade Sherman initiated a crusade to pull out of circulation certain library holdings in the area of human sexuality, and, in particular, homosexuality. Sherman believed that these, sometimes fairly explicit, texts were out of place in a Southern Baptist school. This pressure did not affect the faculty so much as the librarian, who catalogued the holdings concerned, and the students, in censoring what books they could have access to in their learning experience. Randall Lolley maintains,

We took seriously his argument and tried to make
him realize this was a graduate education school. This was the last leg of formal education. These people had already been through college. This was not a junior high library. A high percentage of our people were married. (Personal communication, August 26, 1992)

Librarian Gene McLeod advises that the trustees and conservative students did encourage him to widen the selection in the video holdings. McLeod considered the suggestion a worthy constructive criticism and did add tapes of a more conservative, evangelical nature. (Personal communication, August 25)

In some ways the new fundamentalist trustees appear to have begun with the assumption that the faculty or a significant portion of it was guilty of heresy. (Christine Gregory, personal communication, October 19) Incidents such as the Bultmanian controversy and brewery prayer incident, the trustee disinclination toward the ethos of freedom represented in the wide swath of theological views presented in classes, the Peace Committee report recommendations, and the Convention order to clean out aberrant views fortified this conclusion. Christine Gregory, a trustee from 1982 to 1992, comments matter of factly.
They were ready to go after anybody that was at Southeastern. Some of my best friends on that board of trustees who were not [of] my persuasion were people who were making accusations that they could not possibly back up. And when you would pin it down, they would always say, "Where there's this much smoke, there's got to be fire." That's not fair. (Personal communication, October 19, 1992)

The new standard was inerrancy. After the new president and acting dean came on board in 1988, Roy Debrand was due for tenure consideration. He met with the president and dean for informal conversation in the president's office. DeBrand was told if he did not confess to being an inerrantist, he would not receive tenure.

When I was told by the president and vice-president,...that if I didn't say I was an inerrantist I would not get tenure, I went back and looked at the conditions for tenure in the faculty manual and wrote him a letter and said, "These are the eight principles. I will not be asked about anything other than these. This is the policy....If the Committee on Instruction goes
outside these bounds, adds anything to this, I will scream my head off to the accrediting agencies."

So, basically, they threatened me,...I came back with a stronger threat, and they backed down. I was reviewed for tenure by the principles stated in the faculty manual and none others. I would say there was an informal attempt to add something to the conditions [of employment]. (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)

No matter his theological conservatism and Biblical inerrantism in particular, DeBrand's allegiance to the Lolley administration and traditions of the school alienated fundamentalist trustees. Trustee Jim DeLoach proffered that DeBrand was a "stated inerrantist," but quickly added, "Roy DeBrand in my opinion is a charlatan....As soon as he came on board, he immediately took a position directly contrary to the trustees" (Personal communication, October 26, 1992). In spite of his political incorrectness, DeBrand just did secure tenure by the necessary two-thirds margin by one vote.

Frequently, things faculty members were purported to have said, or quotations lifted out of context by
unauthorized tapes of their classes, would surface in fundamentalist periodicals. (Personal communications: Hewitt, July 29, 1992, and Tolbert, October 30, 1992)

In fact, the whole Southern Baptist world appeared to be listening for every word dropped from the teaching lectern. Professor Malcolm Tolbert illustrates just how limber the system was.

On one occasion I taught a class in which I mentioned something that had been written in a derogatory manner about [former adjunctive faculty member] T. C. Smith in that journal they brought out in Texas [Advocate]....Two hours after class was over I got a call from the editor [Paige Patterson's brother-in-law Russell Kammerling] from Dallas. The word got over there pretty quickly. (Personal communication, October 30, 1992).

Naturally, this sense of being under a microscope and the general malaise of defeat fostered other strong emotions as well in the original seminary community. As he effected closure on his relationship with the seminary clan, Randall Lolley met with each administrative officer and faculty member. While the process required 175 hours, he reported that the
conferences constituted a "therapeutic experience" for him (Lolley, personal correspondence, 1988, March 3). His distillation of those conversations were as follows.

GRIEF: I re-read much of Kubler-Ross' On Death and Dying before I reached the conclusion that this entire community is grieving.

Why not? So much that you have loved is dying; and, thank God, like everything Christian, is struggling toward resurrection.

Recalling that Kubler-Ross has outlined the stages of grief (denial, anger, bargaining, depression, acceptance), I have found persons at every stage. Some are still denying and isolating themselves from realities, thus insulating themselves from the pain.

Others are angry. Their anger is sometimes focused and at other times more pervasive and generalized. There is a sense of outrage among you.

Still others are bargaining and some are depressed.

A few have come to acceptance and hope. Several unknowns have now been cleared and life
and work go on -- not as usual, mind you -- but on. These are coping.

**AMBIVALENCE:** Almost every person with whom I have visited is on a rack about whether to stay or to go. I get the definite sense that moods shift frequently in this regard. (Lolley, personal correspondence, 1988, March 3, p.1)

Seminary Chaplain, Donna Forrester, concurred with this assessment in her report to the Committee on Student Development, the Board of Trustees meeting, March 15. She also described Southeastern as a "grieving community." Forrester reported more than 400 hours of direct counseling already that year. (Unpublished minutes of Ken Stevens, committee secretary) Illnesses, divorce, grief involved in resignations and leave taking, weariness under significant additional demands because of staff or faculty vacancies, heightened levels of anxiety due to the debilitating threat of inquisition and dismissal at any time, even the death of an esteemed faculty member (John Steely) were intensified by, and, in the lattermost example, actually blamed on the stress level on campus.

A great many resolutions from other seminary and
college faculties, state and local Baptist associations, and Baptist churches, came rolling in to communicate support to the listing seminary community. In an effort to demonstrate solidarity, a half dozen faculty members from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary attended and marched in graduation exercises at Southeastern in May, 1988. (In October, 1987, a weeklong series of actions ranging from letters of support to a student rally took place at Southern.) However, this was essentially the extent of the acts of camaraderie by other agency personnel toward SEBTS.

In spite of the fact that they were all under fire, and deaf to calls to come out in common cause, the agency heads and their staffs were largely silent, especially vis-à-vis Southeastern. In fact, "There were some public statements by Larry McSwain [Dean of the School of Theology, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary] and [Roy] Honeycutt [President of Southern Seminary] that obviously the faculty at Southeastern were taking the wrong course and destroying their institution. That wasn't helpful" (Malcolm Tolbert, personal communication, October 30, 1992). "We found other faculties sort of shrinking back from us, like 'My God, don't get us involved in that.' Or, like, 'If
we [Southeastern] hadn't been so provocative we wouldn't be in the jam we're in'" (Richard Hester, personal communication, November 4, 1992).

Those who did sympathize with the institution did so at little cost. Keat Wiles, assistant professor of Old Testament, later pondered the question:

"What was the action or inaction of other Southern Baptist educators, religious and otherwise regarding what was going on here?" My perspective of...it was... "We are so glad you are making that stand at your school instead of at ours. We are so glad you are making the stand for academic freedom and we're glad it's at your school and not at ours." (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)

Terrible risk and great potential accompanied the increasingly clarified ideal the faculty called academic freedom. The former dean, Morris Ashcraft, wrote the faculty a confidential memo dated March 17, 1988 regarding this complex and hazardous season.

In the light of our present situation, it appears to me that we on the faculty at this time have the greatest opportunity for leading during this interim and transition. We have more invested in the life of this school than anyone else. We have
more to lose than anyone else. We have more knowledge of the seminary and more experience in its life than any other party. This faculty has demonstrated remarkable unity of purpose and ability to grasp situations in the past. Therefore, I think we should find a way to express this leadership for the good of this seminary and immediately....

[On the other hand,] The near chaotic conditions now prevailing offer only courses of disaster. One more major confrontation or rejection at this time may well precipitate a special meeting of the board which would dismiss all of us and provide a reinstatement provision for those who would agree "to cooperate" with the new administration and new order. The disastrous consequences of that course of action would destroy the seminary in this community. Other actions could be taken which would force mass resignations of us for reasons such as insubordination, which would not be an accurate evaluation nor would it be a situation we would want to give up our professional careers for. The Southeastern faculty's pressure packed
position was not overlooked by their peers. At the same AAUP national gathering that summer in which Lolley was presented the Meiklejohn award, the faculty at Southeastern was honored with the Beatrice G. Konheim Award for their contribution to academic freedom and a grant of $1,000 to the cause. It was considered a rare concurrence in the history of the awards for both the administrator and faculty to be recognized. ("The Seventeenth," 1988, September - October, pp. 42 - 45)

The search, selection and election of the fourth president of Southeastern Seminary. While the trustees have the inevitable and ultimate authority for the selection of the president, the school by-laws require consultation with the seminary’s various constituencies. An Advisory Task Force meets the formal requirements of the documents. It was made up of faculty, administrators, students and alumni. The faculty was quick to put forward to the Task Force for consideration a five part presidential profile. The qualifications were:

1) A committed Christian and practicing Southern Baptist with a long history of denominational involvement; (This would appear to exclude the
johnney-come-latelies to Southern Baptist life.)

2) Well-educated, with a sound understanding of the processes of education; (This would tend to exclude the graduates of unaccredited Bible colleges.)

3) Knowledgeable about, and faithful to, the Southeastern tradition of theological education; (The Southeastern tradition was exactly what the new trustees and fundamentalist dominated Southern Baptist Convention desired to change.)

4) Committed to a participatory style of administration; (A bold thrust at the heart of the faculty's complaint against the new order, especially in the area of faculty appointments.)

5) A mature Christian.

The news release on the part of the SEBTS AAUP chapter identifying these qualities also invited a deep commitment to Baptist distinctives in the candidate, a characteristic which, they hoped, would give rise to specific support for "the faculty's advocacy of academic freedom and their recent claims that such freedom is rooted in their Baptist heritage" ("Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary Frames," 1987, December 11).
The Task Force committee proposal eventually included an allusion to "commitment to the authority of Scripture" and "reliance on the Scripture alone for doctrine," support for the Baptist Faith and Message, "including its preamble," and, a passage pregnant with meaning, the willingness to work with the trustees.

Some concern existed as to the degree of participation and influence allowed the alumni, students, and faculty by the trustees. Southeastern alumnus T. Robert Mullinax of the Seminary Task Force reported, "We have been given assurance by Chairman Crowley that our work will be taken seriously and become a vital part of the search process" ("Advisory Task Force," 1988, January-February, p. 3).

However, Tom Jackson, the pastor of the Wake Forest Baptist Church, describes a conversation with Trustee Chairperson, Robert Crowley, Christmas eve, 1987, in which the latter advised they already had 21 resumes. Furthermore, Crowley also advised him at that point that Lewis A. Drummond, the Billy Graham professor of evangelism at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, was the only politically acceptable and, therefore, realistic, candidate. The search committee did not hold its first full meeting
until January 21 and 22, 1988, yet, surprisingly, a narrowed slate of candidates was promised at its conclusion. (Ackerman, 1988, January 23, p. 8D)

When the search committee did meet, an open session was supplied to allow input from all the constituencies of the seminary regarding the qualities to be favored in a new president. A hot, acrimonious debate ensued.

Beverly Hardgrove, president of the Student Council, accused some trustees of running ahead of the procedure outlined in seminary documents, giving some groups advanced opportunities for input as to the type of person and his or her style of leadership.

The accusation, voiced by others, partially was prompted by reports in the secular media that 19 people had been nominated and five were considered front runners.

"If the profile has not been determined, how can there be front runners?" Hardgrove asked.

(Puckett, 1988, January 22, p. 1)

The media source, Todd Ackerman, a staff writer for the Raleigh News and Observer, would not reveal his information source. (The next fall, "the East Coast
press quoted [trustee C. Frank] Jordan as calling Crowley a liar for denying that conservative trustees had picked Lolley's successor, even before he resigned. (Knox, 1988, May 13, p. 2)

The trustees were accused at the open forum of "plotting the demise of religious and academic freedom at the school" (Mayfield, 1988, January 22, p. 1A). Complaints were also registered regarding an unannounced schedule change which cut presentations in half at the meeting and caused some to miss the presentations altogether. (Puckett, 1988, January 22, p. 1) The Task Force and the open forum itself appeared a sham to faculty and Lolley administration supporters. Nena Domingo, a second year student, concluded,

We are only left to conclude that our attempt at input is futile, our opinions are unwanted and our position in this community, from the standpoint of the fundamentalist-conservative trustees, is expendable. (Ackerman, 1988, January 22, p. 2D)

At the conclusion of the meetings, Chairman Crowley was only able to put forward the presidential profile rather than a narrowed slate as [previously] reported. The reason supplied was
to extend the date for nominations to Friday, Feb. 5. (Ackerman, 1988, January 23, p. 8D)

The next meeting of the search committee was scheduled for Feb. 11-12, in St Louis, Missouri. The central location was deemed more favorable than North Carolina. On the heels of the bitter exchanges between trustees and alumni, students, and faculty at Southeastern in January, however, it was generally perceived to be an expedient ploy on the part of the trustees to move the process forward without the accompanying negative publicity they invariably seemed to receive on the campus.

Between the January and February meetings, the slate was narrowed to three candidates who were interviewed in St. Louis. The three finalists were: Charles Chaney, Assistant to the Chancellor and Dean of Courts Redford School of Theology and Church Vocations at Southwest Baptist University in Bolivar, Mo.; Lewis Drummond, Administrative Director of the Billy Graham Center and Billy Graham Professor of Evangelism at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.; and, Paige Patterson, President of the Criswell Center for Biblical Studies, Associate Pastor of First Baptist Church of Dallas, TX, and a key architect of the
Southern Baptist Convention takeover.

The search committee immediately and unanimously recommended the Rev. Dr. Lewis A. Drummond, a conservative, to be the next president of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. The candidate had strong academic preparations, a long relationship with the flagship seminary of the Convention, and a recommendation from the most well known Baptist of the century, Billy Graham. (Jennings, 1988, February 14, pp. 1A, 4A) Drummond presented himself as evangelical without the militant edge of the fundamentalists. As a relative unknown in the controversy, he appeared the ultimate compromise.

"We feel that if anybody finds Louie [sic] Drummond inflammatory, then that is their problem, because he is not an inflammatory person," said search committee member the Rev. James R. DeLoach (Jennings, 1988, February 14, p. 1A). Chairperson Robert Crowley exulted,

Dr. Drummond meets every criterion expressed in the presidential profile developed by the presidential search committee of the board of trustees in consultation with the advisory task force composed of students, faculty, alumni and
staff at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. (Knox, 1988, February 15, p. 1)

February 29 the faculty interviewed Drummond. A structured interview process was developed with questions meant to assess particular strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, yet in an unemotional, deliberate and consistent manner. The process was completed March 3. Overall, the Faculty expressed a slightly less than 50% level of confidence in the candidate on the basis of ratings on fifteen items.

The faculty expressed some degree of confidence in Dr. Drummond's ability to engage in discussion and establish his position with clarity, as well as in the sufficiency of his educational preparation. However, the faculty felt little confidence in the nominee's:

- willingness to take prophetic risks,
- understanding of the complexities of the current educational crisis at Southeastern,
- understanding of and sympathy for the broad Baptist constituency,
- and his leadership skills in a theological environment. (Faculty packet item prepared for the trustees)

There was some concern for his lack of
administrative experience, particularly in light of the peculiar challenges at Southeastern. Some postulated that Drummond was nominated with strategic issues in mind. Drummond was 62. On his retirement in a few years, when fiery passions died and with the agenda well in place, another, perhaps far more controversial candidate could be placed in office. Generally, Drummond was perceived as a weak leader who would "enjoy little freedom to direct the seminary himself" (Ackerman, 1988, March 13, p. 31A).

Chairperson Crowley swept all these reservations aside in predicting that Drummond would be elected by a 28 to 2 vote at the March 14 meeting. Actually the nomination passed 21 to 6 with one abstention. The whole process had taken 14 weeks.

Dr. Lewis A. Drummond was formally inaugurated October 11. As the long, robed procession made its way into Binkley Chapel, more than 60 black-clad students and alumni formed a corridor on either side in protest. They handed out yellow ribbons to symbolize support for academic freedom. Brochures prepared by a group called Southeastern Students for Academic Freedom alerted attendees:

When you see us this day know that our hearts beat
with pain - pain for those we love who have been forced by their convictions to depart from our community, pain for our ideals which have been trampled upon by those who never attempted to understand. ("Drummond becomes," 1988, October 12, p. A8)


Though the expected drama was inside, the dark lines of protesters drew an emotional response.

More than 30 of the robed participants in the procession wore yellow ribbons on their gowns. Several professors and a former administrator stopped to hug students and alumni. (McClain, 1988, October 12, 1B, 4B)

Once inside the chapel, Billy Graham called Drummond a "teammate" and the right individual to bring the seminary out of troubled times. While the hall rang with applause for Graham's sermon, the protesters
on the front steps shared in silent communion, then a "litany of grief" for Southeastern. ("Drummond becomes," 1988, October 12, p. 8A)

When you see our eyes this day, know that we have witnessed evil and injustice done in this place. We have felt the hot breath of threat and scorn from the mouths of those intent on destroying what was here....

We have heard with our ears the vows and promises to allow only one monolithic, impoverished view of God here. We have seen with our eyes the abridgement of faculty rights, the patronizing of students and the political maneuvering to push through pre-determined prescribed decisions destructive of the vision and nature of this school.

This day, when you see Southeastern Seminary's new president kneel before the congregation and hands placed upon his head, know that this inaugural not only ordains a new president to his task but also puts official sanction upon the events which put him into office. (Thomas, 1988, October 12, p. A2, A7)

J. S. Moore was in attendance that day, and
observed a mute protest inside the sanctuary which, he maintained, impacted with even more power. He recorded his observations in a letter to the editor of the *Wake Weekly*, (1988, November 10).

Two professors, who were on the platform and participated in the inaugural ceremony by reading scripture, failed to participate in any of the five standing ovations. Dr. Donald Cook and Dr. Sam Ballentine remained seated, heads bowed, during all these standing ovations. This was a most eloquent, silent, but widely seen, expression of the sadness and pain that engulf our beloved school at this time. This "protest" carried greater weight than any other I have observed, including the student protest outside the chapel on inaugural day. In fact, I would have wished that those very students had been inside and could have observed and supported the courageous actions of these two greatly respected and loved Biblical scholars. (Moore, 1988, November 10, A5)

At the outset Drummond had promised "no intention of coming in here and mounting a kind of witch hunt" ("Nominee not planning," 1988, March 1, p. 1D). Drummond added, "Academic excellence must be right at
the core of theological education or we prostitute the whole venture" ("Nominee not," 1988, March 1, p. 1D).

It will be my prayer...that a fresh wind of spiritual renewal could sweep the campus, fostering a spirit of love, harmony and reconciliation and commitment to all that God would accomplish in and through the institution. (Ackerman, 1988, March 15, p. 1D)

Drummond promised a spirit of openness on his part, a desire for peace and healing, commitment to evangelism and growth at Southeastern, and a pledge to uphold the intent of the seminary's Abstract of Principles and the Baptist Faith and Message. (Hefley, 1989, p. 153) The faculty remained publicly hopeful, but thoroughly cautious. Faculty spokesperson, Richard Hester, described the challenge before the new executive.

If the new president shows he is willing to support the tradition, established policies and stated purpose of this school and to do what is necessary to preserve our accreditation, this faculty will help him and give him a chance to demonstrate his ability to lead the school in these trying times.
We are committed to our students and alumni and to carrying on the important mission of this school....We want him to have a chance, and we want the chance to see if we can do this together." ("Lewis Drummond," 1988, March-April, p. 3)

The question was not only whether Drummond could do the work, but whether the trustees would let him be the president, or simply "run the school through him" (Ackerman, 1988, March 13, p. 31A, 34A).

**Sources of trustee consternation.** The remaining six to eight politically moderate, non-inerrantist trustees did not bail out. They resisted the adoption of the Peace Committee report and the implementation of its recommendations. They supported the faculty in resisting the changes in the appointment processes, as well as in their desire to follow accepted procedures in the election of the president and dean. At the March 14 Board meeting they presented a "Statement by Trustees of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary Who Remain Loyal To The Seminary's Heritage." The document was autographed by trustees Caldwell, Gregory, Jordan, Beaver, Stinson, Key, Midkiff, and Shirley.

The seminary's outstanding heritage is being
jeopardized by the current effort to shift
radically the theological foundation of the school
toward fundamentalism and the belief in biblical
inerrancy. We will not endorse such an erosion of
the school's historic character.

One day, we believe Southeastern will return
to the highest standards of theological education.
We pledge ourselves to pray and to work for that
day. Furthermore, we commit ourselves to
nurturing the flame of the school's honored
tradition until that flame burns brightly again,
and we invite others to join us in that active
vigil.

While they were regarded as a thorn in the flesh
to fundamentalist trustees, the moderate camp of the
SBC and the faculty at Southeastern affirmed their
continuing defense of the heritage of the school as the
voice of conscience and integrity. The moderate
remnant on the trustee board rarely bumped the
locomotive-like agenda off its tracks, however.

The fundamentalist majority most assuredly
controlled the boardroom, but just how well that could
be applied to the faculty was in doubt. Clearly, the
new trustees desired the pre-1987 faculty to retire or
resign. They were alert to any evident doctrinal goofs so that charges warranting dismissal could be issued. The professors suspected that salaries would be cut or teaching loads increased to lever the faculty into leaving voluntarily. Yet, according to professor Malcolm Tolbert, "The more that the fundamentalists took over, the more those of us who were there expressed our freedom. We made it clear where we stood" (Personal communication, October 30, 1992).

Following the trustee meetings, the chairperson always remained to offer a debriefing for the faculty. The March, 1988, session was especially confrontive. Crowley declared that peace, reconciliation, and restoration of routine were imminent. The faculty differed. Professor Robert Culpepper retorted, "You turn around and say how much you love us....Pardon me to say, that has a hollow ring." He said the faculty desired some sincere sensitivity to the "violence you have done and are doing to [the seminary]" (Allen, 1988, March 16, p. 1).

Trustee Christine Gregory reports that the free-for-all that ensued in this and other debriefings so upset Crowley that he "couldn't handle it." Crowley handed over the responsibility to Jim DeLoach.
(Personal communication, October 19)

The wholesale resignations in the administration created an administrative vacuum. One administrator who requested anonymity advised that the faculty began to take advantage of that lack of leadership, knowledge and experience. "What they began to do was almost what they dog-gone well pleased, trying to hold the administration to the letter of the law."

Alternatively, the faculty saw the trustees and the new administration as the aggressors and developed plans of defense. They devised strategies for committee meetings with trustees. The professors rehearsed who would volunteer to be recorders for the sessions, who would ask certain questions, and who would offer certain responses or champion particular ideas. Tom Halbrooks, professor of church history, volunteered in behalf of the trustees:

I don't think they understood [group] process at all. That's where we had an advantage, because we understood process. They only understood authoritarian control. When you get into a situation where you are working by group process, they were at a disadvantage, if they were actually going to work. They were working on our turf
rather than theirs. Their turf is authoritarian control. (Halbrooks, personal communication, June 3, 1992)

Faculty resistance to the fundamentalist reformation infuriated the trustees. "Our attitude," said Jim DeLoach, "was then, hey, if you want to play hardball, then we can play hardball. We don't want to do this, but you've put us in almost an untenable position" (Personal communication, October 26, 1992).

Serendipitously, on the flight home from the board meeting, Crowley met up with an old friend, Alan Siegle, whom he described as a nationally known labor lawyer and adjunct professor at Duke.

He's an orthodox Jew. His brother is an orthodox rabbi. We have a real bond. I mean I love the man. It was in the airport. We got on the same airplane to come back to Washington...I told him about the situation....He immediately...offered his services pro bono...no money changed hands....One of the things he told me, under no circumstances have anything to do with AAUP. You don't have to; you don't have to recognize them. Once you recognize them, you're in trouble...We took his advice and to this day AAUP is an
interloper. Actually they operate illegally
because they meet in our buildings...we could have
made an issue of that but we did not....

What nobody knows, I got publically
embarrassed, and my friend [Siegle] was
embarrassed and our friendship was
ruptured....[because] I was publically embarrassed
by Dade Sherman on the floor of the trustees
[meeting] because they [members of the board of
trustees] wanted to make it appear that I was
acting on my own, and nobody knew anything else
about it.

As a matter of fact Lewis A. Drummond knew
all about it and had telephone conversations and
also there was correspondence that he had with
Alan Siegle...and Drummond sat right there in that
seat and let me take the heat....That was the
beginning in the rupture in our relationship
[Crowley and Drummond's]....I think the truth
ought to be told....I'd been totally betrayed....I
protected Drummond. At that time I still thought
Drummond was going to do something. Later on I
found out he was not going to do a thing [that is,
Drummond would prove to be an ineffectual
He knew all about it, which made it legitimate. I'm the chairman. I talked to the president about it and he had conversations with [Siegle] and correspondence with him. (Personal communication, October 19, 1992)

No one is willing to say Drummond entered the fray with the same resources, support and even forgiveness in the face of mistakes that Randall Lolley enjoyed. However, persons on both sides of the fence are willing to testify that Drummond was unprepared for the task before him. Increasingly, Drummond was perceived as a weak administrator, easily succumbing to pressure by whomever he was with.

Early on, however, the issue was Drummond's absence more than his presence. His frequent travel schedule prompted a fit of pique in the faculty. The AAUP chapter sent him a letter dated April 20, 1988, saying "We are distressed. Efforts to administer the office of president in absentia have caused the situation on campus to deteriorate.... We had hoped for better."

Drummond frequently abandoned procedures described in the primary documents of the school. After the
informal discussion between Drummond, Vice President Bush and Professor Roy DeBrand in the President's office, and DeBrand's strong counteroffensive (mentioned earlier), Drummond did an about face, and enthusiastically supported DeBrand's nomination for tenure. As did others under similar circumstances, DeBrand wrote Drummond, not only to clarify and correct, but also to simply document the import of the conversation, for the new president had a propensity to forget or treat significant agreements casually. (Keat Wiles, personal communication, July 31, 1992)

In further considering your kindly suggestion to poll the Instruction Committee of the Board, I think it might be better if we stick to established procedure. I believe if you take a strong stand in my behalf, and the tenured faculty approves it according to procedure, the Committee will do the honorable thing.

I do not find in the procedure for considering tenure a step for meeting again with the Instruction Committee. I was somewhat surprised when you indicated to me that they might desire this. (Roy DeBrand correspondence with Drummond, August 30, 1988)
During the season in which the trustees, administration and faculty were dealing with the all important and evolving faculty appointment process, Drummond once brought an earlier version of the procedures to the faculty meeting.

He blamed his secretary for it. [Actually] He didn’t know the difference between the old plan and the new plan until he was presenting it to us and we said, "Dr. Drummond, this is not the current thing." (Bob Richardson, personal communication, September 11, 1992)

The faculty, the moderate trustees, and, on occasion, President Drummond himself provided sources of trustee consternation. However, the continuing pressure to change applied by the trustees on the institution resulted in the most evident trials. The story of the trustee’s dealings with Mahan and Janice Siler is one such episode.

The Siler story. Is is well within protocol and approved, in fact, for seminaries to hire visiting, temporary, or part-time faculty to cover leaves, instruct in specialized areas, or simply be employed for the fresh insights offered by practitioners in the field. In September, 1988, the academic coordinator,
Robert Dale, acting as interim dean, and the faculty prepared a slate of twenty-one persons to serve as adjunctive faculty for the spring term, 1989. The list was approved by the faculty and Dr. Lewis Drummond at the faculty meeting September 14.

On October 4, from 10:00 to 10:55 a.m., a conference call took place between members of the Committee on Instruction, Chairperson Robert Crowley, and President Drummond. The item of business was to scrutinize the proposed list of adjunctive faculty. Drummond advised those on the line that the entry of trustees into consideration of adjunctive appointments was quite out of the ordinary. He warned of the possibility of the accrediting agencies registering a "notation" because of this action. Jim DeLoach is purported to have said that the by-laws would have to be amended to allow for such action.

The names of the candidates were read. Those with whom any of the call participants had concerns were brought back for discussion. The balance was approved. Three were considered for deletion, but approved with certain qualifications: a) one to be employed for only one term; b) the president to keep close tabs on another; and c) the third to be approved if he agreed
henceforth to refrain from derogatory remarks about the
actions of the trustees.

Mahan and Janice Siler, scheduled to teach a
course in marriage enrichment, were not approved. Ms.
Janice Siler was in private practice in Raleigh as a
marriage and family therapist. Dr. Mahan Siler is the
pastor of the Pullen Memorial Baptist Church in
Raleigh. Previously he served as head of the
Department of Pastoral Care at the North Carolina
Baptist Hospital in Winston-Salem. Both Silers were
certified as a marriage and family therapists. For six
years Mahan and Janice Siler had taught classes at the
seminary.

In the transcript of the call, one trustee
testified that the Silers "believe homosexuality is an
acceptable life-style," and Mr. Crowley said that he
had seen "material promoting a homosexual conference"
in Dr. Siler's church ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989,
May-June, p. 40).

The background appears to be this: (1) After a
hearing of the Human Relations Council of Raleigh
on proposed legislation outlawing discrimination
against homosexuals, Mahan Siler wrote an article
in the Raleigh News and Observer, which was
circulated to members of the board. (2) When a conference on homosexuality was held at Pullen Memorial Church, someone attended and, without authorization, taped Dr. Siler's remarks. (3) Following the condemnation of homosexuality by the Southern Baptist Convention in June 1988, Dr. Siler wrote an open letter to the gay and lesbian community apologizing for the position of the convention and saying that not all Baptist ministers agreed with it. ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, p. 40)

The Committee on Instruction voted to not reappoint either of the Silers. The academic coordinator was notified sometime after regarding the decision and the gist of the discussion. Robert Dale advises,

When I pointed out to them that we [academic coordinator, faculty representative to the Committee on Instruction, and faculty] had not been a part of any of these conversations, then we realized that there had been a conference call. When I pressed that point they produced a transcript of the conference call....

This was the kind of thing that was done in
the dark. It was done in a corner. As long as they thought it wouldn't be known, it was alright.

At the end of that trustee meeting, when I went back to the dean's office I gave my secretary a bunch of materials to be circulated to the faculty. She accidentally got that transcript in there and circulated that thing to the faculty. Well, I just asked to have that back. Most folks did give it back. I don't know whether they made copies of it or not, but I did ask for it back.

I went and told...Drummond. When I told him what had accidently happened, he almost fainted and said, "You need to call the Chairman of that Committee and let him know what's happened." So I did. It turned out he [Jim DeLoach], himself, wasn't that upset. He said, "Well, that's the kind of thing that's going to be known sooner or later anyway." So it turned out that he individually was not that upset about it, but, when I talked with the other members of that committee, they were mighty upset. They really felt I had betrayed them. I hadn't. It was an honest mistake. (Personal communication, May 11, 1992)
The full board received the report of the Committee on Instruction at its meeting October 11. When asked if any changes were present in the list, the board was informed that the Silers had been left off. Trustee Mark Caldwell asked for an explanation.

Rather than give the Trustees the information I requested, the Trustees voted to go into Executive Session, though several of us commented at that time we would not be automatically silenced from speaking publicly about actions taken in such Executive Sessions....During the Executive Session I asked again for information concerning why the Silers were removed from the adjunctive faculty list. The Chairman of the Trustees, Bob Crowley, said that the information would not be given to the Board of Trustees. I appealed the ruling of the Chair. The Trustees upheld the ruling of the Chair, and the information was not given to us. The Executive Session ended, and we went back into full public session.

At no time did the Board endorse the action of the Committee on Instruction. As a matter of fact, the information concerning their action was denied the Board, and no discussion concerning
this event took place! (Caldwell, 1988, November 24, p. 5)

Caldwell came out of the session shaking his head. "It's a circus in there...It's a lethal combination of maliciousness and ineptitude" ("Baptist Seminary Trustees," 1988, October 14, p. 12B). The faculty steamed. "DeLoach has said the trustees were not going to fire anyone," said Michael Hawn, president of the campus chapter of the American Association of University Professors. "In light of this action, how can we trust what they're saying?" ("Dismissals Questioned," 1988, October 14) "While no specific reason was given, it appears to us that Dr. Siler is being dismissed not for what he teaches at Southeastern, but for what he preaches from his pulpit and what he believes in his heart," Hawn continued in an AAUP news release (Allen, 1988, October 27, p. A1, A6). Furthermore, "The firings show the board's total disregard for academic freedom," added Hawn. (Blum, 1988, November 9, p. A20) A formal report of the local chapter of the AAUP to their state organization said, "The intrusion of the...trustees into the process of administrative appointments is a major source of concern to the faculty...and would appear to be
a violation of the respective institutional roles of governance and administration.

The state organization responded.

AAUP members of the state chapter, led by Richard Barnett of Wake Forest University, said that Siler should have received a year's notice and faculty review of his potential dismissal.

"The trustees acted without regard for established academic practice and without recognition of the accepted role of the faculty in institutional government," the state AAUP resolution said. ("Southeastern Seminary Is Criticized," 1988, October 25, p. A18)

The trustees were quick to counter with salvos of their own.

James Bryant of Arkansas, chairman of the instruction committee, told Baptist Press:

"Adjunctive professors at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary are contracted to teach one semester at a time. There is no obligation morally, legally or from the standpoint of educational propriety for the seminary administration to continue automatically a contract to teach for any adjunct professor,
simply because he or she has taught at the seminary in the past.

"Dr. and Mrs. Siler are not presently under contract, nor have they been offered a contract to teach next semester. Therefore, the suggestion put forward by the AAUP that the Silers were 'dismissed' is both ludicrous and false."

("Accreditation Discussed," 1988, November 3, p. 15)

Initially the trustees would give no reason for operating against the recommendation of the president, acting dean, and faculty. "The board's chairman, Robert D. Crowley, would say only that the trustees had been given a mandate to operate the seminary according to the recommendations of the Southern Baptist Convention." ("No-Confidence Vote," 1988, November 9, p. A20)

At first President Drummond confessed that while he did not know the Silers, he had no problem with their teaching. (Allen, 1988, October 27, p. 6) He then reversed himself, saying "We have moral and theological standards that we adhere to, and they just did not meet those." (Blum cited in Lavenue, 1989, p. 28)
The Siler's learned about the non-renewal of their contract in the newspapers. Ms. Siler was miffed because there was no reference to her in any of the debate. "It [was] her feeling that throughout this transaction she was not judged on her own merits but merely as an appendage of her husband" ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, p. 40). Dr. Siler said simply,

Since we had taught at Southeastern for a number of years, we thought we deserved some participation in the process....We are also disappointed that we will no longer be working with the married couples at the seminary. (Allen, 1988, October 27, p. A6)

However, a few days later, Dr. Drummond did call the Silers to extend an apology. Dr. Siler remembered it this way.

Drummond called..."You shouldn't have learned about it in the paper." I said, "Well, it bothers me. I appreciate your call. I'd like to talk with you...." So we invited him to our home for a meal. He came...[as well as Worrell, the new Vice President for External Affairs].

We had a lively conversation on it, direct,
and I told him that I...was really hurt by it, because the word had gone out on the press was that we affirmed homosexual acts. I said, "That is not true, whatever you mean by that. We don't affirm heterosexual acts [either]. We affirm Christian lifestyle. We certainly don't affirm promiscuity...." I don't know if he denied it [though Siler vows Drummond downplayed the reports of the trustee sentiments]. "Dr. Drummond, I know what was said. I have a copy of the manuscript of the meeting." And he backed up, shocked.

(Personal communication, August 26, 1992)

The process alarmed the national organization of the American Association of University Professors. Quick to respond, Dr. Jordan E. Kurland, associate general secretary, said,

The first thing for us to do is to determine whether we wish to authorize a formal investigation, and that is currently under active consideration here....This is a very serious matter for us. The answers we have received have not assuaged us. (Kelly, 1988, October 25, p. 3C).

An investigation was authorized by Kurland for the
actions taken against Janice and Mahan Siler. On January 19 and 20 a committee visited the campus and met with faculty members Barnes and DeBrand, former president Lolley and former dean Ashcraft, student leaders, and several middle-level administrators. Of the lattermost, "one of the middle-level administrators who was scheduled to be interviewed wrote to say that he had been ordered by his superior, the vice president for external affairs, not to appear" ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, p. 42).

President Drummond refused to cooperate, as did all other senior administrators, with the exception of interim academic coordinator Glenn Miller, who had succeeded Robert Dale. Only one trustee would agree to meet with the committee, outspoken moderate Mark Caldwell. The AAUP committee very much regretted the reluctance to dialogue on the part of the administration and trustees, but concluded that "there is a sufficiently extensive written record that a fair assessment of the positions of these parties can be made" ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, p. 42).

When asked the previous August if he thought the turmoil was over, President Lewis Drummond had responded, "I think so" (Munger, 1988, August 21, p.
The stiffened faculty response to the trustees, fumbling on the part of the new administration, and the Siler incident did not lock down that assessment. Nor would the spasm and subterfuge involved in the dean selection make it any calmer.

The Dean search process. The Trustees affirmed the Peace Committee report of 1987, and instructed Drummond to come up with a plan to implement it. The statement recommended that "the theological positions of seminary employees be determined in order to guide them in renewing" their allegiance to the Baptist Faith and Message, the Glorieta statement, and their institutional declarations of faith ("Report of the Southern," 1987, p. 18). This investigation appeared to imply the assumption of heresy at the outset, as well as to employ multiple tests of orthodoxy foreign to the bylaws and the terms under which the current faculty had been hired.

Yet the board’s recommendation would be a minefield to institute. "What they have done is put the monkey on the president's back to implement," said Richard Hester, a spokesman for the faculty. "They have washed their hands of the complexities of it"
(Ackerman, 1988, March 16, p. 1D, 3D). Hester went on to add that the adoption of the Peace Committee report created an "enormous problem" for Drummond. "He knows he's caught between an accrediting agency on the one hand and this report on the other," Hester said. "It's unfortunate that the trustees were not willing to examine the complexity of the report as it bears on this institution" (Ackerman, 1988, March 16, p. 2).

With this action, the person who would fill the slot as dean of the faculty became more important than ever. Drummond needed an agent who could sort out this conundrum and make change. The sides lined up for battle again.

The AAUP chapter memo of April 20, 1988, the one denouncing Drummond's presidency "in absentia," was critical in several specific ways. Drummond had been in touch about working with the faculty, yet never set a date for them to get together. In a memo of April 5, 1988, Drummond requested nominations for the position of dean, a task usually the purview of the faculty Dean Search committee, and actually before that committee had been formed. Drummond had also proposed a radical restructuring of the administration, creating a triumvirate of three vice presidents, including a vice
president for academic affairs. He and the trustee chair requested speedy approval of the restructuring plan by the trustees by mail ballot. The AAUP chapter blistered him for this.

1. It is inconsistent with your first letter of April 5 indicating your desire to work together with us, since you initiated [the administrative reorganization] prior to assuming your on-site leadership and before you had talked with any of us.

2. It is inconsistent with your request for nominations for the position of Dean of the Faculty, since it abolishes that position.

3. It apparently demotes from their present ranks in the administration twelve persons, nine of whom are women.

4. It was prepared and put forth without consultation with the persons who would be involved in the changes proposed.

5. It sets forth a new administrative model antithetical to the thirty-seven year tradition of the school. It is based on the model of the corporation rather than the model of a community of faith and learning.
6. It decimates the area of the administration dealing directly with students, in spite of the fact that their preparation for ministry is the primary reason for which the school exists.

7. It gives no job descriptions for the new positions, making evaluation of the plan difficult and accountability impossible.

8. It violates the Southeastern Seminary By-laws in substance and in process.

9. Such a proposed change would further destabilize a community which has been subjected to trauma throughout the academic year. It creates a problem of morale among administration and faculty, and it makes teaching and learning within the community exceedingly difficult. There is a limit to the trauma that any community can endure in a limited period of time and maintain its proper functioning.

Writing for the chapter, Richard Hester requested Drummond to stop the process immediately, to talk directly to the faculty, to spend some time with the Southeastern community, especially those affected by major strategy changes before any further precipitous action, and, finally, to simply study the seminary by-
This communication was preceded one week earlier by a letter of similar import from the faculty by way of Chairman Pro Tem of the Faculty, Archie L. Nations. It reasserted the dean search procedure outlined by Randall Lolley at the request of the trustees and exhorted Drummond to follow it. The faculty assumed the pressure on Drummond to make wholesale changes in the organization was inspired by Chairperson Crowley. They advised fiercely, "The opinion of the Chairman of the Board of Trustees does not have the force of policy and cannot change established procedure." Drummond was warned that changing established procedures by informal means was exactly the issue in the United States Supreme Court case, National Labor Relations Board v. Yeshiva University. The court looked unfavorably on machinations outside of delineated processes to create change.

These two letters were shortly followed by correspondence from moderate board member Mark S. Caldwell to Drummond, dated April 27, 1988, concerning the mail ballot for the proposed administrative rearrangement. He protested, saying the accompanying documents in Drummond's communication contained no
duties describing the responsibilities of the new officers nor a process for creating these positions. Furthermore, because this was relevant to the by-laws, he maintained the procedure for amendments must be followed, requiring a regular meeting with 30 days notice. Therefore, the whole procedure appeared to Caldwell to be irregular, "cavalier," "hasty and ill-conceived" (Caldwell to Drummond correspondence, April 27, 1988).

Richard Hester managed to reach the president by telephone in Atlanta, Georgia, April 20, to protest the administrative reorganization. Hester reports that Drummond told him the plan was, indeed, premature, and agreed that "it should not have been sent out before faculty consultation had taken place" ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, p. 41). However, "the vice president for internal affairs, who had sent the plan, had told one of his subordinates that the plan was accomplished fact" (p. 41). In time, Vice-president Worrell was right.

Eventually Drummond appointed a faculty dean's search committee made up of Richard Hester, Elizabeth Barnes, Tom Halbrooks, and Don Cook. Drummond was quick to clarify, "They can nominate and give their
opinion as to the various persons who have been recommended, but they have no power (to elect)"
(Hefley, 1988, November 8, p. 6). This had always been true, but the unambiguous message was that the committee would not have the ex officio influence they once enjoyed. In fact, it began to appear that Drummond was only feigning participation in the agreed upon process.

Duane Toole, a reporter from SBA Today asked Drummond if he had been in discussion with Dr. Timothy George of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary about becoming Dean of the Faculty at SEBTS. Drummond said no. But a graduate of SEBTS, Caleb O. Oladipo, informed Drummond that when he asked George to supervise his studies there, the latter said it was unlikely because Drummond had talked with him about just this possibility. (SEBTS AAUP Chapter letter to Dr. James Rogers, Appendix C)

On July 6, 1988, the Dean Search Committee, chaired by the President, met and agreed it was at step 3 in the selection process, "the designation of candidates." The committee voted for their candidates and produced a list of six candidates. Drummond then asserted that he "had to add" the name of Dr. Russ Bush.
of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary to the list, in spite of the committee's reservations about someone clearly identified with the fundamentalist party in denominational politics.

This mysterious compulsion to add the name of Bush appeared to confirm reports that Drummond was negotiating freely outside of the committee process. The committee received reports that not only had Drummond contacted George and [Russ] Bush, but also Dr. Robert Sloan of Baylor University, who said Drummond "all but invited" him to the campus for an interview.

(SEBTS AAUP Chapter correspondence with Dr. James Rogers, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools)

In mid-July at the meetings of the Baptist World Alliance General Council and Commissions in Nassau, Bahamas, Lewis Drummond spoke to Dr. Reginald McDonough, Executive Director of the General Board of the Baptist General Association of Virginia. Drummond told McDonough, "We have a good dean prospect lined up." Drummond appeared to have misled the committee by suggesting they were at the stage of designating the candidate while he was already initiating conversation with the candidate. In fact, the president had participated in lengthy conversations with Sloan.
When confronted, surprisingly, Drummond did not pursue the nomination of Sloan, but confessed to have spoken with Roy Fish of Southwestern Seminary the previous day. Contrary to the minutes of the previous search committee meeting, he maintained that Fish's name had been on the short list. The committee members accused Drummond of acting independently of the search process and discouraged him from adding names to the list at will. Drummond responded by reopening the search process. Later it was discovered that the president had not announced the re-opening of the search process at all. In his defense regarding all the apparent irregularities he said, "I have to make a nomination of someone who is electable by the Trustees." The faculty responded, "Your job is to recommend a qualified person for the position and then let the Trustees make their choice. In our view it is unlikely that the Trustees will reject your nominee."

At another meeting Drummond had responded to this same argument: "Yes, but they could make things difficult elsewhere later on" (SEBTS AAUP Chapter correspondence to James Rogers, SACS).
It appeared that the slate was being narrowed resolutely in the direction of candidates unpalatable to the faculty. November 9 and 16 the faculty went on record voicing their lack of support for Wayne Gruden, Richard Melick, and Russ Bush. Nevertheless, the president did not allow the names to be dropped from the list. December 6 the dean search committee members clearly enunciated their reasons for not supporting Bush's candidacy. (SEBTS AAUP Chapter correspondence with Dr. James Rogers, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools)

The resistance to Bush's candidacy is not difficult to fathom. Bush was a consulting editor of The Criswell Study Bible (1979) which was designed to reflect the theology of the Baptist fundamentalist patriarch and pastor of First Baptist Church of Dallas, W. A. Criswell. Bush coauthored a book with Tom Nettles called Baptists and the Bible (1980), intended in part to suggest that inerrancy was essential doctrinally and historically significant to the people called Southern Baptists. One called the book the "manifesto of the Baptist Inerrancy takeover movement" ("Portrait of our New," 1989, p. 1). Clearly, he was in the fundamentalist camp as a resident academic.
Therefore, Bush certainly did not appear to fit the image of someone who could "work with faculty," as Drummond had described in the profile. (James, 1989, June, p. 11) In fact, near the end of the process, the four faculty members on the search committee wrote a letter to Dr. Drummond protesting Bush's nomination, noting that "some of Dr. Bush's colleagues thought he had acted as an informant to the conservative leadership of the Southern Baptist Convention" (Kelly, 1989, February 2, p. WAl). Dr. Bush denied this allegation.

In his study of the publications of Russ Bush, Gordon James, a Fort Worth, Texas, free-lance theology writer (1989, June, p. 11), concluded that the candidate's theology was not either Criswellite or Baptist, or, at least, not very good in either case. Richard Hester did not pull any punches when he described what he perceived as Bush's lack of competency.

Russ Bush had an extremely narrow way of understanding the philosophy of religion, which is his field. He kind of latched onto one, I wouldn't call him a scholar, but Francis Schaeffer was his thing. I think he didn't understand the
educational process...he saw it as warfare in which you are at war with the forces of evil, of liberalism out here. You've got to indoctrinate people and prepare them for this war. That kind of mentality is really very contrary to the scholarly approach to the philosophy of religion....

According to Hester,

[Bush] was also quite limited in terms of his personality. He was quite paranoid, somebody who had that kind of paranoid outlook we would never hire. We wouldn't put them on the list. We wouldn't even get to an interview with them because you could see from what he wrote...he was controlled by the fundamentalist bias....

[He was] Incompetent to teach and certainly incompetent to be dean. (Personal communication, November 4, 1992)

Summarily, the faculty rejected him for:

Total lack of administrative experience, bias in his writing, his expectation that this faculty would support inerrancy in some form, his affiliation with the fundamentalist leadership in the convention, and his lack of understanding of
the history or traditions of Baptists in this area. (Hefley, 1989, p. 161)

A secret ballot taken at the conclusion of the faculty interview with Bush resulted in twenty-three votes by tenured faculty members against the nomination and only one in favor. The singular affirmation was, most likely, that of Lewis Drummond.

Apparently the lone "aye" carried it, for at the mid-March 1989 trustee board meeting Drummond presented his choice for dean and vice president of academic affairs: L. Russ Bush, III. After three hours in executive session, Bush was elected 22 to 8 by the trustees. The faculty concluded that Bush's nomination and election "over the reasoned opposition of the faculty violated...the criterion of accreditation that calls for the faculty to have a substantial voice in such matters" (Hefley, 1989, p. 161). Alternatively, Chairman Crowley, in defending the majority vote, said Bush was "suited spiritually, intellectually, and in his personality not only to work with Dr. Drummond, but to work with the faculty. He was careful to consider each question raised. I was amazed at his insight into every ramification that has gone on. I cannot imagine that the faculty
Drummond said of his new vice president, "He has all the academic credentials. He has exhibited scholarship in writing and classroom work, and he knows and understands theological education very well. Dr. Bush has a very positive and irenic Christian spirit and is very open to people. When the faculty do get to know him, they will appreciate him as a Christian scholar and gentleman." (Hefley, 1989, 161)

Accreditation woes. Accreditation agencies attempt to be value neutral with regards to the theological orientation of institutions. Therefore, they never put forward a particular line of thinking or believing as a criterion for membership. Rather, their task is to ensure that the policies and procedures reflected in the primary documents of the school reflect strategies which advance an environment for successful teaching and learning. Accrediting agencies monitor the actions of institutions and its personnel to see if they comply with these guidelines.

The trustees appeared surprised that neither the faculty, nor the accrediting agencies in turn, would allow the wholesale changes they intended without
review. Mark Caldwell comments on his perception of the disposition of some of the fundamentalist trustees. "This is family business." These were Baptists, Southern Baptists south of God. But [on the accreditation boards] you had these atheists, humanistic professors from Harvard or some other place, "godless institutions...." This was an intrusion. So xenophobia was very much a part of this whole thing, as it is quite often in oppressive regimes. These are foreigners, even the accrediting agencies, even someone as conservative as Gordon Conwell's president [Richard Cooley]...who worked so closely with us...There was the sentiment on the trustees [that] we should not be accredited by anyone; we should have our own accrediting agency. (Personal communication, October 26, 1992)

Robert Crowley, trustee, paints a picture of the resolve evident in the new trustees to make change. You do what you have to do and take the medicine for it. And that's basically what we did. And that was our game plan, to be honest with you. We're going to do what's right. I said that repeatedly. I'm going to act by my convictions.
(Personal communication, October 19, 1992)

On the other hand, the trustees wanted to be justified as well. Crowley continues.

We're going to live by the documents...of the institution. Where we made our mistake, we did not carry out things according to the official documents, namely, we introduced the Chicago Statement, [and] we did get involved in some of the matters of administration. We did innocently. We did not intend to break the rules. (Personal communication, October 19, 1992)

In January of 1988, the SEBTS chapter of the AAUP "requested an investigation" by their parent body "of conditions of academic freedom at the seminary" ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, p. 42). March 2, Jordan E. Kurland, Associate General Secretary of the American Association of University Professors, sent a letter to Robert Crowley, chairperson of the board of trustees, Southeastern Seminary. He cited several areas of concern.

1) The [Peace Committee] subcommittee visit, the nature of it and that no closure was effected with the accused faculty;

2) Interviews of two candidates to the faculty
where the "Chicago Statement on Inerrancy," was used as a "standard for doctrinal acceptability even though the article is not a part of the official documents;"

3) Actions to amend the selection and appointment process of faculty diminished both the role and any sense of effectiveness [of faculty] in the process and, alternatively, "moved the Board beyond its appropriate role as a governing body" and into the realm of "academic decision-making." (p. 2)

4) Public statements on the part of officers of the Board which indicated that "only those who believe in biblical inerrancy will receive appointments to the faculty -- and the presidency -- of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary," when no such restriction exists in the documents (p. 3). (Kurland correspondence to Crowley, March 2, 1988)

Subsequent communications between Kurland and President Drummond proved interesting.

President Drummond...said, speaking for the board, that there was no intention to restrict academic freedom, and he denied that the seminary was going
to become "a fundamentalistic institution"; rather, "it is an institution of higher education where the free exchange of all ideas will be constantly and earnestly maintained." Mr. Kurland asked if he might communicate these reassurances to the faculty, but President Drummond requested that he not do so, expressing confidence that the associate general secretary would understand his position! The president was invited to reconsider or at least to explain his wish that the faculty not be informed of the substance of his response, but he said nothing further. ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, 42)

Inevitably, it seemed, the A.A.U.P. investigation determined and reported that principles of academic freedom were violated. The four concerns enunciated by Jordan Kurland, Associate General Secretary of the A.A.U.P., (above) were identified. Also cited was the process which yielded the trustee refusal to rehire the Silers because of their views on homosexuality.

As if a warning of things to come, Jordan Kurland said,

We have noted that Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary is accredited by the Southern
Association of Colleges and Schools and by the Association of Theological Schools, both of which have promulgated standards relating to academic freedom and governance that comport with key elements in the aforementioned principles.

(Kurland letter to Crowley, 1988, March 2, p.1)

Indeed the AAUP review was a precursor to investigations by both accrediting agencies. December 15, 1987, the Association of Theological Schools Executive Committee had indicated the intent to visit the Southeastern campus on a fact finding mission. A visiting committee from ATS arrived on campus March 18. Some of the trustees were miffed with the timing of the visit in that Randall Lolley was still in office.

(Hefley, 1989, p. 154)

The committee was composed of Dean Jim L. Waits, Chair, Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia; Dr. Jack L. Stotts, President, Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Austin, Texas; and, Dr. Leon Pacala, Executive Director of ATS.

This committee met for approximately one hour each with the following individuals and groups: (1) President Lolley, (2) Dean Ashcraft, (3) Trustees Dr. James Bryant, Dr. Cecil Rhodes, Dr. Jesse
Chapman and president elect Dr. Lewis Drummond, (4) Faculty members Dr. Michael Hawn, Dr. Delos Miles, Dr. Max Rogers, Dr. John Eddins, and Dr. Ben Johnson, chosen because they represent the faculty areas on the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee, [and] (5) Representatives of the Student Council. (Ashcraft, 1988, p. 59, 60) Those present responded with various interpretations of what the visit meant.

"We're here because of concern for an institution that's gone through the unusual development of losing a number of senior administrators," said Leon Pacala, executive director of the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada (ATS)....

[Randall] Lolley said he thought that the most that would come out of the visit was Southeastern would be notified that standards were being violated.

"They seemed most concerned with two things: academic due process and undue pressure from outside affecting teaching," Lolley said, "They wanted to make sure that our operations are consistent with our statement of purpose. But I
didn't get the impression they thought anything was serious enough to warrant probation or a loss of accreditation...."

Conservative Trustee Cecil D. Rhodes of Wilson [NC] said the board representatives and Drummond told agency's officials that "because of the theological imbalance at the school," there is no academic freedom now....

"Not hiring anyone except inerrantists doesn't sound like balance to us," said (Michael) Hawn (professor of church music). "We told them that trustees are leaving the place in administrative chaos. They don't know the difference between governance and administration. From some of what we told them, they [the ATS representatives] wondered if their recommendation would be taken seriously." (Ackerman, 1988, March 19, p. 8D)

On June 17, 1988 the Executive Committee of the ATS received and referred the Report of the Visiting Committee to the accrediting commission which would meet in January, 1989. The report found Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary to be "a very troubled campus and divided institution" (Sykes, 1988, August
It described a fierce, combative atmosphere prevailing on campus, inconducive to education, dominated by a "foxhole" mentality in a standoff between opposing "armed camps." The statement criticized what the committee described as "unilateral action" in changes in the faculty appointment policies, and, in particular, the insertion of trustees into the process "at a point that has been traditionally the prerogative of faculty and academic officers." The report noted that the school's singular confessional criteria, the Abstract of Principles, was no longer serving as the sole reference document in interviews with candidates for appointment. They also suggested that the "The Board of Trustees appears to be clearer about their role as agents of the Southern Baptist Convention than about their fiduciary role as trustees of the seminary" The assessment admitted that the problems had roots in the Southern Baptist Convention, a source "over which the seminary does not have control." Alternatively, the report was sharply critical of the Convention's threat to investigate the theological positions of the faculty. (See Hefley, 1989, pp. 156, 157; Sykes, 1988, August 10, p. 1A, 7A; and, "Response of the Board," 1989)
Fundamentalist trustee, Bill Delahoyde, responded gingerly, "I don't think we've been treated fairly....But I don't think it's intentional. I don't think they've been given a fair presentation by our side on some of these issues." Delahoyde thought it "unfortunate that two of the three trustees interviewed by the committee were new to the board." (Sykes, 1988, August 10, p. 7A)

Moderate trustee, Mark S. Caldwell, however, welcomed the report and called it a "fair description of events as I have experienced them" (Sykes, 1988, August 10, p. 7A). The local AAUP chapter described it similarly, and advised that the next move was up to the trustees.

The report of the ATS executive committee makes clear that the initiative now lies with the administration and trustees of Southeastern Seminary to respond to concerns raised by the ATS. A prompt, positive response...is needed.

"The report of the site visitation committee appears accurate and fair...It is not a report aimed at criticizing or censuring the trustees. Rather, it is an attempt to clarify the appropriate role of the trustees in the governance
of the school and to identify trustee actions that have exceeded proper governance functions. (Knox, 1988, September 8, p. 6)

Drummond sought to quell fears that Southeastern's accreditation was in danger, saying that the announcement did not carry with it a "sense of any kind of recommendation." Trustee Chairperson Robert D. Crowley added, "I do not feel there is any basis whatsoever for us to be called into question about our accreditation." Richard Hester of the faculty and outgoing AAUP chapter president disagreed, saying, "I think the accreditation is in question....These processes move slowly, but...the accreditation status certainly is in question." (Knox, 1988, September 8, p. 6)

The tension mounted when a special fact finding committee from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) arrived September 14 for three days of inquiry. The committee included: Henry King Stanford, chairman and President Emeritus of the Universities of Miami and Georgia; James E. Kirby, Dean, Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University; C. W. Minkel, Vice Provost and dean of the Graduate School, University of Tennessee/Knoxville; Liston O. Mills, the
Divinity School, Vanderbilt University; and James T. Rogers, Executive Director of the Commission on Colleges, SACS. Seminary representatives meeting with the committee were: Lewis Drummond, President; Robert Crowley, Chair of the Board of Trustees; Robert Dale, Academic Coordinator; H. Eugene McLeod, Chairman Pro Tem of the Faculty; Jonathan Eidson, President of the Student Body; and Richard Hester, former president of the AAUP chapter, serving in the absence of the current president, Michael Hawn.

The visit was largely investigative, but the exit interview provided an inkling of what was to come. Richard Hester provided an unofficial and confidential summary to the AAUP Chapter Executive Committee of statements by the SACS officials to the seminary representatives. Dale and McLeod refined the synopsis. Hester's brief cited references to: low morale on campus and the absence of collegiality between faculty and trustees, public and aggressive conflict between the faculty and trustees, lack of institutional effectiveness, lack of restraint of power on the part of the trustees, trustee confusion with regards to accountability, and, corruption of the faculty appointment process and the adjunctive faculty
appointment process through inappropriate trustee intervention.

Hester quoted Dr. Minkel as saying, "Events here have impinged upon academic freedom to impair the institution's effectiveness." Minkel cited the diminution of the faculty role in the appointment process in general and the infringement of the trustees on the same in particular. Also noted was the sense of vulnerability felt on the part of the faculty and students because of hostile external and internal influences.

The actual report by the visiting committee would not be released until December. However, the pending SACS conclusion to their investigation and the ATS report in hand monopolized the agenda of the fall trustee's meeting. While frustration and anger were expressed, the trustees agreed that the reports had to be taken seriously.

Mark Caldwell put forward a motion encouraging the Board to accept the ATS offer for assistance in order to avoid the loss of accreditation. This was withdrawn in favor of a Jim Bryant motion that the Board of Trustees and the President of SEBTS accept the invitation to utilize the services of the ATS staff in
an effort to clarify the relationship and accountability of the Trustees to their institution as well as to the churches of the Southern Baptist Convention. This latter motion asked for help, as did the first, but dropped the reference to accreditation from the motion. The motion passed with 27 yes votes and 1 no vote. (Minutes of the SEBTS Board of Trustees, October 10, 1988, p. 2)

Bill Delahoyde made a motion that the Chair appoint a committee to prepare and present to the Board a response to the ATS report, as well as to SACS if and when their report arrived. The motion passed. (Trustee Minutes, October 10, 1988, p. 2)

December 5, the special committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools released their findings and conclusions. It found that academic freedom at Southeastern is seriously curtailed because "the Seminary is not functioning effectively as a scholarly community at present; nor is it functioning in conformity with the Criteria" [of the Association] ("Report 13," found in Lavenue, 1989, p. 28). In addition: Board members have visited classes unannounced, stopped and interrogated faculty members on the
campus about their theological beliefs, and have made public their intent to replace by attrition all of them with persons judged more suitable to the majority of members in the Southern Baptist Convention. (Report 20, in Lavenue, 1989, p. 28)

The Committee reluctantly concludes that institutional effectiveness is low at this moment in the history of the Seminary....The Committee concludes that the morale of the faculty is extremely low. In fact, members of the Committee cannot recall ever knowing a faculty so despondent. ("Report of the Special," 1988, p.3)

The Committee concluded that a "sense of collegiality is now missing at the Seminary" (p. 4). Among the issues identified were the open conflict between faculty and trustees, the prolonged impasse over the appointment of new dean, confusion because of delayed appointment of faculty members, a decline in enrollment, and a general sense of drift in the school.

Among the notations were four areas of specific concern to the faculty. Regarding "Eligibility Requirements for Faculty Membership,"

The additional requirement (professing the articles of the Baptist Faith and Message) was
adopted without consultation with the administration or faculty of the School, that there has been no formal Board action, that the procedures for amending the By-Laws have not been followed, and that published statements do not accord with present practice. It appears that the Seminary's traditional understandings of faculty eligibility have been informally and arbitrarily changed. (p. 7,8)

Regarding "Faculty Participation in Appointments:"
It appears that recent actions by the Board of Trustees relative to faculty appointments seriously limit the faculty's opportunity to fulfill their responsibility and raise questions about the policy making and administrative roles of the Board of Trustees.... (p. 8)

The actual designation of candidates, the determination of who among the candidates is to be interviewed, the decision concerning whom to recommend, and the recommendation to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees and subsequently to the full Board have been assumed by the Trustee Committee on Instruction and the President. (p. 9)
Where the "Selection of Part-Time Faculty" is concerned, the committee castigated the trustees for the conference call of October 14, 1987, and the consequent non-reappointment of the Silers.

The arbitrary nature of the decision, taken without consultation with the Seminary administration or faculty, overturns established procedure and has created immense confusion in efforts to maintain an orderly curriculum. (p. 10)

The "Dean's Selection Process" was referenced as a case where the faculty advanced by documented procedure while the president did not, resulting in "confusion and suspicion," as well as a "stalemate in the search for a new Dean" (p. 12).

The Committee described academic freedom as arising from autonomy or freedom from external controls. In formula fashion the committee instructed,

When academic freedom is curtailed, an institution of higher education can no longer function effectively as an intellectual community.

In the judgment of the Committee, the Seminary is not functioning effectively as a
scholarly community at present; nor is it functioning in conformity with the Criteria [regarding academic freedom and professional security]. (p. 13)

They noted specifically Section 6.1.2. of the Criteria concerning the Governing Board.

The governing board must not be subject to undue pressure from political, religious or other external bodies. Furthermore, the governing board should protect the administration from similar pressures.

There must be a clear distinction, in writing and in practice, between the policy-making functions of the governing board and the responsibility of the administration and faculty to administer and implement policy. (p. 14)

The imposition of the doctrine of inerrancy and, in a larger sense, the deterioration in the wall of protection by virtue of action of the Southern Baptist Convention, its agencies and agents, were offered as evidence of compromises of academic freedom (pp. 16, 17). The Board was chastened for not resisting but actually enabling the sense of "assault on...academic freedom" of the faculty and the president (pp. 20, 21).
Finally, Crowley was disciplined, albeit obliquely. The Committee reminded "individual members of the Board of Trustees of the...Criteria which requires that 'no individual committee or member of the Board can take official action for it unless authorized to do so'" (p.23).

The trustee responses to the ATS and SACS reports were nearly identical in style and import. (Crowley, Delahoyde, et al, personal communications) Little was conceded to the committees. They openly criticized the visiting committee investigations for only scratching the surface, and especially for allowing the assignment of motive on their part without regard to the political context in which their detractors accused them ("Response of the Board," 1989, p. 3,4). They thought the opinions of the faculty and former administrators and certain students carried unjustified weight, and, for their part, said, "We do not believe that the seminary as a whole, or the board of trustees, or the Southern Baptist Convention has been treated fairly in the Association's review" (p. 68).

They held fast in support of the SBC power to mandate change or correction in SBC institutions (pp. 6, 26, 39, 51, and 54), and defended the Peace
Committee subcommittee initiative to the seminary as appropriate (p. 51). They maintained that the trustees did in fact act in accordance with Southeastern's primary documents when initiating change (Hefley, 1989, p. 160). They rejected the conclusion that the trustee action to change the appointment process was "unilateral" (p. 30, 31).

The trustees specifically blamed Lolley's lack of and sometimes antagonistic leadership, as well as his resignation as significant factors in the undesirable state of affairs (pp. 20, 21). The breakdown of collegiality and institutional effectiveness was owed to the uncooperative spirit of the faculty and their supporters in adjusting to change (Hefley, 1989, p. 160). They chastised the committees for what the latter perceived to be academic freedom issues when in fact they were not but exaggerated, publicity gaining stunts (pp. 64 - 66). While seeking to avoid pointing a finger at either association, the trustees decried an anti-fundamentalist prejudice and alluded to certain aspects of the report which "evidence this tendency" (p. 69).

For a time after the release of the ATS report President Drummond had dallied a bit in releasing it to
the faculty. In mid-December the administration still had not met with the faculty to discuss the report. (Kelly, 1988, December 13, pp. A1, A16).

Trustee Chairperson Robert Crowley, President Drummond and two other trustees met with 30 members of a fact-finding committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The representatives from Southeastern expressed no desire to back off of their intent to pursue a more conservative faculty.

"The bylaws state that the trustees shall elect the faculty," said the Rev. Robert Crowley of Rockville, MD. "That is really non-negotiable. If they want us to change that back, then we'll have to take the consequences" ("Seminary's Board Sticks," 1988, December 14, p. 1C).

Later Crowley would add,

I'm not anti-intellectual...but I do believe that when the time comes that we have to sacrifice the integrity of our beliefs about the Bible there is not even a close toss-up. Forget the accreditation. Accreditation doesn't mean that much to me...I'm a minority in that viewpoint...(but) I say we don't have to have it. (Personal communication, October 19, 1992)
At the December meeting, Crowley reiterated that the trustees were simply carrying out the will of the Southern Baptist Convention. Mark Caldwell, an outspoken opponent of the fundamentalist agenda, concurred that the election of faculty is the responsibility of the trustees. However, Caldwell added that the Seminary is not just responsible to the Convention, but to the faculty, students, and North Carolina, for the sake of academic quality. ("Seminary's Board Sticks," 1988, December 14, p. 4C)

**Political non-appointment.** Punctuating the year was the news that the SBC Committee on Nominations would not consider C. Frank Jordan for the customary second term on the Board of Trustees, Southeastern Seminary. Jordan had been openly critical of Chairperson Robert Crowley and trustee action which led to Randall Lolley's resignation. An alumnus of Southeastern and a friend of many years to both Randall Lolley and Robert Crowley, Jordan was shocked and disappointed, but did not resist the decision. Marv Knox, a writer for Baptist Press, described the move as indicative of the impatience of the fundamentalist controlled SBC to make change. (Knox, 1988, May 13, pp. 1 - 3)
To Will, to Wiles, and to the Wall: 1989

The Will to Win. While President Drummond was talking about revival, school sponsored foreign mission ventures and an expansion in programs at Southeastern, things were looking bleak on paper. Clint Hopkins, a moderate pastor and president of the SEBTS Alumni Association, observed a decline in enrollment and alumni support, and decried what he perceived as misinformation being issued by officials of the school.

Dr. Hopkins, pastor of Churchland Baptist Church in Portsmouth, (Virginia,) said that the alumni were told in the fall that the seminary would have an enrollment of 1,000 students, or roughly the same number as those the year before.

"The very next day, the official figures showed actual enrollment at 800," said Dr. Hopkins....

The minister added that the seminary also reported as alumni contributions the $11,000 that was raised to buy a car for the former president,
Dr. Randall Lolley. Dr. Hopkins said the contributions for the car were nearly half the total amount that seminary officials said alumni gave to the school.

"Even including the money for the car," Dr. Hopkins said, "there is no growth in alumni support, contrary to what the president reported."

Reached by telephone, Dr. Lewis A. Drummond, Southeastern's current president, said he hadn't "the foggiest idea whether the car was included in the money," although he acknowledged that overall alumni contributions were off.

He (Hopkins) added that since the fall enrollment of 800 was reported, this semester's total enrollment had dropped to 750.

"They've lost a quarter of the campus in a year," Dr. Hopkins said referring to the 1,000 students who were on campus during the 1987-88 academic year.

Dr. Drummond attributed the enrollment decline to a loss of the "baby-boomer" generation, which inflated enrollment at all seminaries until the mid-1980s.

"Of course, the controversy had some effect,"
he added.

However, Dr. Drummond said that for the most part the accelerated graduations have subsided and the campus is back to normal. (Briggs, 1989, February 9, p. C8).

Notwithstanding Drummond's sentiments, the Convention crisis had indeed wreaked havoc on enrollment, and, consequently, planning, based on the SBC enrollment driven funding formula. The financial crisis was calamitous enough that members of the staff of the SBC Executive Committee and the six Southern Baptist seminary presidents met on May 29, 1989, in order to develop a course of action. A plan was approved, recommended to the Executive Committee, and subsequently adopted which froze the SBC seminary financial support at 1985 to 1988 formula levels, especially strong enrollment years at SEBTS. ("Sixty-Third Annual Report," 1990, p. 79) This bridge strategy, in the end, guaranteed the new proprietors transition time. (Fletcher, personal communication, August 25, 1992)

In the mind of the faculty, another form of decline existed in job security and compromises in role boundaries between administration and trustees and
faculty. In a 1989 survey of Southeastern faculty, Suzanne Lavenue found 82% or fourteen of seventeen faculty respondents indicated they felt "direct influence of pressure from the trustee body as a result of the controversy" (p. 78). When asked, "Have you felt your position threatened as a result of the conflict?" 35% or six (6) believed "dismissal seems highly possible, and 12% or two (2) more thought it somewhat likely. (p. 78) Ninety-four percent (16) responded that the trustees had "become involved in the executive and administrative operations of the seminary" at a level described as "major, heavy involvement." The lone holdout suggested "significant involvement" (p. 77).

The morale of the faculty continued to be tested. Russ Bush was elected as Vice President for Academic Affairs in early 1989 over the decided opposition of the faculty and over six candidates which they did affirm. Moderate trustee Mark Caldwell said, "We could have had an inerrantist the faculty supported. They [the faculty] supported other inerrantists. [Drummond] could have been a champion of the faculty and of the inerrantists, but he did not do that. He lost a chance to reconcile." (Knox, 1989, March 16, p. 1). Michael
Hawn, a professor at Southeastern, said, "It appears that, one by one, the doors of reconciliation are being closed off..."

"The seminary bylaws stipulate the faculty should give its consultation in these matters," Hawn said. "We felt like we gave our consultation and feel very clearly it was ignored" (Satterwhite, 1989, January 24, p. 15).

The election of Bush weakened still further the flow of students from traditional feeder schools and churches.

As alumni president, Dr. Hopkins said he wrote in the fall to the alumni, mostly pastors, to encourage those going into the ministry to attend Southeastern.

"Now, the appointment of a dean who is abhorrent to the faculty has undermined the ability of the pastor to recommend students," he declared.

"I certainly cannot recommend a person to a place when the dean has 100 percent of the faculty against him." (Briggs, 1989, February 9, C8)

The ultimate blow to faculty morale would have been dismissal. While the faculty still thought
firings were possible, they were reassured repeatedly that this would not be the case. Chairman of the board of trustees at Southeastern, Robert Crowley, reiterated: "There will be no witch hunts and no faculty firings....The way the institution will change is through attrition" (Lavenue, 1989, p. 81).

Michael Hawn of the faculty countered that "There are other threats that are worse than dismissal - loss of community, loss of integrity, loss of institutional vision, etc." (Lavenue, 1989, p. 81)

Lavenue (1989) identifies another emotional load factor relevant to this period. It is a sense of increasing isolation on the part of the faculty. As more and more faculty left SEBTS, she anticipated a growing sense of alienation among the remnant.

Of course, not everyone saw the developments at Southeastern as a decline in any sense, whether measured in institutional, educational or emotional terms. After a year at the helm, Dr. Drummond framed the seminary's status and changes in positive terms (1989).

At the immediate moment, we have a decline in student enrollment as a consequence of the conflict. However, I am confident that we are
beginning now to come out of this....I think in the long term that this situation that was created by the Trustees was an absolute necessity. The seminary had been declining for three or four years in enrollment and though this past year has been a radical time, I do believe it was the correction in the course of the institution that is necessary to make it viable and healthy in the future....

I think the future is going to be better as a more balanced approach is brought into the institutional life of our schools....

I believe our schools are becoming more sensitive to the general constituency of the Southern Baptist Convention and this is always healthy....I am sure that this bodes good for the future. (Lavenue, 1989, pp. 103, 104)

In their response to the report of the visiting committee of the Association of Theological Schools, the trustees of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary pointed out:

The Seminary's physical and financial condition are strong. The same faculty teach the same classes in the same classrooms. The Board of
Trustees remains committed to academic due process, including the legitimate exercise of academic freedom, while at the same time making the Seminary responsive to its Southern Baptist constituency. ("Response of the Board," 1988, p. 12)

The Southern Baptist Convention Executive Committee (EC) went on record in 1989 as affirming the trustees at Southeastern and defended their actions, by saying they are:

"Duly elected by the SBC and thus...given the right and the duty to set policy" at the seminary. The Executive Committee "found nothing in the policies adopted by the trustees...that is contrary to principles enunciated by the SBC in its official actions" (Hefley, 1990, p. 111).

Trustees, the EC document said, "were not put under any pressure to take action against any "individual" or "group of professors". (Hefley, 1990, p. 112).

The EC further affirmed that "the SBC does not in our judgment desire to have a self-perpetuating board of trustees. We believe in the principle of administrative leadership in..."
faculty' selection without denying the value of faculty input through consultation." Trustees, the EC maintained, had "the right to set the 'new faculty' selection policies and procedures without fear of intimidation by a faculty that may want a different procedure (especially one that tends to suggest a self-perpetuating mode of faculty selection)." (Hefley, 1990, 112)

In pin-pointing the appointment of faculty, the Executive Committee was describing the last bit of contested ground in the conflict on campus. The new trustees and administration intended to see inerrantist faculty appointed in spite of the dreadful drop in contributions and Cooperative Program receipts, a hiring freeze in all positions except new faculty, and no new raises for incumbent faculty. (Lavenue, 1989, pp. 69, 70) This also was the disposition of the new Vice President for Academic Affairs, L. Russ Bush, who indicated at his nomination that "it is absolutely essential that a conservative majority on the faculty be achieved as soon as possible" (Kelly, 1989, March 15, p1C).

In 1989, two years after the fundamentalist trustees wrested control of the board from moderates,
the first full-time, tenure track faculty were appointed. Robert Crowley, the trustee chairperson, noted affirmingly, that he "sat in with the instructional committee and... asked if they believed Adam was a real person and if the first 11 chapters of Genesis were real history, to be taken literally. I got an affirmative answer from all three" (Hefley, 1990, pp. 110, 111).

The faculty voted to disassociate themselves from this new faculty selection process, disapproving of what they saw as a nominal, token faculty role in the process. (Keat Wiles, personal communication, July 31, 1993)

"Under the present set-up there is no place for us to give our opinion," [faculty member] Thomas A. Bland said. (Kelly, 1989, August, p. 23)

In response,

Trustee James W. Bryant said the faculty should give up the hope of having as much control over hiring as it did under Randall Lolley. (Kelly, 1989, August, p. 23)

Yet not every trustee approved. Moderate trustee Robert Brooks thought the criteria used in the selection of the new faculty members stemmed from the
recommendations of the SBC Peace Committee, a decision with which he did not concur.

The [Peace] Committee was neither assigned nor qualified to do this," he said. "Why should Southern Baptists be doomed to have faculties at their seminaries chosen on the basis of unimportant, if not invalid, criteria devised by the [Peace] Committee?" (Hefley, 1990, p. 111) The authors of the aforementioned SBC Executive Committee (EC) report (1989), disagreed with the Brooks formulation, saying,

Trustees retained full authority to set policy for each seminary in accordance with the primary documents of each school. Trustees were not put under any pressure to take action against individual professors nor against any group of professors. Findings were reported but no condemnations were expressed in the report, nor were any voted by the Southern Baptist Convention, nor any of its agencies or committees. Non-binding recommendations were made about future hiring policies as one possible solution to the controversy within our convention, but even these recommendations were not aimed at any one
Convention institution agency, but were affirmed as suggested recommendations to all entities of the Convention....Each trustee board has voluntarily responded in ways that it deemed appropriate in light of individual circumstances. We believe that each trustee has acted as he or she saw fit. ("SBC Executive Committee Affirms," 1989, Winter, p. 9).

Sub-plots to the story continued after the three new appointments. Paul House decided to not leave Taylor University for the position at SEBTS after all, in spite of the announcement he was coming. Therefore, the search committee had to begin the process all over again for a professor in the Old Testament area. (Wiles, personal communication, July 31, 1992)

Rumors persisted that these new faculty members were being brought in at inflated salaries, salaries which were more than Seminary guidelines allowed. This was flatly rebuffed by the Vice President for Business Affairs, Paul Fletcher, who maintained that the salaries were based on competitive marketplace rates. Furthermore, Fletcher remarked, "There were never any written guidelines that I can find and to this day no one else has found them for me, including the faculty"
Professor Roy DeBrand stoutly maintains, however, that there was preferential treatment given new faculty members, while at the same time the pre-1987 faculty were actively and effectively ostracized. It was his perception that,

Efforts...were contrived to demoralize and humiliate, such as bringing in a new professor in my field who had not the experience, nor the educational achievements, nor the publishing achievements, at a level higher [in faculty rank] than I was, to which I wrote the president a very stinging letter of protest, something like: "How dare you. How could you? Why did you do this?"

Even little things like making a distinction between old and new faculty relative to press releases and information about enrollment, where they would put things in certain faculty members' boxes and keep it from other faculty members. Scheduling, instead of allowing faculty members with more seniority the preferred classroom times, to change their schedules and give them terrible schedules: eight o'clock in the morning classes, 3 o'clock in the afternoon classes, undesirable
times in the name of, "We have to offer classes at all different times." Giving new people the preferred times, and the old [undesirable times]. Somebody would say, "Well, that just happened." If you ask the dean, [the response was,] "Aw, that just happened, nothing wrong with that." Maybe, maybe not. I think it was purposeful. (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)

Money did, ultimately, become an issue, however. In 1988 the faculty had received no pay increase. ("Seminary files reports," 1989, October, p. 25) In a memo to the faculty in the first two weeks in February, 1989, President Lewis Drummond had advised that in light of a $60,000 shortfall, there would be no cost of living salary increases, there would be a hiring freeze on all seminary positions, the money for research assistants would be restricted, the chapel ensemble would no longer be funded by work study money, and conference accounts (already only $300.00) would not be increased.

All this disappointed the faculty, but disenchantment peaked when reports surfaced that the president's mansion was being renovated to the tune of $100,000, including a greenhouse for Drummond's prize
orchids and a 28 foot climate controlled closet for Mrs. Drummond's furs. In addition, it was learned that the seminary was paying a consultant $15,000 to teach the new vice president for external affairs how to do his job. ("AAUP reports academic," 1989, July, p. 6) In response, in October, the Southeastern faculty "instructed" the administration to present their demands for a ten percent, across-the-board pay raise for all employees to the trustees.

The Woes of Keat Wiles. Keat Wiles joined the Southeastern faculty on presidential appointment by Randall Lolley in 1987. Wiles was to fill the consecutive sabbatical leaves of Sam Balentine (1987 to 1988) and Max Rogers (1988 to 1989) in the biblical area of Old Testament. Morris Ashcraft had known Wiles at Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary when the two were professor and student, respectively. When Wiles arrived he immediately joined the SEBTS chapter of the AAUP. Professor Richard Hester remarked admiringly, "Here he was, a contract professor, and it didn't bother him at all. He was clearly a participant with us" (personal communication, November 4, 1992).

By the time Wiles arrived in late summer, Old Testament professor John I Durham announced his
intention to retire. Wiles informed Dean Ashcraft of his desire to be considered for the vacancy. Ambivalent feelings set in when Lolley and Ashcraft resigned in October. Wiles began to look elsewhere for employment in January of 1988 (personal communication, July 31, 1992).

In a memorandum dated August 17, 1988, from acting dean Robert Dale to President Drummond, the former enumerated certain "Decisions We Must Make." The list included the following:

**Contract Teachers.** Keat Wiles is on contract with us for this academic year. Let's review our needs and either (1) extend his contract or (2) notify him of his termination date. If other contract teachers are needed, let's plan to recruit them now.

This request was in keeping with the seminary employment policy and ATS guidelines which required of the school to give 12 months notice when persons on term appointments were not to be re-hired. President Drummond did not act. (Richard Hester, personal communication, November 4, 1992) By Dr. Wiles' report:

My reading of the Academic Personnel manual indicates that they should have told me within 12
months of the end of my contract what the
disposition was going to be. Already by the fall
of '88 they were inside the 12 month deadline and
hadn't done anything. Colleagues in the Biblical
area, both New and Old Testament working together,
began pressuring the administration to tell me one
way or the other, to make a decision. They were
supportive of my continuing at Southeastern. Dr.
Drummond kept putting off making a decision. At
faculty meeting [Drummond] asked for [a] session
[with Wiles].

[At that personal session Drummond indicated
he would extend the contract one year.] "That
way, that will give you another year to see how
the Lord leads." I translate that: to find another
place of employment. Often when people in Southern
Baptist life see how the Lord leads the Lord
usually leads away from where they are.

I asked him three questions: Would I be paid
at the same rate or would I receive the step
increase which was typical? Would this preclude
me from taking other employment offers that would
offer more professional stability, long term
stability, or was I locked into this contract if I
accepted it? We were currently renting seminary housing. Would we be able to stay in the same house we were currently renting? He said, about the housing, he didn't see any problem with that. About other employment, surely if I found something, I should feel free to take it, as quickly as I wanted to. He really hadn't checked the budget to see whether or not anybody was going to be paid, so he didn't know what I would be paid, but he thought it would be on schedule. I agreed.... [This agreement was subsequently formalized in a letter to Wiles from the President, dated November 16, 1988.]

Later I found out that the reason he stopped by [before the faculty meeting] and made at the time...[an offer which] seemed a bit off the cuff, especially when he did not know whether the budget would support my salary or not...Later I found out the reason he made the offer that day was a faculty member of the Biblical area approached him during his backslapping time before faculty meeting time started and asked if he had made a decision about me. He said, "No, he hadn't." He said, "Well, I'm going to bring it up on the floor
of the faculty today. So Dr. Drummond came straight to me...I think he did it under fear of having to talk about it openly instead of privately. (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)

The following fall, 1989, the twelve month advance notice period eclipsed again, the biblical area faculty began once more to pressure Drummond to extend Wiles' contract. At a meeting December 5, the members of this area made specific appeals to Drummond. His colleagues reported to him that the president "quickly indicated that he had already been thinking about my situation and felt like perhaps the school owed me something," though Drummond had some doubts about Wiles' "institutional loyalty," specifically because he had worn yellow ribbons during the 1987 crisis ("Chronology of Institutional Relationship: John Keating Wiles and SEBTS," unpublished).

Drummond indicated at that meeting of area faculty his desire for the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Russ Bush, to enter into conversation with Wiles and make a recommendation. The president hoped for a decision by December 7, 1989, because he was going into the hospital at that point. (From: "Chronology")
Wiles did not hear from Bush until a casual conversation on December 7 indicated the latter's interest in conversation the next week. No date was set and Wiles received no call from the Vice-President.

Keat Wiles called Drummond on December 19, 1989, in order to "express...relief at the good reports...received...concerning his recent surgery." He also thanked Dr. Drummond for what what his colleagues had described as his "apparently favorable disposition toward extending" the contract. "The President said that that was being discussed and that he would call Bush to get right on that right away."

Bush wrote a letter to Wiles, dated December 22.

I am aware that your teaching contract expires at the end of the Spring semester. The President has expressed some concern about that to me because neither of us have heard anything of your plans. I would, of course, be happy to help you with recommendations or in other ways. I may be able to help you find another teaching position or perhaps I could help you find a place of service in a church. I do not know what efforts have been made on your behalf, nor do I know the status of your options. Perhaps we could talk some about
that.

Let me say this, however, regarding your teaching responsibilities here. You surely seem to have built your reputation with your colleagues, and several of them have expressed concern for you and for your family. Frankly, I believe that our trustees expect the President to sustain the present contract stipulations. If you do have suitable employment lined up, it would be easier for him to simply stay with the contract as originally stated. He can go to the trustees, however, and announce that our curriculum needs have remained severe in Old Testament, that the faculty selection delay has increased the pressure in the biblical areas especially, and thus on those grounds that he wishes to extend your appointment through the Fall semester of 1990. Let's talk about this. I will support Dr. Drummond in that extension if you think it is a move that would help you. I must honestly say that I think the one semester extension would be the most he would be able to do. But if that will help, I think we could work that out.

Let's make some time to talk this through....
After Christmas Wiles received a memo communicating that the President wanted to offer a six month extension on his contract. Wiles' peers thought it unwise to appoint someone to a full time position for only one semester when he would be teaching the first installment of two semester courses. His colleagues also surfaced the conclusion that because Drummond had to give Wiles 12 months notice, the president figured that adding six months to the six months remaining would satisfy the policy. (Personal communication, July 31, 1993)

Bush called Wiles on the Friday between Christmas and New Year's. In light of his colleagues' assessment of his work, as well as the fact that a six month contract would break the continuity in the course schedule, Wiles expressed disappointment over the proposal. He also noted that it was "unfortunate that we were already in violation of our own documents since I should have been notified by August 1 regarding renewal or non-renewal of my contract" (From "Resume of Phone Conversation with VP for AA, December 29, 1989, 6:00 - 6:45 p.m., prepared by Keating Wiles, unpublished). According to Wiles the Vice President
was unclear on the policy documents of the seminary in this regard.

Wiles went on to comment on the difficulty of securing a person within the limited time available. Bush commented that he suspected Drummond anticipated resistance among the trustees to Wiles' reappointment. Wiles countered that the President could nominate whom he wished, not the trustees. The Vice President thought Wiles had taken a strong stand against trustee actions in 1987, but he really had no personal knowledge of this. Wiles offered that he had a great deal to offer the current situation: good reviews of his teaching by students, strong peer reviews, knowledge of the institution, and had taught under the "Baptist Faith and Message" in other circumstances. To an incredulous VP, Wiles advised that the President had never talked with him about any concerns regarding Wiles. Bush said he would talk to Drummond the next day and get back in touch soon. (From "Chronology")

President Drummond and Keat Wiles met on January 2, 1990, at which time the president offered to extend Wiles' teaching contract for one year. The chief executive officer advised, however, that Wiles should not anticipate any further extensions. Wiles asked why
and records the gist of what followed this way.

8. [Drummond] responded that he would not want to put me through the embarrassment of having the Trustees vote not to elect me.

9. I asked if he could tell me why he thought the Trustees might not elect me to the Faculty.

10. He responded, "Oh, probably just on vague generalities."

11. I asked, "Is there some question regarding my competence?"

12. He answered, "It's your emphasis on the use of historical-critical method."

13. I asked, "Is the use of historical-critical method inappropriate at SEBTS?"

14. He answered that it was not. He didn't think so, but some of the trustees did. He admitted that he himself used it sometimes.

15. I noted that anyone who was post-Enlightenment did whether they knew they did or not.

16. He agreed....

In a letter dated January 8, 1990, Wiles responded to a letter from Drummond dated January 5, accepting the extension in the contract and clarifying the
details of the agreement. Wiles added:

In closing, let me thank you for your clear statement of the administration's view that my future at SEBTS does not extend beyond the appointment of 1990-1991 because of my emphasis on the historical-critical method. I greatly appreciate your candor in our meeting of January 2.

The president did not disagree with this summary in word or correspondence.

The AAUP Acts. While the American Association of University Professors is not an accrediting body, its articles resonate with those of the major accrediting bodies. In some ways the issues articulated in a review by the AAUP anticipate what is likely to be considered by the accrediting agencies.

January 19 and 20, 1989, a subcommittee of the AAUP visited SEBTS. The trustees were unmoved.

Chairman Robert D. Crowley said he would not participate in the probe.

"The AAUP is a union, actually," he said.

"They really have no standing and therefore it is not appropriate for trustees to be communicating with faculty members except through the president."
For them to summon us to come to campus is inappropriate."

Dr. Crowley confirmed that some trustees had hired a Washington law firm specializing in labor relations to deal with the seminary's AAUP chapter.

The reason?

"That's obvious," Dr. Crowley said. (Kelly, 1989, January 18, p. 2D)

The AAUP subcommittee left the campus sorely concerned about the state of academic freedom at Southeastern.

One member of the committee, a professor of Mercer [University] of Georgia asserted, "I thought I had seen a fundamentalist 'takeover' at Mercer, but it was a cake-walk compared to this. I have never seen such cruel disregard for an academic community as I have seen (at Southeastern)." ("AAUP Investigates Southeastern," 1989, February 10, p. 2).

The May-June issue of ACADEME, the journal of the AAUP, declared, "Through all of these actions and statements, academic freedom is placed under severe threat at the Southeastern Baptist Theological
The AAUP was especially critical of the trustee's intent to assess the theological views of the president and faculty, the non-appointment of the Siler's; demoting the faculty status in the faculty appointment process; and the appointment of a dean in spite of overwhelming opposition on the part of the faculty. (Kelly, 1989, May 23, p. 4A)

On June 17, 1989, the Annual meeting of the AAUP acted to place Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary on its list of censured administrations.

"Censure is our way of letting the academic community know that conditions at the institution relating to academic freedom primarily have been found seriously deficient," said Jordan E. Kurland, associate general secretary of the AAUP. "It is essentially a warning to people to know what they're getting into before they take a job there or have anything to do with it." (Kelly, 1989, May 23, 4A)

The AAUP described the circumstances which gave rise to their serious decision.

It is equally evident that his [Randall Lolley's] successor, President Drummond, has been
inconsistent and less than forthcoming. He has kept faculty in the dark, while protesting his firm intention of working with them; he committed himself to observe stated procedures in the case of the search for a dean and regularly violated those procedures; he has repeatedly floated expressions of faculty opinion, even when it was unanimous or nearly so.

Lacking requisite knowledge of specialities of prospective faculty members, they have brought inappropriate considerations to bear, have reached conclusions on casually acquired and partial information and so have directly and severely prejudiced educational work of the institution.

They have consistently flouted their own regulations, effectively substituting one doctrinal statement for another (despite protests to the contrary), twisting the meaning of by-laws to fit their own purposes, simply ignoring stated procedures when it suited them and substituting the rule of men for the rule of laws.

[It said the action to remove the Silers was] clearly at odds with the 1940 Statement's assurance of academic freedom for all members of
the faculty." ("AAUP reports academic," 1989, July, p. 6)

The Wall. Would the Association of Theological Schools and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools strip Southeastern Seminary of its accreditation? At his election, Vice President for Academic Affairs Rush Bush said no, the seminary would not lose its status with the Association of Theological Schools or the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

I can see no reason why it should. We still have the same fine library that we had before accreditation concerns were raised, our faculty is as adequately credentialed as it was before and at this time is basically unchanged, and our curriculum is still strong and in place. Loss of accreditation (and the likely consequent loss of personnel) would imply to outsiders that poor education is taking place here, and that is simply not true. The quality of education is high even though not everyone is in theological agreement all the time. I doubt they ever will be until we get to heaven, and some may even try to carry on their arguments there as well! But seriously, we
will be making a full report to the accrediting agencies right away outlining our plans for the school, and I do not believe that we will suffer the loss of our accreditation. ("An interview with Russ Bush," May-June, 1989, p. 5)

Nevertheless, in September of 1989, the Association of Theological Schools asked Southeastern to "show cause...why it should not be placed on probation" (Knox, 1989, September 7, p. 3). Their concerns were buttressed by the fact that since the firestorm of 1987 eighteen professors and administrators of Southeastern had resigned and enrollment had plummeted 40 percent.

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' report had identified four areas of concern: (a) changing of the eligibility requirements for faculty appointment through the introduction of additional "tests," especially biblical inerrancy, (b) reduction in the faculty role in the appointments process while the trustees had become involved in administrative matters; (c) invasion of trustees into the adjunctive faculty appointment process, a duty of the president and the committee on instruction, and particularly evident in the case of the Silers; and, (d) a
fragmented and compromised dean's selection process. The report reminded the trustees of the necessity of due process and invited accountability, not just to the SBC, but to the seminary, its various publics, employees, and traditions. SACS noted that the trustees failed to remain free of external pressures and to shield the faculty and administration from the same. The faculty was reminded that they also "have an obligation to seek a solution" to the serious problems facing the school...[and] they too must be reminded to avoid airing grievances in public" (Hyer, 1989, January 7, p. G12). SACS gave Southeastern until December to meet their accreditation guidelines in these areas. However a plan that addressed the concerns of SACS was due by July 1. (Satterwhite, 1989, January 13, p. A12)

Lewis Drummond remarked regarding the eleven month grace period, "This is good news to us." Rev. Robert Crowley, trustee chairperson, received the news just as gladly.

"I interpret this as a complete vindication of what the trustees have done," Crowley said in a telephone interview from Rockville, MD. "I knew all along that when they got the other side of the story, the outcome would be vastly different"
However, the formal communication from James T. Rogers, Executive Director, Commission on Colleges, SACS, indicated the reason for the grace period was:

Because the 237-page draft response of the Board of Trustees to the SACS Special Fact-Finding Committee was not received until the day of the interview, had not been reviewed by the entire Board of Trustees of the College, and contained a substantially different interpretation of the recent controversy at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary from that indicated by the Special Committee, [so] the Committee deferred final action until December 1989 pending the receipt of additional information. (Personal Correspondence from Rogers to Drummond, dated January 5, 1989)

The second item, that the report of the trustees had not been reviewed by the entire Board, had become a sore point in the accreditation issue. An ad hoc committee prepared the report to SACS and presented it in December. But moderate and conservative trustees alike took Chairperson Crowley and the committee to
task for making the presentation before the board had an opportunity to assess it.

"Nobody told them to make a report to SACS," [moderate Mark] Caldwell said. "We empowered them, as our minutes clearly state, to make a report to us." (Knox, 1989, January 4, p. 8)

"This kind of reckless behavior on the part of the chairman puts us in serious jeopardy," Dr. Caldwell said in a telephone interview.

"My idea about the whole thing was they would report to us before they made their response to the accreditation committee," said Robert Earl Shirley. "I resent anybody speaking for me without my name and my authority behind it...."

"All of a sudden information becomes very privileged," moderate trustee Charles W. Midkiff said. (Kelly, 1989, January 5, p. 1D, 3D)

Crowley disputed [these] claim[s]. "The board asked me to appoint a special committee to report to the Association of Theological Schools and to SACS," he said. (Knox, 1989, January 4, p. 8)

While the SACS report called on greater cooperation on the part of the faculty, the faculty had not seen a copy of the SACS report even as late as the
end of January. Nevertheless, board chairperson Robert Crowley did authorize that both the Southern Association and the Association of Theological Schools reports be distributed to the faculty. (Knox, 1989, January 26, pp. 1 - 3)

The SACS report was released to the faculty and discussed by the trustees at the March 13 to 15 meeting. The report was passed 19 - 7 with several corrections which did not substantially alter the statement.

Moderate trustee Christine B. Gregory, who voted against endorsing the report...[said,] "I think the trustees should have had a greater responsibility in the blame" [in the report].

The Rev. Mark S. Caldwell, a moderate trustee from Maryland, said the report left a biased account of what happened at the seminary during Dr. Lolley's tenure.

"This is no objective history," Dr. Caldwell said. "We've simply put flowers on the grave of the school." (Kelly, 1989, March 16, p. 1D)

In spite of their public statements advocating a mutually prepared report, the trustees and faculty prepared separate statements.
The report sent to SACS by Southeastern president Lewis Drummond proposed establishment of a task force to deal with "perceptions regarding academic freedom" at the seminary, and to address such issues as "the difference between education and indoctrination." He also advocated faculty-trustee workshops to improve understandings about the role of trustees, faculty and administration.

However, the Southeastern faculty sent a separate report to SACS, asking that professors be given more power in hiring of faculty. Faculty spokesman Richard Hester said: "We put down in clear and concrete language what we think are necessary changes if the school is going to keep its accreditation."

The faculty also called for a moratorium on selecting new teachers until the faculty-selection procedure is "modified to conform" to accreditation standards. ("Seminary files reports," 1989, October, p. 25)

President Drummond began to contact individuals from the various components of the seminary to serve on a committee to form proposals which might lead the seminary out of its impasse. He later defended his
authority to select the committee, saying that he thought he best could select a balanced group and thereby enhance the prospect of success. (Memo to the faculty, May 22, 1989)

In a memo dated May 5, 1989, Vice President Bush described the task of this group.

This committee is not supposed to be the group that "works the plan" so to speak. They will not make decisions for the faculty, the alumni, the trustees, etc. They will simply offer ideas as to how best to move toward a satisfactory response to the four areas of concern.

Bush also noted that "the procedure called for by the motion would be time consuming (almost guaranteeing that the deadline for the report could not be met)." Bush further advised that the process which was developing would in all likelihood include the assistance of some kind of "facilitator." (Memo to the faculty, May 5, 1989)

October 9 and 10, 1989, faculty, trustees and administrators at Southeastern took part in a workshop in a step toward reconciliation and peace. Robert D. Crowley, outgoing chairperson, offered a three point compromise which was adopted. It promised to:
Place a moratorium on election of permanent faculty members until after the board's March meeting.

Instruct a special faculty/trustee task force to propose a new faculty-selection process, which the trustees are to consider in March.

Allow President Lewis Drummond to maintain his prerogative to appoint temporary faculty as needed during the interim. (Knox, 1989, October 26, p. 8)

New Chairman James R. DeLoach of Houston said: "In the small-group meetings, faculty, administration and trustees had the very first opportunity to sit and face each other and ...speak candidly about agreements and disagreements....All of us are looking forward to the ongoing process of continuing this dialogue."

"The main thing accomplished in this workshop is a movement toward participatory governance," said Richard Hester.... "Participatory governance would be a different way of going than during the last three years. If participatory governance works...then there is hope for our situation." (Knox, M. (1989, October 26)
Hope was almost derailed by four steps taken by the trustees during the course of the meeting.

First, trustees voted that the American Association of University Professors and its chapter at Southeastern Seminary "have no official standing with the seminary...." Second, they refused to allow "inclusive language guidelines" drafted by the faculty to be printed in the seminary's catalogue, student handbook and directory.

Third, they agreed to consider at their March meeting a proposal that would name the 1963 Baptist Faith and Message Statement as an official seminary document and would require all faculty candidates to affirm the statement prior to election or full-time employment....

Fourth, they voted to open the small group meetings in which faculty and trustees were to discuss seminary issues. At the faculty's request, they later consented to close those meetings, as prearranged procedure indicated. (Knox, 1989, October 26, p. 8)

As unhappy as the faculty was with these actions, they did not negate the three agreements.
Robert Cooley, president of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in Boston served as workshop facilitator. He noted that "Change is accomplished through crisis, revolution, or process. I have seen in this process some movement toward change" (Hefley, 1990, p. 113) Cooley invited trustees to "design faculty input at every trustee meeting ... Adopt a shared governance model of operation" ("Southeastern takes steps," 1989, November, p. 4). As an immediate forum for this, a committee made up of representatives of faculty, administration, and trustees, would collaborate on a report of the process due on or before February 1. ("Southeastern takes steps," 1989, November, p. 4)

In the meantime, SACS was due to determine the status of Southeastern's accreditation by December 12. ("Southeastern takes steps," 1989, November, p. 4)

When SACS met in Atlanta, Georgia, in December, they cited four areas of deficiency at Southeastern: "planning and evaluation, selection of faculty, role of faculty and its committees and governing board." ("Association gives 'warning,'" 1990, February, p. 11) For these reasons SEBTS was issued a "warning." (p. 11)

The "warning" is the second of three levels of
sanction. The first is "notice," which Southeastern was given one year ago. "Warning" is in effect for two years, while the institution works on deficiencies cited. Final sanction is "probation." The seminary retains its accreditation while it is on "warning" ("Association gives 'warning,'" 1990, February, p. 11).

Reaction to the decision was as different as night and day. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, Russ Bush, expressed relief.

We are very pleased that the SACS did not place Southeastern on probation. We did receive a warning, and that is a serious matter, but it is not as serious as probation. We feel this was a very significant decision in our favor...We are confident we will be able to remedy all of our remaining problems soon. ("Association gives 'warning,'" 1990, February, p. 11).

Alternatively, if not surprisingly, Thomas Halbrooks of the faculty and new president of the SEBTS AAUP chapter, responded quite differently.

The situation appears grave. This day in the life of Southeastern seminary has occurred because of changes forced upon the school in violation of
established standards in American higher education. The faculty remains committed to those standards. We call on the administration and board of trustees to join us in meeting these standards and restoring the reputation of Southeastern seminary as a theological school offering quality higher education. ("Association gives 'warning,'" 1990, February, p. 11)

Thus ended the year 1989. Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary did not hit the proverbial "wall" by being stripped of its accreditation. On the other hand, while the momentum appeared to slow with the joint workshop, the seminary nevertheless appeared to be drifting resolutely toward censorship because no substantive adjustments were made in either camp. The decisions of the last few years just would not go away, nor would the faculty roll over and acquiesce to the imperatives of the trustees. The changes had been effected, but the ultimate assessments were still in the future.
Epilogue: 1990 to the Present

The trustee tack. The Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary trustee board meeting in March of 1990 witnessed several significant decisions. The foremost among them was a compromise with the faculty in hiring procedures, a proposal which was recommended by a task force made up of both trustees and faculty.

The suggestion called for an advisory committee of six, including three faculty, a trustee, the president and the vice president for academic affairs. This committee would seek to trim the list of prospective faculty and present a slate to the president when a two-thirds majority prevailed regarding a candidate or candidates. (Hefley, 1990, p. 166).

The president, however, would not be required to recommend an instructor from the search committee's list, or someone endorsed by the faculty for that matter. But if the president did not, the trustees were to be advised and the faculty's objections made clear. (Knox, 1990, March 29, p. 10) The trustees retained power in the election of teachers who were recommended by the president.
Faculty member Tom Halbrooks expected the faculty to respond positively (Knox, 1990, March 29, p. 10), while moderate trustee Mark Caldwell "predicted that the procedure would always deadlock." Notwithstanding, Michael Hawn of the faculty described the new policy, "a step in the right direction....We hope to come to a point of collegiality" (Hefley, 1990, p. 166).

The second issue was a motion referred to the trustees from the Southern Baptist Convention calling on Southern and Southeastern seminaries to replace their Abstract of Principles' articles of faith with the Baptist Faith and Message. Faculties at both schools were unwilling to accept this switch. At their spring, 1990 meeting, Southeastern trustees voted to affirm the 1963 BFM statement and have it continue to be published in the seminary catalog, as it had been since 1978. New faculty would continue to be guided by the Abstract of Principles which would "not be supplemented, amended or replaced." (Hefley, 1990, p. 166)

This victory for the faculty was moderated significantly by the decision of the trustees to interpret the Abstract of Principles, and, in
particular, the article on the scriptures, in light of Basil Manly's treatise, The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration, Explained and Vindicated (c. 1888). Basil Manly, Jr., a founder of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, created for the school a set of Articles of Faith to which the faculty would subscribe. The Articles of Faith of Southern Seminary was borrowed en toto by Southeastern and renamed the Abstract of Principles.

The logic of the trustees went this way. If Manley, the writer of the Abstract, could be documented to believe in the inerrancy of the scriptures, then surely he meant for the Abstract to be interpreted in the same manner. (Russ Bush, personal communication, July 8)

On the other hand, the faculty saw it as an end run. Tom Halbrooks, professor of church history, volunteered,

I think their whole logic and reasoning behind that was faulty. I pointed that out to them. As historians they were making a mess of the situation. Nevertheless, they used that as a rationale for claiming they could demand this...of any future faculty members even though they would
not overtly try to impose it on us [the pre-1987 faculty]. (Personal communication, June 3, 1992)
As if to remove all doubt, the trustees also affirmed a motion put forward by fundamentalist trustee William Delahoyde, which said,

[The] Seminary will endeavor to attract faculty candidates who reflect the viewpoint that where the Bible speaks, the Bible speaks truth in all realms of reality, and to all fields of knowledge and that the Bible, when properly interpreted is authoritative to all of life. (Hefley, 1990, 166)

In addition,

Even adjunctive faculty and teaching fellows will be required to affirm the official documents of the school. Visiting professors will not, but the trustees must be satisfied that the visiting professor "will teach in accordance with the theological purpose of this school." (Knox, 1990, March 29, p. 10)

Also at the March 11 and 12 meeting, the trustees decided:

* That no Jew, Muslim or non-Christian speakers be invited for sanctioned chapel programs.
* That "inclusive language" not be used in
classrooms by professors.

* That books in the library dealing with human sexuality and/or homosexuality be given a "brief, cursory overview" by someone named by President Drummond and that a report be brought back to the trustees in March 1992 with a policy recommended for the ways books are placed in the library.

(Puckett, 1991, March 21, pp. 14, 15)

Only a year after these significant decisions, and only four years after the watershed trustee actions of 1987, the SEBTS administration cautioned the trustees against precipitous action and offered "sobering reports...concerning accreditation, confidence in the institution, enrollment, faculty and finances"


"What I ask of you," President Lewis A. Drummond said to the trustees in the opening session, "is to realize that the approach of the past was right for its day.

"Our situation, however has changed. We have made little progress on accreditation issues, we are still perceived with suspicion and our funding base has clearly reached a serious point.

"Nothing is more important than our
theological and financial integrity." (Puckett, 1991, March 21, pp. 14, 15)

The end was in sight for the elevated level of funding from the Southern Baptist Convention. In 1988 the Executive Board of the SBC had frozen the financial level of support for the seminary, when traditionally the formula depended on size of enrollment. At that time (1987) there were 1,073 students enrolled. Since that time enrollment had dropped drastically to about 650 students. (Briggs, 1991, July 14, p. A13)

While this window of opportunity allowed for a surplus of cash in securing the services of new administration and faculty, and providing attractive severance packages for pre-1987 faculty, something Drummond was more than willing to do, the window of opportunity was to close in 1993. When the formula would be unfrozen, "The school could face up to a 40 percent cut in its financial support" (Briggs, 1991, July 14, p. A13).

The faculty position. The effort involved in dealing with faculty-trustee-administration issues as well as the usual responsibilities in the seminary enterprise taxed everyone, but doubtless the faculty. Professor Roy DeBrand offers an example.
Changing the faculty hiring procedure...demanded faculty to spend so much time studying, writing, working to correct, suggest, offer their insights, to the faculty and trustees, that our time devoted to research and teaching and academic pursuits were severely limited. Understand what I'm saying? We had to spend so much time on policies and procedures that it robbed us of academic time. [I] couldn't tell you how many hours we met. (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)

Yet in spite of the energy invested, the impasse between faculty and the administration/trustee block appeared unyielding. At the March, 1991, trustee board meeting President Drummond proclaimed that all attempts toward reconciliation and collaboration with the faculty had been for naught. Professor Glenn Miller describes what followed.

[Drummond] delivered a strong call for what he called "theological integrity." The trustees responded by "authorizing" an investigation of the faculty. Apparently, a committee comprising the president and other administrators devised a procedure to deal with the alleged heretics. We were not informed of all the steps taken.
Although the president denied that he was organizing a witch hunt, the witches knew better. Confronted at the next faculty meeting with a demand for evidence that any member of the faculty had taught contrary to the Articles of Faith, President Drummond admitted that he had no official complaints or charges. As he and Dean L. Russ Bush understood the matter, the faculty's deviations from the Articles of Faith were matters of common repute. Wherever they went, they claimed, they heard rumors of Southeastern's liberalism. At best, these reports were based on erroneous perceptions. In investigating these allegations [Vice President for Academic Affairs] Bush professed to be helping the faculty by setting these public misapprehensions straight.


Professor Sam Balentine called this action the "straw that broke the camel's back," which would eventually lead to the resignation of many of the faculty. The pre-1987 faculty was not about to submit to any investigation akin to the Peace Committee subcommittee process of 1986 and 1987. What made the measure particularly unpalatable to Professor Balantine
was that the trustees developed the plan without the faculty, then intended to compel the faculty to adopt it. (Balentine, personal communication, August 25, 1992)

The faculty waited for the axe to fall, but the charges never came. Roy DeBrand vows he heard members of the faculty, John Eddins [and] Delos Miles, stand up in faculty meetings and in trustee briefing sessions and say, "If there is heresy here, if there is liberalism here, if there are problems here, bring charges. Bring us up on trial. If I am guilty of heresy, try me for heresy and let's let the truth be known. Otherwise, shut up about it." Of course, there was never a formal charge...it didn't exist. (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)

In spite of the absence of charges, professor Tom Halbrooks believed that a number of the faculty were indirectly censored.

We had to work on committees with board members. One that I remember most specifically was in the spring of...1991....I was faculty representative to the board of trustees, to be their official presence there, and report back to the faculty,
Gene McLeod and I were. We sat in on the Executive Committee meeting that evening and it was the worst meeting I've ever sat through in my life in terms of denunciation of faculty, wanting to get rid of faculty, and they're "tired of this faculty in their recalcitrance and unwillingness" to conform themselves to their views. Just vitriolic rhetoric against faculty. Not calling us by name, [though] they knew the two of us were sitting back there, but implying certain persons whom they had worked with on committees, of which I was one, Tom Bland, Dick Hester, Sam Balentine. Those are the ones in particular on those committees. They never used our names but...(these) had been working with the board on things like faculty selection process, trying to work with them to build some kind of compromise. We would not knuckle under to their point of view. We demanded that faculty rights be preserved, as well as trustee rights, and they were getting very put out with us.

It shows where things were [actually] headed [as early as] in '89. They're not as clear in '89 as they become at a later date. We sensed they
were going that way, but we didn't have hard
evidence until 90, 91, when that happened to Keat
[Wiles] and that awful board meeting, and, of
course, following that when...the president [was]
saying he was going to reform the school in the
image the trustees wanted: "Those that won't
shape up are going to feel the consequences."
That's in the spring of '91. (Personal
communication, June 3, 1992)

Faculty members Hewitt and Wiles (personal
communications, July 29 and July 31, 1992,
respectively) avow that students were exhorted by key
administrators to avoid or to postpone taking classes
taught by the two professors until new instructors
joined the faculty. On the other hand, the students
who were in class were changing. Professor Sam
Balentine observes that:

Our traditional feeder schools did not send us any
more students like they once were. Traditional
feeder schools would have been some of the
stronger universities like Furman, Richmond, Wake
Forest, and the like. Corresponding with that,
the number of admissions we had from Bible
Colleges and the like was going up. (Personal
Teaching became increasingly difficult according to Keat Wiles, professor of Old Testament. His assertion is that none of the original assumptions remained. In particular, students first had to be persuaded regarding the process with which he approached the study, because of the naivete and fear of critical studies of the students. (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)

Sometimes the disposition of the students appeared downright disagreeable to the teaching staff. Faculty member Robert Culpepper remembered teaching an Associate of Divinity degree course for John Eddins while the latter was on sabbatical. Culpepper was lecturing on formative factors in systematic theology, specifically theologian John MacQuarrie's third factor, tradition, and within that, the protestant, free-church, Baptist tradition. He suggested that "our [Baptist] tradition is in the process of being re-shaped very radically," especially in the areas of the scriptures, priesthood of the believer, local church autonomy, and religious liberty. Culpepper then recalled:

When I finished this, two students, very
vociferously, with anger and almost a scream in their voices, said, "We don't have to listen to this kind of garbage. This is not what we pay our Cooperative Program funds to get. [The] Southern Baptist Convention has said that that's out of line."

In other words, some resolutions had been passed at the SBC, the Peace Committee report the previous year, [and] the statement on priesthood of the believer. [In the minds of the two students,] the seminary had no right to call into question anything that they [the Convention] had done....

I want you to understand that I welcome dissent. I welcome views that are different from mine if they are done on a rational basis, they do not attack persons, that deal with ideas. But this was a different type of thing. It was saying, you are not free to talk like that at this school. It was near the end of class but I responded by saying, "I am the professor in this class. I claim my freedom to express my views. I believe that these views are theological and they relate to the subject that I've been dealing with
and they are quite relevant. The student has the privilege to disagree and to express disagreement with anything I say, but I think you are out of bounds when saying I don't have the right to say it." Now at the close of the class, a lot of students came up to me and apologized for their classmates. Later one of these students did. (Personal communication, July 29, 1992)

Professor DeBrand asserts that the quality of the students was changing as well.

[Doing what teachers are asked to do] got harder as the student body changed. As the quality of our incoming students dropped, then teaching methodology had to adapt somewhat. I was one who was reticent to change anything. I tend to have high expectations of my students and make strong demands on them and changed some the last semester. I taught, but unwillingly, without a great deal of joy about it. (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)

He explained.

When I came here, three out of five students in my classes were good, "A" and "B" students. I would have a class of 20 people, I would have one or 2
"A" students and another 6 to 9 "B" students and then 8 or 10 "C" students and one or 2 "D" students. Those ratios changed as the quality of the student body dropped: more and more "C" and "D" students.

I like to give unit quizzes when I finish one unit of material...rather than letting it pile up for a mid-term or final. I had students who couldn't pass quizzes. I'd give a pop-quiz with ten questions on a unit...and half the class or more would fail it. I'm not talking ten, twenty, thirty percent. Half the class! There'd be, one class in particular, [where] not a student in the class would make a hundred. I'd never had that before. (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)

DeBrand offered as illustrative material copies of tests. Poor and incomplete sentence construction predominated. Some words were indiscernable and the thoughts expressed often impossible to understand. DeBrand described them as representative of the new post-1988 students. He added, "When I came, this would have been unheard of" (Personal communication, July 31, 1992).

Sam Balentine of the faculty concurred.
There weren't any more bonafide A and B students, or at least there were very few. Most of them had left. "C" students are now our "A" students. The bottom had arisen. The top had departed.

So one finds the teaching situation, (of course, you have to teach students, not ideas,) one finds a teaching situation which is very demanding to say the least, and you are constantly, in the Biblical field,...fighting fights that have been won and settled a hundred years ago, and even so, doing it on a kind of first year college, last year high school, advanced Sunday School kind of level. As a colleague said in faculty meeting once, he had to ask himself, "Is this the kind of teaching I want to do? In order to be effective, I've got to do this, but if I do this, am I really teaching?"

That became a great concern to me. To look out on a classroom of faces that were just blank with disinterest and incomprehension is not [a] challenging teaching situation. I think I finally just said it's not worth it...If you try it, then you've got to spend extra hours in your office writing letters, defending yourself, apologizing,
explaining...It was absolutely exhausting.
(Personal communication, August 25, 1992)

When asked if this were an academic freedom issue, Roy DeBrand responded in the affirmative.

It could be in the sense that you are not free to teach at the level you anticipated teaching and began teaching at. [In other words,] You're not free to teach on a master's level if you don't have master's level people.

When asked if the terms of the contract between teacher and students were changed, DeBrand acknowledged, "Radically." To the statement, "The people who were responsible for that were the trustees and the new administration?" Roy DeBrand replied, "Directly."

The pre-1987 faculty also felt their status was diminished by hiring decisions of the administration and trustees. In particular, they maintained that new faculty and administrators were added at rank and salary levels incommensurate with their experience or training, and, in particular, relative to the existing rank and compensation of pre-1987 faculty. (Personal communications: Michael Hawn, July 29, 1992; Roy DeBrand, July 31, 1992; Eugene McLeod, August 25, 1992;
Sam Balentine, August 26, 1992) The policy of the Lolley administration to publish the salaries of seminary personnel had quickly been discontinued by the Drummond administration, adding to the sense of suspicion and estrangement on the part of the professors. (Personal communication: James Good, August 26, 1992) Moreover, while elaborate landscaping projects beautified the campus, the faculty received no merit pay increases. (Michael Hawn, Personal communication, July 29, 1992)

In short, the pre-1987 faculty felt shut out of the network of information. To them, policies and decisions appeared arbitrary. In addition, they believed personnel decisions did and would increasingly favor those of the same theological persuasion as the trustees and administration.

This was certainly the conclusion of Keat Wiles. In spite of President Drummond's clear message that Wiles had no future at SEBTS, when a vacancy in Old Testament was declared in the spring of 1990, Wiles applied for it. He hoped that the trustee-faculty-administration attempts at dialogue, especially where the new faculty appointment process was concerned, had thawed the impasse. In Wiles there was born renewed
hope for appointment.

Indeed, Wiles did make the short list. However, Wiles says, the questions of the committee were "most revealing."

Specifically, I was asked for a judgment on the historicity of the floating axe-head, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and Jesus' competence as an historian. (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)

Three had been selected for the short list: a graduate student from Duke University; Steve Andrews, a graduate student from Hebrew Union College; and Wiles. Wiles thought he stacked up pretty well against the competition, saying, "I thought I was the best qualified of all three of them. I had finished my degree, I had teaching experience...." He added, "We came to the interview...it was kind of a strange thing. They took us all to dinner together with the Instruction Committee, all six of us (personal communication, July 31, 1992).

Wiles suspected that Drummond was under pressure by the trustees to elect a professor at the March meeting. Within a certain amount of time Drummond had to announce who his candidate would be. Then, still
more time was required for the faculty to evaluate his choice. The day preceding the faculty meeting of February, 1991, Drummond called Wiles into his office to say that Wiles was not his choice. (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)

The following day at the February, 1991, meeting of the Faculty President Drummond announced that he was going to nominate Mr. Steve Andrews to the Board of Trustees for election to the Faculty. Mr. Andrews was a doctoral candidate at Hebrew Union College at Cincinnati, OH. He had no full-time teaching experience, and was regarded by the Faculty as the least qualified candidate interviewed for the position. In my judgment, two factors probably determined his choice: he was an alumnus (Th.M.) of SEBTS; he gave assurances to Trustee Robert Crowley, who called him sometime before the interviews with prospective candidates, that he was indeed an inerrantist. (Mr. Andrews informed me personally of this fact upon his arrival at SEBTS in August, 1991.) ("Chronology of Institutional Relationship: John Keating Wiles and SEBTS," unpublished, undated)

Keat Wiles completed his responsibilities as a
member of the Faculty of SEBTS at commencement exercises in May, 1991. Wiles reflected on the meaning of his being passed over this way.

I think the faculty felt like...if they could not elect me with the new search process, when given the applicant pool, I was the best qualified, on the short list, then it was clear that the process could be manipulated toward their [the trustees] own end....All the guidelines were followed but the spirit of the process was not followed...We were playing with a stacked deck. (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)

As Tom Jackson, the pastor of the Wake Forest Baptist Church on campus, remembered it,

When the faculty rated the three member pool [of candidates], Wiles got an 8.5; another received a 6; and the third got a 3. The "3" got it. The faculty felt that this was evidence that the process was a done deal. The last candidate was Crowley's pick and the process was regarded as a charade. (Personal communication, July 8, 1992)

Roy DeBrand comments:

Keat Wiles was "done dirty," as we say out in the country....They absolutely decided they didn't
want him because he didn't teach the way they wanted him to teach, and refused to consider him....[The interview] was a matter of form. Everybody knew he would not make it. From my perspective they did Keat as dirty as anything I've ever seen. (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)

Malcolm Tolbert exclaimed, "The reason he wasn't kept on was because he didn't fit into the fundamentalist mold...He's so superior to anybody they are going to get!" (Personal communication, October 30, 1992)

Trustee Robert Crowley offered simply, "We refused to grant him tenure because it was obvious that he was a liberal professor. He was not elected faculty, he was appointed faculty, so we were completely within our rights there" (personal communication, October 19, 1992).

As for the rest of the faculty, finding a position outside of Southeastern was increasingly difficult. Occasionally opportunities presented themselves, but they were not attractive in light of the Southeastern difficulties. Robert Dale, a former faculty member, explains:
Delos Miles and I were both offered department chairs at Southern and both turned them down because in part we both saw the same thing happening to Southern that had just happened at Southeastern and we didn't want to go through that again. (Personal communication, May 11, 1992)

Yet there seem to have been other curbs to faculty mobility. Dale offers a case in point.

Glenn Miller interviewed with Wesley Seminary in D.C. about a church history post. They turned away from him. There was another Southern Baptist in the consideration and a third person, and the job went to the third person. When Glenn talked to some friends on that faculty about why he was passed over he was told that in the final analysis anybody that had been through what he had been through at Southeastern would not be a productive teacher for at least two years. He was bypassed in part for that reason. (Personal communication, May 11, 1992)

Professor Bill Clemons offers his own example.

I was...invited to accept a faculty position at [Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at] Louisville [Clemons' alma mater]. [Clemons
replied,] "In this climate I don't think I've got a snowball's chance in hades, but you do what you want to do." So they submitted it. It went through the faculty review process, passed on.... The Dean of the School of Christian Education, Bill Rogers, thought, well, let me check with the chair of the faculty selection committee and, without mentioning my name, he went through all my qualifications. The guy said, "Yeah, that's the kind of guy we would want. We'd want that one."

Then he mentioned Southeastern. And [the fundamentalist chairman of the faculty selection committee] said, "Oh, no. Anybody who has worked for Randall Lolley will not be on this faculty."

In fact, if you look, there were 35 of us on the faculty here when I came. Seven of that 35 are left [1992]. Not a single one of us are employed by Southern Baptists. (Bill Clemons, personal communication, July 31, 1992)

Malcolm Tolbert offered that "The younger ones [of the faculty] paid a heavy price" because they had not established themselves as fully in the larger academic community and found it more difficult to find other employment. Michael Hawn described pre-1987 faculty as
"untouchables" (Personal communication, July 29, 1992). Other senior members of the faculty were tantalizingly close to retirement and found themselves unwilling to uproot.

Bill Clemons' observation above is an interesting statistic in that while former Southeastern faculty appear unemployable in Southern Baptist life, some were picked up to teach at: Harvard Divinity School, Princeton Divinity School, Bangor Theological Seminary, Perkins School of Theology at Southern Methodist University, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary in Chicago, Duke Divinity School, the International Theological Center in Atlanta, and the Baptist Theological Seminary in Richmond, a part of the Richmond Theological Center Consortium.

When they could find positions, and sometimes when they could not, rather handsome arrangements were made by the administration in order to allow them and encourage them to leave. (Robert Dale, former academic coordinator, personal communication, May 11, 1992) Tom Halbrooks reports that there were rumors that the Vice President for Academic Affairs was not happy about the "deals" which were arranged to move faculty out.

He wanted to get rid of the faculty and not give
them anything, fire them if necessary. But Lewie Drummond wanted them to go willingly, and he was willing to cut deals, and the business manager, Paul Fletcher, was backing [him] up and encouraging Drummond in that regard. (Personal communication, June 3, 1992)

Halbrooks believes that Drummond and Fletcher agreed that these settlements were better "PR" and avoided potential legal confrontations. (Personal communication, June 3, 1992) Drummond described the settlements as "divorce with a bit of honor" (personal communication, July 10, 1992).

By the late summer of 1991, they were leaving in droves. By the end of the 1992 school year ten to seventeen of what was now a 27 member faculty were expected to leave. Robert Crowley, fundamentalist trustee from Rockville, Maryland, said, "Obviously, the faculty has pretty much given up." Furman Hewitt, an ethics professor who was taking early retirement, acknowledged, "It's like the curtain is coming down on the last act and everybody is taking their final bows" (Briggs, 1991, August 2, p. B4).

Fundamentalist trustee James DeLoach reflected on the mass of faculty departures.
The thing that is so ironic, if Randall [Lolley] and the faculty that was there at that time had been willing to work with the changes that were taking place in the Convention all the things that happened at Southeastern would never have happened...Now, the situation has come to the place that there won't be balance on the faculty. What you are going to have is an inerrantist faculty. That's the way it's moving now. (Personal communication, October 26, 1992)

President Lewis Drummond mulled it over in these terms.

The resolution [of the faculty appointment process conundrum] was...they left. I may be naive and unrealistic, but, you know, I really thought I could go in there and under God's grace, wisdom, etc., and effect some reconciliation. It took me almost two years to finally say, and you don't know how loathe I was to say this, there is no reconciliation. The cleavage is so deep, there is no reconciliation...It was one of the traumas of my life. (Personal communication, July 10, 1992) Lyman Ferrell did not perceive Drummond as quite so aggrieved.
I heard him speak at a retirement dinner [for three departing SEBTS faculty]. He had no sense [of rapport, relationship] with the faculty for a long time. He said, "Tonight is one of those nights when "ambivalence" is the word that comes to mind." He said, "It's like that feeling the young man had when he saw his mother-in-law driving his brand new Cadillac over a cliff...."

In my view it was stupidity. (Personal communication, July 30, 1992)

Trustee Robert Crowley greeted all this with zest, saying, "I have a directory, an '85-'86 [Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary] directory, and I've marked them off one by one as they've resigned" (personal communication, October 19, 1992).

For those who remained at Southeastern, the changing reputation of the institution offered new dilemmas. Michael Hawn said, "The institution itself, taking stands, formal stands on issues, everything from abortion to whether it's Pullen [Memorial Baptist Church]'s situation or whatever, but allowing themselves certain political stands" made him feel "chained" to positions not his own. Professor Sam Balentine admitted,
A number of us felt that we were the laughingstock of the academic community. When one goes to professional meetings and the issue of one's dean comes up and one is asked, in an informal setting, "Is your dean really an inerrantist?...How do you devise a curriculum? How do you accomplish the ends of the degree? How is it possible in an academic setting?" There is no defense for that. There was a sense in which to wear the Southeastern badge at a professional meeting was...a matter of shame. (Personal communication, August 25, 1992)

Balentine also illustrated by noting that a long standing relationship between the faculties of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary and the Duke Divinity School was affected.

We have a sister relationship with Duke Divinity School. One way that manifests itself is that every year we have a joint Duke/Southeastern faculty dinner. One year it will be here and they will supply the speaker. The next year it will be there and we will supply the speaker...That stopped two or three years ago, in large part because of Duke's exasperation with our dean and
our president, and because I think Duke didn't think it was in their best interest to continue the affiliation anymore. The public image of Southeastern is so diametrically opposed to what Duke is and wants to be. (Personal communication, August 25, 1992)

The "fundamentalist factor" affected a graduate of Southeastern, and then Balentine himself.

We had a graduate from here, whose name I could give you if it's important, went to UNC [The University of North Carolina] - Chapel Hill, trying to go, applied to the Ph.D. program in Biblical studies, one of our brightest students. In the interview process he was asked, in view of his graduation from Southeastern Seminary, had he ever been exposed to the "critical method." The student, in reporting this conversation to me, interpreted that question and others related to it as suggesting that he was ill-prepared for the program for which he was applying and [the interviewers] felt it was necessary [for him] to respond in writing in a fairly lengthy explanation of the courses he had had, the teachers under whom he had studied, the books that he had read....
The University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, is a neighbor school. We have been sending graduates there for years. They have known and would have known that we have been so much in the press that they, I assume, had begun to evaluate Southeastern in terms of its public image. The public image of the place is a conservative, indeed a fundamentalist institution, close minded, rigorously opposed to the kind of critical preparation for advanced work that a Ph.D. requires. It's one thing to say a student is not able in the sense that he doesn't have the scores or the ability to enter the program. It is another thing to discount the student, to raise red flags about the student simply because he or she is a graduate of Southeastern....

I, myself, in a professional meeting was having breakfast with a colleague from UNC with whom I have had a relationship for a number of years. We were joined at breakfast by a younger colleague of his whom I had never met and who had been teaching a year or two or three. This younger colleague proceeded to quiz me on my preparation, on my orientation to Biblical
studies, my acceptance or resistance to the critical method. They were the kinds of questions that were insulting under any circumstances, let alone by a colleague in a professional meeting. This was an SBL (Society of Biblical Literature) meeting in Atlanta. (Personal communication, August 25, 1992)

The accrediting agencies act. In June, 1990, the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) affirmed what it called "conciliatory steps" taken by the administration and trustees. The threat of probation was lifted. Notwithstanding the positive movement on the part of the seminary, several "notations," or formal concerns, were identified. They included:

1. faculty members are unduly diverted from their essential task;
2. the governing board exercises inappropriate control over the administration and faculty; and,
3. the general tone of the school impairs the capacity to provide significant theological education and ministerial training.

("Southeastern seminary retains," 1990, August, p. 7)

Apparently soured on the relationship with the
accrediting agencies, a motion was considered at the March, 1991, Board meeting, calling "for legal counsel regarding the rights of the trustees, as well as the possibility of lawsuit against the accrediting agencies if accreditation were withdrawn" (Puckett, 1991, March 21, pp. 14, 15). The motion was withdrawn.

James R. Deloach, trustee from Texas and former chair of the board, said he "wanted more than a report" to the SBC Executive Committee.

"This thing is greater than Southeastern Seminary; it affects all Southern Baptists," DeLoach contended.

He offered a substitute motion which, if accreditation is lost, called for:

* Withdrawal of all financial support from ATS and SACS.

* A request to all other SBC seminaries to withdraw support from ATS and SACS.

* A request to the SBC Executive Committee to look into an accrediting agency for Southern Baptist institutions. (Puckett, 1991, March 21, pp. 14, 15)

It is not known what impact, if any, this had on the sentiments of the Association of Theological
Schools toward Southeastern. In any case, at the June 10 - 12, 1991, annual meeting, ATS reversed itself. The agency was not only considering probation but why it should not remove its accreditation altogether. (Briggs, 1991, June 23, p. A11) The accrediting commission decided to visit the seminary once again in February, at which time the school "is to show cause why it should not be placed on probation or have its accreditation withdrawn" (Warner, 1991, June 27, p. 2).

The [first] "show cause" order was removed in June 1990 after the seminary "made several positive steps" to resolve its problems, said Daniel Aleshire, associate director of accreditation for ATS.

However, the most recent action of ATS said, "The situation at the seminary may very well be worse" than when ATS began its investigation in 1988. Instead of resolving differences between faculty and trustees, "Some administrative judgments and actions have seriously impeded progress toward resolving the differences," ATS said.

The Association of Theological Schools, one of two agencies that accredits the seminary,
requires that a seminary demonstrate that its three internal constituencies - trustees, administrators and faculty - share responsibility for governing the school.

"A school cannot function effectively for very long if these groups don't have some capacity for sharing responsibilities and trusting one another," explained Aleshire, a former professor at Southern Seminary. (Warner, 1991, June 27, pp. 2, 9)

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, at its annual meeting December 5, 1991, in New Orleans imposed probation on Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. The probation was placed on Southeastern for a maximum of two years, when the school would either be removed from probation or suffer the loss of its accreditation standing.

"This is the final and most severe of our three sanctions," explained James Rogers, executive director of SACS' commission on colleges. "If (the violations) are not corrected, they are removed from the association." (Warner, 1991, December 19, p. 1).

Although SACS offers counsel and assistance
in helping Southeastern solve its problems, Rogers said, the burden of proof is on the school. "Southeastern needs to show some significant improvement by the time the committee gets there in April," he said. ("Southeastern receives ATS," 1992, July 9, p. 7)

Rogers identified violations in the following areas: Southeastern's lack of research and long-range planning, trustee involvement in the selection of faculty, and the diminished faculty role. Undoubtedly a by-product of the marked changes at the seminary and related to the first criticism, reporter Greg Warner wrote that full-time enrollment was down to 434 in the fall term, about half its pre-1987 level, and financial troubles were escalating. (1991, December 19, p. 1)

In June of 1992 Southeastern did receive notice from the Association of Theological Schools. The communication advised that, in the absence of any positive response to the "show-cause" ruling in 1991, the school was placed on probation.

The Association of Theological Schools Bulletin (40, part 7, Membership List, p. 20), July, 1993, continued to list Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary as being on "Probation: June, 1992 - June,
1994. The issues cited were:

Faculty

N2.1: Faculty is inadequate for one or more degree programs offered. (p. 28)

N2.2 Faculty members are unduly diverted from their essential task. (p. 28)

Administration/Governance

N3.6 The governing board exercises inappropriate control over the administration and faculty. (p. 28)

Evaluation

N7.1 The evaluation procedures are insufficiently developed or implemented in this institution. (p. 29)

General

N14.1 General tone of the school impairs the capacity to provide significant theological education and ministerial training. (p. 30)

A new administration. A great many felt that Lewis Drummond, from beginning to end, was asked to lead Southeastern Seminary as an interim person. (Lyman Ferrell, personal communication, July 30, 1992)

Rumors began to circulate that Drummond was making plans to retire or feeling pressure to do the same
because of problematic financial conditions at the school, academic and accreditation issues, and declining enrollment. The fact that he had turned 65 made the notion of an impending transition appear all the more plausible. (Warner, 1992, January 23)

Drummond's spending practices had been under fire as well. This time the salvos had come from his own trustees and through editorials in the fundamentalist newspaper, the The Southern Baptist Advocate (Briggs, 1991, June 23, p. All).

According to trustees, Drummond spent about $200,000 - eight times the amount allowed - for renovations to his house; charged the seminary for his wife's travel expenses; purchased $108 worth of cosmetics at Belks [department store]; and stayed in plush hotels, including a $160 room at a resort in West Virginia. (Pipkin, 1991, April 7, p. 1A)

It appeared that it was time for Drummond to go. January 30, after four years in office, Lewis Drummond announced his retirement. This time the trustees "defended their transitional president" (Warner, 1992, February 6, p. 10):

"We called him to do an impossible task,"
summarized Robert Crowley of Rockville, Md., who chaired the committee that recommended Drummond for president. "Lewis Drummond would have succeeded if the faculty had cooperated...."

"Dr. Drummond has labored under extremely difficult circumstances," said [Roger] Ellsworth, a pastor from Benton, Ill. "We are concerned about the SACS probation, and we are concerned about student recruitment and faculty recruitment. But I do not lay that at his feet" (Warner, 1992, February 6, p. 10).

Regarding Drummond's proposal for a retirement package:

One trustee said Drummond got almost everything he asked for.

"He was very pleased," said another. (Warner, 1992, February 6, p. 10).

A few months later, on May 11, Paige Patterson, the president of Criswell Bible College and a primary architect of the fundamentalist takeover of the Southern Baptist Convention, was elected president of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. The vote by secret ballot was 24 to 1.

"We didn't surprise anyone, did we?" chairman
(Roger) Ellsworth said of the trustees' selection.

As recently as last June, Patterson said his role in what he calls the "conservative resurgence" in the SBC would make him unelectable as head of any SBC agency.

But Southeastern trustees, anxious to solidify the seminary's conservative image, concluded Patterson's qualifications to fill Southeastern's specific needs "outweighed" those considerations, Ellsworth said.

While the election of Patterson will "give a definite cast to the seminary." Ellsworth said, Southeastern already was well on its way toward establishing its conservative identity "no matter who we picked as president." (Warner, 1992, April 30, p. 3)

According to reporter Robert Dilday, "questions about Patterson's theology never emerged, an omission [Trustee Chairperson Roger] Ellsworth said was surprising. However, one trustee quipped, "Do you ask the Pope if he's Catholic?" (Dilday, 1992, May 21, pp. 6, 7)

Former faculty member Tom Halbrooks did not see Patterson's election as, from his perspective, a
troublesome thing.

[Patterson] is such a known person and his stances are so well known that it will clarify for many persons who couldn't see what was going on, it will clarify what really had been going on since '87...I am just glad it's clear. (Personal communication, June 3, 1992)

Patterson identified four critical areas which required his immediate attention: satisfying the accreditation requirements, student recruitment, financial support ("New President Announced," 1992, Summer, p. 2), and rebuilding the faculty (which was down to twelve from a high of 35) (Dilday, 1992, May 21, pp. 6, 7).

Under Patterson the enrollment did begin to grow, up from 546, (Association of Theological Schools, 1992 - 1993, p. 90) to 628 with 153 new students, according to Sheldon Alexander, the school's registrar ("SBC seminary enrollment," 1993, January 21, p. 12). The faculty began to grow as well, with a great many new professors following Patterson from Criswell Bible College. Michael Hawn was not encouraged.

Academic freedom is imperiled in the sense that I know of at least two of the positions in Pastoral
Care [where] he's bringing in people who don't even have terminal work in this area....That's an infringement of academic freedom out of ignorance. One is a clinical psychologist, a counselor. Well, that is not pastoral care. One has a degree in New Testament, but he has done some "ministry." That's a problem. (Personal communication, July 29, 1992)

The Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary Vision for a New Day, the institutional catalogue for 1992 - 1993, advertised the school as "Biblically Sound, Distinctively Conservative, Spiritually Alive."

In a paragraph entitled "Statement of Mission," it reports:

Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary is an institution of higher learning established and supported by the Southern Baptist Convention in order to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once and for all delivered to the saints."
The Seminary maintains an administration and faculty of God-called members whose convictions and calling reflect consistent adherence to the institution's Articles of Faith....

The Seminary is committed to the complete
veracity, inerrancy, and infallibility of the Bible as an essential foundation for effective Christian ministry and service (p. 2). In a section called "Faculty Profile," the same document proclaims the instructional staff:

Accept, affirm, and subscribe to the Seminary's doctrinal "Abstract of Principles;" further, they are guided doctrinally by the Baptist Faith and Message of 1963; they affirm and teach the Bible as the inspired and infallible Word of God, a perfect treasure of divine instruction, with God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter, the true center of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and religious opinions should be tried. (p. 6)

As of 1993, over eighty of 120 employees of Southeastern Seminary in 1987 have resigned or retired. Eighty percent of the full time faculty members in that year have left (Bill Clemons, personal communication, July 31, 1992), and of those who remain, most are nearing retirement.

The vision of its original leadership replaced; a once loyal, immovable faculty cast into diaspora; a
learning community refashioned in a new image; a revolution of expectations in the classroom; Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, its mission, ethos, and people, have changed.
Chapter 5

Analysis of the Study

Appraisal of the status of academic freedom in a particular context requires consideration of multiple concerns, to which theological education and church related higher education contribute additional complexities. That being assumed, the organization of this analysis will be as though one is observing a singular event from several perspectives. Transforming an event of multiple dimensions into one analysis will occasionally and necessarily entail sifting certain events several times through different issues relevant to academic freedom. This disclaimer is offered because a certain amount of redundancy is required in the evaluation which follows.

The Conclusions of Others

Was the academic freedom of the faculty violated at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary? As fundamentalist-conservatives assumed a majority on the board of trustees of the seminary and concurrently
attempted to turn the school in a more conservative direction, was academic freedom compromised?

From start to finish, the fundamentalist trustees and the administration elected by them have steadfastly said, no, academic freedom was not compromised. One such statement professed, "No professor at Southeastern has been fired, nor are any firings contemplated by the Board. No one has been restricted or censured for what is being taught" ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, p. 43).

The Rev. Robert D. Crowley of Rockville, Maryland, chairman of the board of trustees, called the [academic freedom] question "a complete red herring." He quoted a description of academic freedom as "a large pasture a horse can graze upon. As long as he stays within the fence, he can graze anywhere he wants to.... There will be no witch hunts and no faculty firings," Mr. Crowley said, so long as professors adhere to the Articles of Faith they signed when they originally came to the school. "The way the institution will change is through attrition...."

The new president [Lewis Drummond] doesn't [sic] share the faculty's views on the impairment
of academic freedom. "I don't know where in the world you could go that there would be more academic freedom than here. There has been no intrusion on the classroom whatsoever." (Payne, 1989, March 2 - 9, p. 5)

In a 1992 interview Drummond added:

[The seminary was] never cited for that [violations of academic freedom by the accrediting agencies]....That issue fell by the wayside after the first on-site visit by the accrediting agencies. Academic freedom never became an issue at all....Professors were always given complete freedom to investigate and to look into every area of academic exercise....[There was] never any censure. I never even heard any criticism of the articles...in our theological journal....and I never heard the issue raised by the trustees in terms of publications or research or any such thing.

Obviously, a number of the trustees were not elated...about some of the theological positions of some of the faculty, but in any attempt to intrude into the classroom, this is not the case. (Personal communication, July 10, 1992)
Alternatively, former faculty member Richard Hester was certain academic freedom had indeed been violated.

I don't think they [Drummond and the fundamentalist trustees] have any grasp of what academic freedom is about. It's really a foreign idea to them. There's nothing in their universe that really accommodates that idea. A good example would be Jim DeLoach, who became chairman of the board of trustees, [who said] that Southeastern Seminary has been given perfect academic freedom within certain bounds or limits.... Our response to that metaphor was that he didn't understand that academic freedom allowed one to extend beyond the fence and think things and might explore things that might be heterodox.

(Personal communication, November 4, 1992)

This appears to be the general disposition of the faculty according to a 1989 survey by Suzanne Lavenue. In that study, Lavenue asked faculty to respond to the following statement: "I feel that the controversy within the SBC has affected academic freedom in this way." The suggested responses and the Southeastern faculty reactions were as follows: A) no effect (0
responses, or 0 percent); B) few restrictions (1, or 6 percent); C) moderate restrictions (2, or 12 percent); D) severe restrictions (13, or 76 percent); E) enhanced academic freedom. (0, or 0 percent). Therefore, 88 percent of faculty responding to the Lavenue survey believed that their academic freedom had been encumbered with moderate or severe restrictions.

The accreditation agencies also had something to say about the transition at the seminary effected by the fundamentalist trustees. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, identified violations in the following areas: Southeastern's lack of research and long-range planning, trustee involvement in the selection of faculty, and the diminished faculty role. (Warner, 1991, December 19, p. 1)

In June of 1992, Southeastern received notice from the Association of Theological Schools placing them on probation. The issues cited were, by category (from the Association of Theological Schools, July, 1993, Bulletin 40, part 7, Membership List):

Faculty

N2.1: Faculty is inadequate for one or more degree programs offered. (p.28)

N2.2 Faculty members are unduly diverted
from their essential task. (p. 28)

Administration/Governance

N3.6 The governing board exercises inappropriate control over the administration and faculty. (p. 28)

Evaluation

N7.1 The evaluation procedures are insufficiently developed or implemented in this institution. (p. 29)

General

N14.1 General tone of the school impairs the capacity to provide significant theological education and ministerial training. (p. 30)

While not specifically articulated in terms of academic freedom, these issues resonate with those relevant to the concerns of Robert M. MacIver, which will be addressed later, and the American Association of University Professors. The AAUP, as does MacIver, holds to a definition of academic freedom concerned with a more expansive breadth of issues in academic life than simply faculty dismissals. In its assessment of SEBTS, the AAUP investigating committee found:

[Among the fundamentalist adherents at Southeastern] there seems to be a severe
misunderstanding or violent twisting of the idea
[of academic freedom]. Academic freedom is more
than not firing or censuring someone: it is an
ideal whose translation into reality is
authenticated by the whole of the behavior of
those responsible for maintaining it. And here
the performance of the board and the president has
been so inimical to the fundamental assumptions on
which the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic
Freedom and Tenure is based that it is impossible
in most cases to find a passage in the 1940
Statement that will specifically underpin an
allegation of violation; a major exception is the
action of the board's Committee on Instruction to
deny reappointment to the Silers because of an
alleged overly tolerant attitude toward
homosexuality, an action clearly at odds with the
1940 Statement's assurance of academic freedom for
all members of the faculty.

[Nevertheless,] the investigating committee
of the AAUP found that "academic freedom at
Southeastern has been placed in peril by a series
of actions taken and statements made by its
trustees and its president....(:)
(1)...the systematic reduction of faculty participation in matters that rightfully fall within its province....

(2) The interjection by the trustees, in making faculty appointments and granting tenure, of unauthorized doctrinal standards...

(3) The abrupt refusal to reappoint part-time teachers, recommended by faculty and president, on casual and ill-informed grounds...

(4) The dogged persistence - in violation of stated rules and by misrepresenting faculty action - in hiring a dean adjudged unanimously by the faculty to be unacceptable on scholarly grounds as well as on other criteria...sent a signal not only that faculty opinion on matters on which it can speak authoritatively is of little or no account but also that doctrinal correctness, narrowly measured, is of far greater significance than openness of mind.

(5) The repeated promises that the trustees will hire no one in the future who is not an inerrantist may not have been intended to intimidate, but they have intimidated, and have put faculty members of another theological
persuasion on notice that they are not wanted or trusted because they do not adhere to a position that is assumed to have a monopoly on rightness. ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, pp. 43, 44).

The trustees and former president Lewis Drummond hold fast to their defense that academic freedom was not compromised at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. The faculty which had been in place during the Lolley administration differs, as does the American Association of University Professors. In some ways the notations of the accrediting agencies, the Association of Theological Schools and the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges, which led to placing Southeastern on probation, resonate with the AAUP issues articulated as infringements on academic freedom.

The Southeastern Experience Considered

In his text Academic Freedom in Our Time, Robert M. MacIver indicates that academic freedom is first "the freedom of the educator to investigate, to draw conclusions, and to impart his (or her) knowledge." He adds more to be considered, however, in assessing the vitality of academic freedom.
Anything that interferes with this freedom, either as a direct curb or by its indirect repressiveness, comes within our purview. We shall be concerned with "security" measures as well as with censorship, with tenure and status conditions as well as with authoritarian controls and the penalization of nonconformity, with the regulation of the academy as a whole as well as with interferences and charges directed against the individual teacher (p. 9).

MacIver's themes have been sorted into a series of assessments in order to measure the academic freedom experience of the faculty at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary during the period 1979 to 1989. They are grouped in three sections: the Educational Process, the Professional Context, and Policy, Power and Procedure.

The Educational Process

General comments. It must be observed from the outset that the increasing absence of collegiality between faculty and trustees as more fundamentalist trustees were added to the board; the open conflict between SEBTS faculty, students and administration on the one hand and trustees, denominational figures, and
some students on the other; the significant changes at the school in terms of governance, ethos and community in such a relatively short period of time; taken altogether, diverted a great deal of the attention, time and energy of the faculty. Both individual teacher and institutional effectiveness were diminished. In that basic sense, pure distraction sorely tested the academic freedom of the faculty to investigate in their fields, draw conclusions, write and teach.

During the season in which they were spending a great deal of time on Peace Committee responses, Dean Morris Ashcraft met with Randall Lolley frequently. He offered this reflection and recollection:

If you are subject every year of being attacked by something, you waste your energies on that instead of doing your job....Along about '86, '87, I went in...[to Randall Lolley's] office one day, and said, "Randall, if these people keep pressure on us for two more years they can fire us legitimately for incompetence for not doing our work. I'm not doing my dean's job. I'm wasting my time running down here to your office with this kind of crap." He said, "I know, Ashcraft. It's
the same way with me." I said, "I've quit functioning as the academic officer of an institution." (Morris Ashcraft, personal communication, August 25, 1992)

Were faculty members free to investigate in their fields? It appears that faculty at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary were generally permitted to research in whatever directions their interests and expertise led them, until things began to heat up in Southern Baptist Convention life, sometime before 1987.

During that season, former professor Tom Graves served as editor of the Faith and Mission, a faculty publication at SEBTS. He claims that there existed an undoubtable tentativeness on the part of faculty when it came to taking on certain writing projects. In his words, "I got turned down on ideas for more than one article, by more than one person...saying, 'I'd better not print that because of what is happening in SBC life'" (Personal communication, June 6, 1992). In short, faculty members did not feel completely free to investigate in their fields because of the potential backlash. The range of possibilities was restricted, and, with it, academic freedom.

Were the conclusions of study and research freely
drawn? When the editor of John Durham's Sunday School commentary on Job changed the words, meaning, and intent of the author without his knowledge or his permission, academic freedom was compromised. Durham's original conclusions, as he would have expressed them, were not allowed a public review. This is censorship and a compromise of academic freedom. However, the research question specifically invites reflection concerning the role of the trustees.

The Southeastern trustees insisted that the Job Sunday School lessons be placed on the agenda of the fall, 1985, board meeting. Upon their review, the trustees issued a "mild censure of John [Durham] for not making...clear his belief, in a personal devil" (Randall Lolley, personal communication, August 26, 1992). This seems odd when the conclusions of his study on the Satan of Job do not compel this self disclosure. Furthermore, and particularly significant, no definitive article on Satan exists in the seminary documents. It appears, in both respects, that a particular belief was required of Professor Durham, and in that sense, it cannot be said that the conclusions of study and research were freely drawn.

During the decade of rapid change at the seminary,
the faculty was under pressure to introduce a balance of viewpoints in class. According to Professors Stewart and Hewett (personal communications, September 9 and July 29, 1992, respectively), they did attempt to add conservative and fundamentalist writings and reflections to their lectures, as well as assigned readings sympathetic to this perspective. Later, Stewart regretted this adjustment.

The biggest compromise I made in general was that I included among readings and treated with a seriousness positions that I really regarded as almost, in some cases, as foolish and in some cases as subpar...In that sense I was shaped. (Personal Communication, September 9, 1992)

Prior to this it appears that Stewart and possibly others would not have considered such material at all. Conspicuous insistence from vocal fundamentalist sources and the desire to accommodate calls on both sides for balance in the classroom, persuaded a departure from what Stewart regarded as the highest he had to offer in scholarship and teaching. The conclusions of his advanced study and research, regardless of where he fit in the spectrum of Southern Baptist scholarship, were manipulated in order to
The Harvard Law Review describes academic freedom as "that aspect of intellectual liberty concerned with the peculiar institutional needs of the academic community" (cited in Hunt & Connelly, 1969, p. 53). The Review goes on to justify that need.

The claim that scholars are entitled to particular immunity from ideological coercion is premised on a conception of the university as a community of scholars engaged in the pursuit of knowledge, collectively and individually, both within the classroom and without, and on the pragmatic conviction that the invaluable service rendered by the university to society can be performed only in an atmosphere entirely free from administrative, political, or ecclesiastical constraints on thought and expression.

Therefore, the influence of external and internal forces on the seminary, including the board of trustees, on professors Durham and Stewart influenced the conclusions of study and research. This constituted a violation of their liberty to freely draw conclusions, render judgments, and make decisions regarding the content and nature of what they shared.
with the community.

Were faculty free to share their knowledge and skills? The Association of Theological Schools asserts that the professor of theology "should have freedom in the classroom to discuss his subject in which he has competence and may claim to be a specialist without harrassment or limitations" (cited in Hunt and Connelly, 1969, p. 95).

Even elaborate haranguing from a critical public or peers does not justify the claim that academic freedom has been compromised. The key is whether the security of the learning exchange is preserved, both for the sake of the individuals participating in the academic community experience, and for the community's interest in its business: the pursuit and sharing of knowledge. Specifically, where the academician is concerned, is any antagonistic posture or action meant to entrap and/or denigrate the status and security of the teacher and what the teacher has to share?

Former professor Tom Halbrooks believes that the SEBTS faculty members "sort of put a muzzle on themselves. They didn't want to cause trouble" (personal Communication, June 3, 1992). If this report is true, then, in a sense, academic freedom had been
inhibited at Southeastern for some time. In the interest of this study, the question which arises is, "Did the sense of restriction ease or increase?" It increased in the period of this study.

In 1984, Paige Patterson, a fundamentalist leader, divulged that, "Any time these people [faculty members] talk, we have someone there listening and sending us tapes" (cited in James, 1989, p. 31). Living under the microscope of antagonists without, students recruited as spies to report on everything within the classroom (see the Malcolm Tolbert incident, pages 285 and 286 of this document), and the increasingly militant interruptions in class by fundamentalist students (Lyman Ferrell, personal communication, July 30, 1992; Robert Culpepper, personal communication, July 29, 1992, et al.) created an atmosphere of suspicion and confrontation rather than trust and mutual interest in learning. The possibility of the faculty freely sharing their knowledge and skills in this increasingly hostile environment was severely restricted.

This was also true in faculty publications. Professor Tom Graves reported that the controversy stifled interest in publishing.

[There was] an awful lot that could have been
printed that never has been. There are books that were written seven years ago that still aren't finished, because of persons not wanting yet to get those published. (Personal Communication, June 6, 1992)

The Southeastern Chapter of the AAUP issued a news release October 5, 1987, which alerted readers that:

Professors and students at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary are facing a threat from forces opposed to the principle of academic freedom. The faculty's right to teach theological students without fear of harassment is threatened by members of the Board of Trustees who want to dictate precisely how and what these professors are permitted to teach. ("Response of the Board," Exhibit M)

Saying it doesn't make it so. However, the clear intent of the fundamentalist trustees to mandate inerrancy as the reference point of choice in the classroom is well documented in this story. This and the evidence cited above appears to suggest the Southeastern AAUP Chapter conclusion is correct. The faculty was not free to share their knowledge and skills without significant repercussions. For
instance, in the case of John Durham again, he received a trustee review and "mild censure" (Randall Lolley, personal communication, August 26, 1992).

The Professional Context

Was anyone censured directly? Indirectly? The term censor describes a circumstance where "unpleasant ideas, memories, etc. are kept from entering consciousness" ("Censor," Webster's new world dictionary of the American language, p. 229). To censor does not necessarily imply a value judgement, but certainly an action. "Censure" is broader in import, suggesting "a condemning as wrong; strong disapproval 2. a judgment or resolution condemning a person for misconduct" (Webster's, p. 230). The terms censor and censure are related etymologically, for both stem from the Latin, "censere," meaning to "assess," "tax, value, or judge" (Webster's new world dictionary of the American language, pp. 229, 230). To censor or to censure means to burden, to devalue, pronounce judgment, restrict, and/or, by design or default, to punish. It seems both censor and censure are within the scope of MacIver's concerns. Therefore the limiting effect of censorship in a functional way (with or without intent or antipathy), and the punitive
ends of censure will both be considered as academic freedom issues.

Fundamentalist students in the 1960s did not like what they discerned as liberalism in instruction at Southeastern. It is impossible to discern the difference between grievances held against the individual faculty personalities involved in the "Bultmann controversy" at Southeastern in the 1960s and general complaints against the whole school. Even though the professors directly involved left, as did several others, the reputation of Southeastern as a liberal stronghold persisted and may have grown.

The Bultmann crisis, the importation of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary faculty to form the nucleus of the original teaching staff, Lolley's brewery blessing reputation, the inclination toward academics early on, secured a liberal label on the institution among Southern Baptists, however warranted. There is a sense in which SEBTS was censured early on by reputation without investigation, and for an ethos rather than charges.

Circumstances which invite consideration of academic freedom issues usually pertain to individuals who think, research, and write outside the mainstream
of their community. What made the Southeastern experience unique from an academic freedom standpoint is that the whole faculty and administration are a character in the story. The complaints were generalized against the institution and faculty and not against an individual. Consequently, those complaints were unverified by due process procedures outlined in the by-laws and personnel manual.

Charles Stanley, president of the Southern Baptist Convention, during a visit to the campus in April, 1985, said, "A lot of folks feel it's [Southeastern] not balanced. I don't know this because I don't know the condition of the seminary that well. But if it's not balanced, why shouldn't we balance it?" (Winston, 1985, April 4, p.C1) Much later in the story, President Lewis A. Drummond was also operating out of posture which was speculative.

Confronted at the next faculty meeting with a demand for evidence that any member of the faculty had taught contrary to the Articles of Faith, President Drummond admitted that he had no official complaints or charges. As he and Dean L. Russ Bush understood the matter, the faculty's deviations from the Articles of Faith were matters

Morris Ashcraft, former dean of the faculty concluded, "There was never any claim made and never any procedure set in motion to key and trigger the process for doctrinal review of anyone's teaching.... There was a lot of innuendo" (personal communication, August 25, 1992).

Everyone was the target rather than a clearly identified individual. This resulted in a circumvention of procedures which would have rendered a judgment and action. As such, there was no closure, only the evidence of a disposition which depreciated the faculty's status as professionals who served in theological education.

In the fall of 1986 the Peace Committee Subcommittee issued a report to Randall Lolley. They concluded that there was an insufficient balance of theological opinion on the faculty and in the classroom. No formal study produced these conclusions. This was simply the impression of a group largely dominated by fundamentalist sentiments. Nevertheless,
they proposed:

That the administration and Trustees be requested to enter into dialogue with the faculty concerning each faculty member's interpretation of the phrase that the Bible has "truth without any mixture of error for its matter."

That the administration and Trustees be requested to carefully review the concerns addressed by our subcommittee to determine if the specific views expressed by some professors are within the Baptist Faith and Message Statement on Scripture.

That we make available to the administration and Trustees our records of concerns and responses relative to specific professors. ("A Response of the Board," 1986, pp. A-12, A-13)

This "Proposal" was never presented to the Board of trustees nor the faculty by Lolley, thus making it unique in that it was not reviewed in a public forum or acted upon. From this standpoint, it is no assault on academic freedom.

However, the definition of censure in a value neutral sense simply purports the evidence of strong disapproval, especially as evidenced in formal action,
as in committee decisions and correspondence. The Subcommittee, an external agent, which was increasingly perceived as having legitimate powers to legislate for action, suggested that investigation on the part of the trustees was warranted based on their inquiry. The investigative nature of their recommendations clearly required that the faculty had to prove their blamelessness, or were, in other words, guilty until proven innocent.

Therefore, while Lolley censored the censure, the formal action of the group called the Peace Committee Subcommittee did formally imply reasonable suspicion of the orthodoxy of the SEBTS faculty. Eventually, the "Proposal" was made public and became a part of trustee documents ("A Response of the Board," 1986, pp. A-12, A-13).

It also appears that the Glorieta Statement, created by the Southern Baptist Convention seminary presidents, statements by persons other than the faculty, contributed to the continuing defamation of the faculty's character. The Glorieta Statement was intended to bring about some compromise. Instead it appeared to concede that the fundamentalists were correct in their criticisms, else why would the
presidents commit themselves to the following?

1. To "reaffirm our seminary confessional statements" and "enforce compliance by the persons signing them."

2. To "foster in our classrooms a balanced, scholarly frame of reference for presenting fairly the entire spectrum of scriptural interpretations represented by our constituency."

3. To "respect the convictions of all Southern Baptists....

4. To "commit ourselves to fairness in selecting faculty, lecturers, and chapel speakers across the theological spectrum."

5. To "lead our seminar[ies] in spiritual revival."

6. To "deepen and strengthen the spirit of evangelism and missions on our campuses...."


The terms of these concessions did not compel the audience to receive them as a political compromise, which is how they were later described ("Randall Lolley's Remarks to Members of Faculty Speaking at
Alumni Meetings at State Conventions," October 30, 1986, unpublished memo). The particulars of the Glorieta Statement were received initially as a confession. The fundamentalists maintained that it was not actions by the fundamentalists themselves which precipitated the statement, but the moral failure of the professionals who reigned in the classroom. The professors were in error, giving rise to comments by fundamentalist faction leaders Paul Pressler and Paige Patterson, like these:

1. We greet with enthusiasm the statement of the Seminary Presidents in Glorieta and appreciate their recognition that there is "legitimate concern" about the seminaries and that the teaching of inerrancy has not been given "a fair shake" in the schools....

5. ....We ask that there cease to be discrimination against those voicing concerns about our institutions and that none be excluded from admission as students, selection as faculty, or appointment as administrative leadership, because they have expressed their heartfelt concerns....Individuals should never be penalized for expressing what are now recognized both by the
Peace Committee and the presidents' Glorieta statement as legitimate concerns.

7. ...We are grateful that increasing numbers of Southern Baptists are now recognizing that these problems can no longer be disregarded and that we must have our institutions operate from the predicate that the Bible is "truth without any mixture of error" and "not errant in any area of reality...."

11. ...We call on all Southern Baptists involved in the controversy to address the issue and all of our seminary professors and other denominational employees to address forthrightly and honestly this issue in such a way that there are no ambiguous phrases or hidden meanings. (Statement Appreciation and Affirmation, 1986, position paper.)

In particular, Randall Lolley, as their chief advocate for defense, appeared to plead guilty to the charges without consulting his faculty or allowing them a fair hearing on their own. All in all, the teachers were considered guilty of professional misconduct, or censured. Lolley backpedaled with numerous explanations and disclaimers shortly thereafter, but
these did not undo the damage. While the Glorieta Statement was not adopted formally by the SEBTS trustees until later, it did become a reference point for legitimizing fundamentalist interests in change at the seminary.

During the time when the Peace Committee first began its work, it gave consideration to defining the limits to diversity among Southern Baptist employees. Charles Fuller, the Chairperson, asserted that the Committee was not imposing a double standard since they were not attempting the same for Southern Baptists in general. (Martin, 1985, October 10, p. 4)

However stated, this is a double standard, for the expectations of seminary faculty (already required to be Southern Baptists for employment purposes) were not the same as that of Southern Baptists at large. What were grounds for charges of misconduct in the faculty (censure) were not cause for dismissal from Southern Baptist life. What was free for Southern Baptists to think, do, and say, was "taxed" in a sense (the original meaning of the Latin censere) with values prescribed by the convention (censorship).

However, not all censorship and censure was indirect or generalized. The Peace Committee
subcommittee visit and report singled out sixteen individual faculty members who were identified in the Peace Committee Subcommittee investigation as the subjects of concern for correct orthodoxy. As the story evolved, the professors were not allowed to examine the minutes of the Subcommittee meeting with Seminary representatives which gave rise to concerns about their orthodoxy. They were asked to respond to questions twice, outside of guidelines for due process, without peer review, with no response on either occasion. The students and former students whose criticisms provided the ammunition for the "concerns" were not cross-examined, nor were their classmates' recollections solicited in order to corroborate testimony. The sixteen Southeastern teachers were never cleared or convicted, but the sequence of events cast a pall on their reputations in Convention life. This was to be arbitrarily censured.

While some trustees did object to the intrusion of the Peace Committee and its Subcommittee on their "turf," the Southeastern Seminary Board did formally agree to cooperate with this investigation anyway. In short, the trustees allowed the Subcommittee to perform tasks outside of protocols, specifically the
investigation of individual professors. By virtue of its consent, and the absence of intervention, the board became liable for the violations of academic freedom of 16 faculty members by the Subcommittee.

Another example of direct censorship begins with a conversation between trustee Jerry Holcomb from Virginia and Professor Elizabeth Barnes. It took place on the occasion of her election to the faculty at the Spring Board of Trustee's meeting, 1987. After her election, Holcomb advised her that her nomination barely carried, threatened in particular by her insistance on the use of inclusive language in the classroom. He added, "Some of the trustees said, after the vote was taken, in my presence, 'Well, she might have been voted in, but she will never get tenure.'" (Barnes, personal communication, October 16, 1992) Dr. Barnes admitted:

I knew that. I knew that from the first day. There wasn't a prayer, even at that time, in the spring of '87, that I would ever be granted tenure, and for such a reason that I endorsed and recommended the use of inclusive language in my classes.

The seminary had not adopted a position either way
regarding the use of inclusive language. This black mark on her record which would preclude her arriving at tenure was unqualified and arbitrary censorship of the way she believed she could and should teach her classes. She was censured by unidentified trustees in the form of strong disapproval for conduct believed to be unbecoming a teacher at Southeastern Seminary, and unfairly, too, because the standard was absent from all seminary documents.

In the fall of 1989, Lewis Drummond was under pressure by the faculty to extend Keat Wiles' contract as a presidential appointment. The President indicated that he had some doubts about Wiles' "institutional loyalty," because he had worn yellow ribbons in support of the former administration and faculty elected prior to 1987 (Wiles, unpublished paper). The question of his status stretched once again, not only through the fall of 1989, but into January of 1990. At that point he was told by Lewis Drummond that, while his contract was extended, he should not expect renewal again. The reason offered was his use of the "historical critical method" of the study of the Bible (Wiles, personal correspondence to Lewis Drummond, January 8, 1990).

Clearly in the first case, the question was not
"institutional loyalty," but loyalty to the fundamentalist trustee agenda. In the second case, even Drummond admitted in his conversation with Wiles that the use of the historical critical method was not inappropriate at SEBTS. In fact, he himself did not object, but, he said, "some of the trustees did" (Wiles, "Chronology," unpublished). Robert Crowley, trustee, confirmed this later, saying, "We refused to grant him tenure because it was obvious that he was a liberal professor" (personal communication, October 19, 1992). In each respect, lack of loyalty to the fundamentalist trustee agenda, the use of the historical critical study method, and the accusation of liberalism, Wiles was censured according to criteria without standing at the seminary.

The 12 month minimum guideline in advising appointed faculty of their status is a policy held throughout higher education, including the Southeastern personnel manual. Not issuing a clear signal to Wiles in a timely manner regarding his future relationship to the seminary on, not one, but two occasions, placed the professor's well-being in jeopardy. The administration failed to keep faith with Wiles' contract. Failure to maintain the protections of appropriate notice disrupts
continuity in the academic program and distracts the professor from the task at hand. This is a compromise of conditions which contribute to academic freedom.

In a related issue, December 5, 1989, the special committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools released their findings and conclusions regarding Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. In particular, it reported that the fundamentalist trustees "have made public their intent to replace by attrition all of [the faculty] with persons judged more suitable to the majority of members in the Southern Baptist Convention (Report 20, cited in Lavenue, 1989, p. 28).

Former trustee chair Robert Crowley confirmed this objective most colorfully when he volunteered, "I have a directory, an '85-'86 [Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary] directory, and I've marked them off, one by one, as they've resigned" (personal communication, October 19, 1992). This categorization by theology and ecclesiastical politics meets the definition of censorship and censure in that it clearly stigmatizes the pre-1987 faculty, devalues their contribution to the institution, pronounces judgment on their role in resisting change, chills the sense of
security, and by design and default punishes those who remain with increasing isolation.

The evidence of censure begins with the observation that Convention messengers, seminary trustees, and seminary leaders made decisions based on heresy that Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary lay outside of Southern Baptist orthodoxy. This accusation was never dealt with formally, so as to be confirmed or denied. Second, the Glorieta Statement appeared to concede that the faculty was indeed the source of the Convention controversy and the problem was theological integrity. Third, the Peace Committee exercised a double-standard toward the faculty by imposing a standard on them which it did not obligate of its SBC constituency regarding the limits of diversity. Finally, the fundamentalist trustees advertised that they intended to replace all the faculty through attrition, an oblique comment on how unwelcome the pre-1987 faculty really was. In all four illustrations, the Southeastern faculty is censured as a group for not adhering to a particular party line.

In addition, and in specific terms, the personal academic freedom of the 16 faculty members identified in the Peace Committee Subcommittee investigation was
violated. The same was true when Professor Elizabeth Barnes was advised she would never receive tenure, as well as in the case of the reappointment notice of Keat Wiles because of delay and resistance to his candidacy. These three examples illustrate impingements on academic freedom because efforts of the Peace Committee Subcommittee and the trustees distinguished faculty from others in such a way as to detract from their professional reputation and security.

Were there direct or indirect curbs to faculty mobility? This will be interpreted as intra-institutional mobility, especially as it has to do with status on the faculty. As such it is related to another question: Were tenure conditions...manipulated in such a way as to insure conformity to religious principles? This pertains to the right to hold a position and the security with which it is held. In an academic institution, the notion of permanent appointment is held as a safeguard of academic freedom.

The faculty rank advancement plan at SEBTS is defined objectively and operates routinely. Except under exceptional circumstances, faculty members are promoted automatically. In no case within the parameters of this study does there appear to have been
a departure from the practice of advancing faculty members in grade.

However, where appointment to tenure is concerned, the Holcomb-Barnes exchange above appears to imply that, because Barnes advocated a perogative antithetical to the fundamentalist trustees, she would never receive tenure. Whether such disciplining action should be considered punishment or a corrective (as to insure conformity) is a moot point since in both instances conditions for tenure are predetermined.

An experience of professor Roy DeBrand deserves attention here as well. At the time DeBrand was up for tenure consideration, President Lewis Drummond invited him into his office for informal conversation. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, Russ Bush, was also present. According to DeBrand (personal communication, July 31, 1992), he was told, if he did not confess to being an inerrantist, he would not receive tenure. This application of pressure constitutes a manipulation of the conditions for tenure in order to bring about conformity to a religious position. Post-employment date conditions which demand a teacher adapt to suit in order to gain or to retain tenure are violations of academic freedom.
Tenure conditions also have to do with tenure security. A 1989 survey of Southeastern faculty by Suzanne Lavenue found 47% of respondents thought dismissal was somewhat likely or highly possible. The implication is, that at one point in time, almost half the Southeastern faculty was uncertain that tenure protections were meaningful. Former faculty member John Durham offers the following observation.

Tenure is worth no more than the integrity of the governing board. You can have tenure at Southeastern Seminary with Drummond as President and Crowley as chairman of trustees and it's not worth a plug nickel, because you either don't want to stay there, or if you do stay there you have to give up so much that it no longer has any meaning. (Personal communication, November 4, 1992.)

While, as a group, the faculty viewpoint represents only one perspective in the matter, it remains significant because the apprehensions were held so extensively within the faculty as Lavenue's study establishes. Furthermore, that perception precipitated very real defensive countermeasures on the part of the whole faculty and not in part. It may be concluded that academic freedom was moderated by conditions
imposed by the trustees affecting the faculty's sense of security of tenure. This will be clarified more thoroughly in a discussion of institutional policies and procedures which follows.

Summarily, in the cases of Barnes and DeBrand, identified above, conditions were placed on tenure which were outside the bounds of propriety. In this regard, as well as in the faculty's sense of tenure insecurity (examined by Lavenue), and the depreciated value of tenure (addressed by Durham), academic freedom was compromised as fundamentalist trustees attempted to reframe the seminary according to their religious principles.

Did barriers exist for those who sought to leave? Initially, at least, it was quite to the contrary. President Lewis Drummond and the trustees were quite anxious for faculty elected prior to 1987 to leave. The evidence suggests that through the summer of 1992 the administration was very willing to negotiate attractive severance packages with professors who desired to leave Southeastern Seminary.

On the other hand, as time passed, the marketability of those same faculty members appears to have decreased. Michael Hawn, former professor,
describes them as "untouchables" (personal communication, July 28, 1992). Former academic dean Morris Ashcraft comments:

Up until '86, our faculty members were constantly being approached by other seminaries to move.... but since the controversy broke into the open in such an ugly way in '87 and '88, faculty members at Southeastern have had a very difficult time, those who wanted to move to other schools. It's been virtually impossible...[to get jobs inside and outside of the Southern Baptist Convention].

One dean told one professor, and this dean was not of any Baptist seminary [though a church related school], said, "You're damaged goods."

And from his standpoint,...it had absolutely nothing to do with a person's academic preparation, competence or doctrinal beliefs....He looked the guy in the face and said "You've been injured emotionally to the point it would take you a year or two to get over to where you can operate. You're damaged goods, a person who is emotionally pressured and hurt to the point that that person would be operating at 75 or 80% efficiency for a year or two." (Personal
Ashcraft continued, saying, that in the Southern Baptist milieu, an insidious pattern of guilt by association prevailed.

In Southern Baptist life, there is an unofficial or underground network that spreads opinion and evaluations and appraisals of people. Some are very popular. But [for] those who get criticized, like seminary professors get criticized, that gets in the talk and that goes around and you run into it years later...."Well, these guys may not be heretics or they may not be too liberal, but they've been a lot of trouble over there. Why go with one of them when we could get someone who's never had that?" There's that tendency in the Southern Baptist Convention. (Personal communication, August 25, 1992)

This assessment is supported in the statements of former faculty members Balentine, Clemons and Dale, (personal communications: August 25, July 29, and May 11, 1992, respectively), as well as the experience of former academic coordinator Glenn Miller, as related by Dale (personal communication, May 11, 1992). (See pages 422 - 425, 429 of this study.)
Therefore, as the fundamentalist trustees sought to move the identity of the school in a new direction, those faculty who served prior to the Drummond administration found it increasingly difficult to find work elsewhere. Their professional standing was held in question. If not actually black-balled in Southern Baptist life, they did find job opportunities in Convention agencies closed to them. Finally, there is evidence that personnel from kindred agencies outside of Southern Baptist life were wary of the war-weariness of Southeastern faculty. It is difficult to pin-point direct curbs to faculty mobility, but indirect curbs are most assuredly evident.

Were status conditions manipulated in such a way as to insure conformity to religious principles? Notions of rank and position having been addressed already, this question refers to the broad range of opportunities to participate in and impact institutional life, through faculty and seminary committees, advancement through the ranks, visibility at events, and participation in the governance process. These are the greater structural and environmental elements which make a vast difference in the life of an academic community.
The faculty shall prescribe, subject to approval by the Board of Trustees, requirements for admission, courses of study, conditions of graduation, the nature of degrees to be conferred, and rules and methods for the conduct of the educational work of the Seminary....(p. 5)

The faculty shall organize itself, appoint officers and committees, and detail its duties and responsibilities. Subject to approval by the Board of Trustees, the faculty shall....

6. Develop and administer policies and procedures for the conduct of the academic work of the Seminary. (p.13)

Herein lies an expectation that the faculty would be extensively involved as partners in all matters related to academic life. There had to be agreement on the part of the trustees, to be sure, but support for this assignment had existed as long as this bylaw had been in place. With this in mind, Southeastern cannot be called a "faculty controlled institution" in light of the bylaws specifically and the perception of
partnership true to any healthy community of learning generally. The trustees enjoy seniority in determining policy and exercising fiscal responsibility, of course, but wise restraint in the areas of administration and matters relevant to academics is also expected.

Former President Randall Lolley enhanced the significant role of the faculty through his participatory management strategy. This is the stewardship of the mission of the institution through the delegation of responsibilities appropriate to the vested interests and abilities of key groups like the faculty.

In an organic balance of responsibilities such as this, any and all limitations of their role in making internal changes frustrated fundamentalist trustees, especially with reference to traditional faculty responsibilities. In spite of the by-law imperative mentioned above, the president's perogative in defining administrative style, and the evidence to the contrary, Jim DeLoach, a fundamentalist trustee, scolded the president at the fall, 1987, board meeting, saying, "We Trustees, are no longer 'rubber stamps' who will agree to faculty-generated policy!" ("Response of the Board," 1988, Exhibit P, p. 6).
At the fall meeting in 1986, the trustees introduced a new nuance to the faculty selection process. The new policy said that before a single candidate was recommended, the instructional committee would review and comment on the five or six leading candidates. This commenced the first step down for the faculty from their singular role as trusted experts in the field of theological education, particularly regarding the selection of fellow teachers. This action also placed the Committee on Instruction in a strategic position to mandate that the president select inerrantist faculty or be guilty of insubordination.

On October 13, 1987, at the meeting of the board, the trustees amended the bylaws regarding the faculty appointment process once again. The new plan demanded that the president, rather than the faculty, select the pool of candidates. The role of the faculty was reduced to one of "consultation." Removing the faculty from the selection process virtually guaranteed the appointment of professors of a singular view (Ammerman, 1990, p. 250). The maneuver eluded the traditional values of the academy, and waltzed around the sources of resistance, namely the administration and faculty (Halbrooks, 1987, p. 3). Inherently, the
traditional status of the faculty in appointments was depreciated, and, consequently, one of their most important opportunities to participate in and impact institutional life was, for all intents and purposes, erased.

The radical restructuring of the President's cabinet in 1988, with the changing of the title and responsibilities of the Academic Dean to Vice President for Academic Affairs, was without the consultation of the faculty, those persons most affected by the modification. President Lewis Drummond later agreed that things should not have proceeded without faculty consultation first taking place ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, p. 41). On the other hand, the change went through anyway. It is not the change itself, but the process which represents a marked devaluing of faculty input, and, in a larger sense, their status in institutional affairs.

Another example is the selection and election of seminary personnel. A faculty survey did not yield an expression of confidence for Lewis Drummond as nominee for the office of president (p. 298 of this study). The nomination and election of Russ Bush as Vice President for Academic Affairs was opposed by the
faculty (pp. 335, 336 of this study). When the first trustee approved nominees to the faculty came through the new appointment system, the faculty voted to step aside in protest of their nominal role in the process (Keat Wiles, personal communication, July 31, 1993). Together these suggest a one-sided, uncollaborative posture on the part of the trustees. In this way the opportunity for faculty expertise and preferences to shape the life of the school was sorely rebuffed.

At the October 9 and 10, 1989 joint meeting of faculty, trustees and administrators, the following action was taken:

First, the trustees voted that the American Association of University Professors and its chapter at Southeastern Seminary "have no official standing with the seminary...."

Second, they refused to allow "inclusive language guidelines" drafted by the faculty to be printed in the seminary's catalogue, student handbook and directory. (Knox, 1989, October 26, p. 8)

It is not unheard of for trustees to disagree with faculty conclusions, or take stands contrary to the faculty. Yet in light of the resistance to faculty
initiatives in other realms these two actions become significant. This continuing trustee resistance to faculty interests gives rise to the conclusion that the influence of the faculty, or status, in the affairs of the institution was significantly reduced from that enjoyed prior to and during the Lolley era.

The rapid and dramatic changes brought on by the fundamentalist trustees of Southeastern Seminary also impacted the reputation of the school as a place for moderate, open theological education in SBC life. The dramatic transformation also interrupted the flow of students from traditional feeder schools, and precipitated a drop in enrollment and financial contributions. The institution became very vulnerable under these circumstances, as did the individual livelihood and emotional well-being of faculty members (page 286 and following). Therefore, the policies of the trustees created a situation where faculty security was at risk. In an effort to bring about conformity to religious principles, the status of the faculty was left on precarious footing.

The Association of Theological Schools counsels that "Termination of membership in a faculty may be because of financial exigency..." (ATS Bulletin 40,
(1992) Part 5, Policy Statements, p. 9). Of course, "harassment" might present itself in terms of threatened and even needless termination of contracts because of financial woes. Harassment might also be manifested in terms of cuts in pay, more work for the same pay, or the same work for same pay when money is going to other things.

In 1988 the faculty did not receive a pay increase. In 1989 they were informed that no cost of living increases were forthcoming. The financial belt-tightening was discomforting, and especially so in light of rumors that new faculty and administrators were brought on board at much higher levels of compensation than their predecessors or peers of comparable education (Michael Hawn, personal communication, July 28, 1992; Roy DeBrand, personal communication, July 31, 1992).

When it was revealed that Lewis Drummond had significant cost overruns in the renovation of his office and the president's mansion, including a greenhouse for Drummond's prize orchids and a climate controlled closet for Mrs. Drummond's furs, a significant disparity in treatment was confirmed. As salary constitutes a tenure condition, this example
suggests that faculty employed before 1987 were treated prejudicially because of resistance to the fundamentalist trustee agenda and for maintaining theological positions unlike newcomers brought on by those trustees.

Roy DeBrand perceived other forms of harassment as well.

I felt [certain actions] were contrived to demoralize and humiliate, such as bringing in a new professor in my field who had not the experience nor the educational achievements nor the publishing achievements at a level higher than I was. To which I wrote the president a very stinging letter of protest....

Even little things [had an impact,] like:
1. making a distinction between old and new faculty relative to press releases;
2. information about enrollment, where they would put things in certain faculty members' boxes and keep it from other faculty members;
3. scheduling, instead of allowing faculty members with more seniority preferred classroom times, change their schedules and give them terrible schedules: eight o'clock
in the morning classes, 3 o'clock in the afternoon classes, undesirable times in the name of, "We have to offer classes at all different times." [They were] giving new people the preferred times and the old [otherwise]. Somebody would say, "Well, that just happened." If you ask the dean [the response is], "Aw, that just happened, nothing wrong with that." Maybe, maybe not. I think it was purposeful....[There were] subtleties, innuendoes rather than direct frontal attacks. (Roy DeBrand, personal communication, July 31, 1992)

The status conditions of faculty at SEBTS were not clearly manipulated so as to insure conformity to religious principles. However, status conditions of the faculty were frequently attenuated in order to reduce the power of the faculty, press the agenda of the fundamentalist trustees, reward compatriots and demonstrate non-support for opponents. The key incidences include: the changing role of the faculty in the appointment process; the restructuring of the academic dean's position without faculty input; advancing and electing candidates for president, vice-
president for academic affairs, and the faculty which did not receive the support of the faculty; non-support for faculty initiatives like the AAUP chapter and gender inclusive language policy; decisions and actions which led to enrollment and financial crises; and, the apparent difference in treatment between old and new faculty. Whether as an inducement to adopt trustee approved behavior or as a consequence of trustee action, the status of the faculty was depreciated and the traditional rights and privileges of academic freedom were transgressed. 

Policy, Power and Procedure

Organizational purposes give rise to institutional policies and consequent courses of action. Policies can be established formally and informally, and felt to be more or less compatible with institutional purposes. The employment of policy, power, and procedures can be in support of the highest ideals of academic freedom, or otherwise. The first question for consideration is: Did institutional policies impinge on academic freedom?

A policy of perception accepted as fact. As has been stated previously, it appears that a great deal of the rationale for making change at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary was based on reputation. Some of
this had foundation historically and experientially, but there was no truly unbiased assessment. Former SEBTS president Lewis Drummond supports this conclusion.

[It was] the general atmosphere of not being as conservative. It was more of an atmospheric thing than a pure systematic theology denying of the faith...that really precipitated the crisis. It wasn't so much, "Professor so and so is a heretic in his Christiology," [but] "Professor so and so, he's got kind of an attitude [about conservatives]....

An atmosphere was created...where conservative students did feel uncomfortable in some areas of seminary life. I don't know that any professor attempted to do that, but that atmosphere did get precipitated. That was probably as big a factor in drawing attention to the problem as actual when you get right down to it, [e.g.] anybody denying the statement of faith. It's perceptions that are more significant than realities. (Personal communication, July 10, 1992)

When Drummond was challenged in faculty meeting to
justify the claim that the Southeastern faculty was not keeping faith with Southern Baptist principles articulated in the seminary documents, he responded that:

As he and Dean L. Russ Bush understood the matter, the faculty's deviations from the Articles of Faith were matters of common repute. Wherever they went, they claimed, they heard rumors of Southeastern's liberalism. (Miller, 1991, September 18 - 25, p. 839)

Rumors and perceptions are powerful motivators. They cannot be described as adequate justification for dramatic changes in policy at the seminary and antagonistic posture toward the faculty, however. This is especially true when both the aims and procedure for change implemented by the new trustees were not generally held to be in keeping with policy either. Yet trustee policy appears to have been based on perception without forms of due process recognized throughout higher education.

A policy of assumed heresy. The Miller quotation above seems to imply that the SEBTS faculty was accused of not adhering to Southern Baptist principles, without trial, according to accepted protocols defined by the
seminary's personnel manual and the general principles held throughout higher education. It was these accusations, unsubstantiated in occasions of due process, which gave rise to the fundamentalist rallying cry to change Southeastern. Perceived heresy inspired policy.

The Sherman to Neely correspondence of September 3, 1986 seems to suggest that the faculty of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary was assumed to be guilty of apostasy.

These people are not going to be pleased until you give them the small answers they want and until then, you are going to be guilty. (Sherman to Neely, personal correspondence, September 3, 1986)

Former trustee Christine Gregory says:

They were ready to go after anybody that was at Southeastern. Some of my best friends on that board of trustees who were not [of] my persuasion were people who were making accusations that they could not possibly back up. And when you would pin it down, they would always say, "Where there's this much smoke, there's got to be fire." That's not fair. (Personal communication, October 19, 1992)
The trustees stoutly maintained that academic freedom did not secure for the professor theological license. Their work was in and through a specifically Southern Baptist context. They believed teaching outside the norms of the Southern Baptist experience in the name of intellectual diversity was pure bias and breaking covenant with mutually held Southern Baptist commitments.

On the other hand, "The right to academic freedom is recognized in order to enable faculty members and students to carry on their roles. It is not sought as a personal privilege" (R. Fuchs, cited in Hunt & Connelly, 1969, p. 54). A confession, such as the Abstract of Principles, is regarded as a protection of the academic freedom of the teacher from unwarranted and picayunish harassment in the completion of her or his duties. It is not first an instrument of inquisition.

Moreover, trustee Jesse Chapman, and professors Malcolm Tolbert, John Durham, Alan Neely and others, understood the tradition of signing the Seminary's Abstract of Principles as to profess to adhere generally to a set of theological and historical reference points in Christian life (see pages 125 - 127
of this study). The Abstract was not meant to be a technical or personal statement of faith. It was with this interpretation in mind that the faculty members signed the document in good faith.

However, the terms changed with the advent of the new fundamentalist majority on the trustees. In short, the faculty signed the document with one interpretation in mind, and was criticized by another. To suffer under the changing tides of theological opinion based on majorities at annual gatherings is to severely restrict free inquiry and expression to whatever is politically and temporarily expedient.

A policy of balance. Another policy issue was the initial appeal by fundamentalists for theological representation or balance, both in the classroom and in the selection of faculty. (See the arguments on pages 146 and following.) Balance in theological viewpoints, at first glance, is a worthy goal on a faculty. Yet difficulty in establishing the reference points make this an elusive goal.

Is balance to be struck within departments, within a school of thought, or within the range of beliefs, say, of the Southern Baptist Convention seminaries or even in the Southern Baptist Convention itself? Did
balance exist in more conservative institutions?

The academic freedom threat which exists in the mandate for balance is actually a pressure to conform to a definition that exists outside the academy. This means that politics, albeit in the church, rather than scholarship, determines teacher selection and the content of instruction. Autonomy in the academy is retained, in order to allow the faculty to scan the environment and make its own choices in order to fulfill its unique function, the addition and sharing of knowledge in the larger pursuit of truth. The policy advanced as seeking balance was an effort to control which is antithetical to the autonomy appropriate the academy.

A policy of inerrancy. The policy driving the perceptual issues, the assumption of heresy, and the calls for balance, was the fundamentalist ambition to establish inerrancy as initial article in an "irreducible minimum theology" (James Draper, 1984, p. 105) incumbent on seminary faculty. Inerrancy clearly became the litmus test for faculty appointments and trustee sentiments toward pre-1987 faculty and administrators.

Inerrancy, however, is not an apparent requirement
in the SEBTS Abstract of Principles, nor is inerrancy universally accepted among Southern Baptists. In fact, while the seminary catalogue advertises the seminary to be "committed to the complete veracity, inerrancy, and infallibility of the Bible" (Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary Vision for a New Day, p. 2) the Abstract has not been changed to bring about clarification in this regard.

Fundamentalist trustees disavowed the imposition of inerrancy (Ackerman, 1987, October 12, pp. 1C, 4C). Yet in the appointment of faculty members (Personal correspondence of Jim DeLoach to Morris Ashcraft, April 21, 1987, included as addendum in Hester, et al., 1988), and in the selection of a new president (Robert Crowley, cited in Hester et al., 1988, p. 19) the inerrancy test was utilized. Former Chairperson Robert Crowley was quoted as saying:

"We will hire new faculty who believe that the Bible is without error. We're now able to review people under consideration [as prospective faculty]; that's brand new and our most significant action" (The New York Times, October 19, 1987). Elsewhere [Crowley] is reported to have said: "The one agenda (of the board) is that
we will be electing faculty members who agree with
the literal interpretation of the Bible"
(Greensboro News and Record, October 23, 1987)
(Cited in Hester et al, 1988, January 19, p. 18).

A policy of document misuse. In an attempt to
enforce conformity to the policy of inerrancy, the
trustees employed certain external documents as
doctrinal norms and conditions for employment at the
institution. These included the Baptist Faith and
Message of 1963 (Trustee Dade Sherman, cited in
Ackerman, 1987, October 8, D1-2), which has never been
adopted by the seminary and does not appear to insist
on inerrancy, and the Chicago Statement on Inerrancy
("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, p. 37), again,
not adopted by the seminary but which certainly does
advocate the doctrine.

This compromises academic freedom in that the
conditions of employment should not shift with the
theological currents. Also, the ATS Bulletin exhorts
members to enforce only those "limits as may be stated
by the governing body of a theological school or
cluster and attested to by the faculty member when
appointed" (40, Part 5, 1992, "Academic Freedom and
Tenure." p. 28).
In 1988 the trustees of Southeastern Seminary affirmed the Peace Committee report of 1987 (pages 324 and following of this study). Moreover, they went on to adopt the recommendations of the Peace Committee which included determining faculty adherence to the Baptist Faith and Message, the Glorieta statement of the seminary presidents, as well as the school's Abstract of Principles. The first two were not required as tests of faculty orthodoxy according to the By-laws or the personnel manual of school. The application of external tests, the addition of tests without faculty consultation, and the imposition of tests in the face of outright faculty opposition are examples of institutional policies which conflict with the support of academic freedom.

Worth considering as well is the practice of the board to treat the article on scripture of the Abstract of Faith and the Baptist Faith and Message (1963), regardless of its interpretation, with substantially more importance than the other articles, particularly the ones on religious liberty and the freedom of conscience. The unevenness of the application of this policy impinged on academic freedom for it was an imposition, not a choice or individual deduction.
It appears that the professors at Southeastern encountered the same problem confronting Catholic educators. This predicament has to do with those teachings of "absolute binding force since they are infallibly proposed....Other teachings are to be held by that 'religious assent' (inherently conditional in nature) which is due to authoritative noninfallible pronouncements" (Hunt and Connelly, 1969, p. 102). The inerrancy doctrine was apparently "infallibly proposed," while liberty of conscience was accepted by "religious assent," though no such differentiation between articles exists in the Abstract of Principles. This de facto manipulation of the confession of faith puts strain on the integrity of the individual faculty member who attempts to keep the covenant in good faith, another challenge to academic freedom.

Additionally, the limitation of any infallible proposal is that it narrows the field of possible conclusions in study and research. (See MacIver, 1955, p. 286.) This idea runs directly counter to the atmosphere of freedom of inquiry to which the SEBTS professors believed they had a right according to the by-laws and traditions of the school. Said Professor Richard Hester:
Fundamentalists are insisting on a single-minded doctrinal position that permits no dissent and chills freedom of speech and expression. We can read the writing on the wall. If it happens here, we would cease to be an educational university."

(Ackerman, 1987, October 12, pp. 1C, 4C)

In terms that the pre-1987 Southeastern faculty might have affirmed, the Baptist Faith and Message (1963) plainly counsels:

A living faith must experience a growing understanding of truth and must be continually interpreted and related to the needs of each new generation. Throughout their history Baptist bodies, both large and small, have issued statements of faith which comprise a consensus of their beliefs. Such statements have never been regarded as complete, infallible statements of faith, nor as official creeds carrying mandatory authority. (pp. 4 - 5).

In conclusion, the pressure to enforce a doctrine of inerrancy on individual faculty members and Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary was directly opposed to the nature of the academy, the documents of the school and Convention. In so doing, the academic
freedom of the faculty was constricted.

A policy of enmeshment. Still another policy issue had to do with the dysfunctional entanglement of corporate identities, or enmeshment. The model found in most of higher education provides for the trustees to be the owners and controllers of the institution. Individuals or corporate identities outside of the institution may be faithful benefactors, or serve functions in support of the institution, e.g. provide the mechanism for the election of its trustees, but they do not dictate policy or polity.

The SBC Executive Committee took steps to suggest that this model was in place at Southeastern, but only during the season when the accreditation status of the school was threatened. (Hefley, 1990, p. 112)

Throughout the crisis, the fundamentalist trustees freely maintained that they were acting on the will of the Convention. (Hefley, 1988, p. 152).

"But [the administration and faculty] must recognize," said trustee Walter Lonis from Denver, "that this institution is run by the Convention and is not a separate entity. As elected trustees we have a responsibility to see that the wishes of the convention are carried out...." (Hefley, 1988,
Later, Chairperson of the Trustees, Robert Crowley would go so far as to say that rebellious faculty might be dismissed if they remained "completely adamant against the direction the convention has voted" (cited in Hester, 1987, November 7, p. 2), even though the faculty had broken no seminary statute.

The Certificate of Incorporation, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Inc., Article IV, paragraph 6, dated July 13, 1950, ("Response of," 1988, Exhibit A) states

This corporation having been organized under the authority of the Southern Baptist Convention is hereby declared to be affiliated with and controlled by that Convention....Said corporation shall furthermore be subject at all times to such by-laws, rules and regulations for the said corporation as may be prescribed by said Southern Baptist Convention, either with particular reference to said Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Inc., or for general application to all corporations of like nature affiliated with and under the control of said Southern Baptist Convention. (p. 2,3)
The word control means:

1. to check or verify (payments, accounts, etc.) by comparison with a duplicate register
2. to regulate (financial affairs)
3. to verify (an experiment) by comparison with a standard or by other experiments
4. to exercise authority over; direct; command
5. to hold back; curb; restrain


Fiduciary responsibility (definitions 1 and 2) was actually placed in the particular hands of the trustees deputized by the convention. The question is, did this arrangement imply a desire for separateness or simply delegation as in any Convention agency? The way the fundamentalist trustees supported their argument for change was to interpret their responsibility as a matter of delegation by the SBC.

The notion of verification could imply in this context annual reports of the presidents, associations with accrediting agencies, regular self studies, and occasional investigations of concerns or improprieties.
There is far more activity in this regard among the trustees than originating with the Convention.

Definition 4, above, suggests absolute power and control over an entity. It is not clear whether this implies "direction" in general terms, as in policy making, which, again, is traditionally the purview of the trustees, or specific terms, as in the administration of daily affairs and management of the academic program.

To "hold back, curb," suggests a restraining or shaping of behavior. Infidelity to the gospel or confessional statements might precipitate some restraining and reformation efforts. What measure of restraint is appropriate and applied, especially where Baptist understandings of autonomy and freedom are concerned, is not clear.

Notwithstanding the reassurances that the SBC is the controller of the seminary, the guideline mentioned above in the Certificate of Incorporation actually follows a clarifying sentence which reads:

All the corporate powers of this corporation shall be exercised by a Board of thirty Trustees, to be elected or appointed in the manner hereinafter set forth, who shall have control and management of
the operations of this corporation. (Article IV, p. 1)

Clearly, the Trustees are to be the "controllers" of the seminary in law and in practice. While the Convention supplies the mechanism for the election of the trustees, because the seminary is incorporated it takes on a life of its own. Hunt and Connelly note that "the legal character of a corporation is determined solely from its charter, not from the intent of its sponsors" (p. 110). They observe that, in the case of Catholic University:

In cases in which the good of Catholic University as an educational civil corporation conflicts with the desires of its sponsoring body or individual financial sponsors, the stated civil purposes of the University must prevail. (Hunt & Connelly, p. 111)

Therefore the trustees are, at a minimum, as responsible to the "by-laws, rules and regulations..." within the seminary, and justifiably more so, as to those which "may be prescribed by said Southern Baptist Convention." That the Convention spawned the institution, provides the overwhelming part of its budget, as well as identification as an SBC agency are
essentially immaterial. It is the adopted policies and guidelines of the seminary which take precedence, even to the point of becoming rule of law because the charter is granted by the state.

This is confirmed in Article VI of the seminary charter which asserts: "said Board of Trustees shall for all purposes be considered and treated as the sole membership of the corporation, exercising all the powers, rights, prerogatives and duties vested by law in corporations of this character" (p. 3). This is also supported by action of the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention. On September 18-20, 1989, the Committee passed a motion on Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, stating:

As the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention, it is not our prerogative to direct the affairs of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. Rather, we wish to affirm.... that the trustees of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary...have the right and duty to set policy and to direct the affairs of the seminary according to established seminary policies and procedures. ("SBC Executive Committee," 1989, Winter, p. 9)
Therefore, the Convention becomes one of many constituencies with which the seminary relates. In support of this, the ATS 1992 statement of "Procedures, Standards, and Criterion for Membership" the agency advises:

The governing board shall be accountable to the constituencies of the school and shall be responsible for the establishment, maintenance, exercise, and protection of the institution's integrity and its freedom from unwarranted harrassment or inappropriate external and internal pressures and destructive interference or restraints. (ATS Bulletin, 40, Part 3, p. 29)

Even in recent times, the Southern Baptist Convention has been reticent to wade into trustee matters.

SBC President Ed Young, acting at the recommendation of the committee on order of business, ruled out of order a motion calling for an investigation into allegations of harassment of female students by a trustee of Midwestern Seminary in Kansas City, Mo. The convention has no authority to direct trustees on internal operation of an institution, ...
order of business chairman, Fred Powell] told messengers....

No such allegations have been brought to Midwestern President Milton Ferguson or him, Peterson said.

"If the proper procedures are followed, I assure you the administration and the trustees will vigorously and thoroughly investigate any and all charges and will take appropriate action," Peterson said. ("32 motions," 1993, June 23, p. 7.)

This anecdote is offered as an example of the Convention ruling it inappropriate to dictate to the trustees how they carry on their business. This is in keeping with most of church related higher education. However, this ruling is in direct contradiction to the disposition which gave rise to the intrusive Peace Committee Subcommittee visit, its interpretations and recommendations regarding Southeastern Seminary, and the Peace Committee Report.

In Southern Baptist life, the Convention and its agencies live in a tangle of multiple and sometimes contradictory authority. Bureaucratic enmeshment with the Southern Baptist Convention meant that the trustees
and President Lolley, in acquiescing to the will of the Convention, were in some ways more responsive to the SBC than their other constituencies: the faculty, administration, students, and sources of various forms of support. The trustees did not protect the seminary from outside interests, like the fundamentalist resurgence in general and Peace Committee Subcommittee actions in particular. The trustees were, in fact, agents of those interests.

Resistance to Convention inspirations like the Peace Committee subcommittee visit or the literalist interpretation of the scripture, or the appointment of inerrantist faculty was considered insubordination rather than exercising the freedom to say "no" to actions and documents independent of the guidelines and procedures of the school. Consequently, the faculty was accused of being "pretty far out" (Russ Bush, personal communication, July 8, 1992), suffered an inquisition of its members by the Subcommittee of the Peace Committee (1986), and was eventually threatened with investigation by its own trustees (1991).

What has been described as a policy of enmeshment with the SBC contrasts sharply with the notion of institutional autonomy. Corporate autonomy insulates
and protects the faculty pursuit of truth and the sharing of knowledge according to their disciplines. The polar opposite to autonomy is dictation. In democratic societies, a will-of-the-majority approach to education can and sometimes does prevail.

Specifically, the changes at Southeastern in policy and polity were predicated precisely on the ability of the fundamentalists to win majorities at meetings of the Southern Baptist Convention. Those changes had nothing to do with the experience, expertise, and results of scholarship of those closest to the academy, on whose expertise the institution most depends. Institutionally, the identities, purposes, and governance of the Southern Baptist Convention and Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary were at points indistinguishable. When doctrinal decrees were handed down from the Southern Baptist Convention and accepted by the trustees and administration as compelling mandates for change, academic freedom was compromised, for, by definition, protections from outside interests were abrogated.

A policy of faculty alienation. Professors employed prior to 1987 were "grandfathered in" as exceptions to the new trustee policies. In the
meantime, until they left or retired from Southeastern, they experienced the indignity of teaching in a school where they were not wanted. In the words of former trustee, Robert Crowley: "I have a directory, an '85-86 [Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary] directory, and I've marked them off one by one as they've resigned" (personal communication, October 19, 1992).

The public differentiation of pre-1987 and post-1987 faculty fosters alienation and hostility instead of meaningful dialogue in a creative environment of genuine support. This policy impinges on academic freedom and did at Southeastern Seminary.

Did institutional procedures impinge on academic freedom? This inquiry invites consideration of the standard and exceptional operating procedures, the functional side, of seminary life.

In Section 2, the "Duties of the President," the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary Bylaws observe that the President "shall preside at the meetings of the faculty except as hereinafter provided and shall be the official medium of communication between the students or faculty and Board of Trustees" (p. 11). This responsibility as "official medium" of communication between students or faculty and the Board
is the key to sorting out the Peace Committee Subcommittee visit.

It appears that when an agent of another incorporated body comes to the Southeastern campus for formal inter-agency business, it proceeds with the permission of the trustees or the President acting for the time being in their stead. It also appears that the President continues to act as the official medium of communication between the students or faculty and this agent, or with the President's permission to communicate directly.

The record indicates that even inerrantist trustees had struggled specifically with the prospect of an external agent performing the duties ascribed to the trustees. Nevertheless, in the event that another agent or agency will act in the place of the trustees, the assumption is that the other agent, the president or subcommittee, will act according to guidelines expected of the trustees themselves. If the Peace Committee Subcommittee was not going to act according to the guidelines of the institution then the visit should have been refused by the trustees. If the Peace Committee and its Subcommittee intended to follow the guidelines, they failed terribly.
The exceptional, unannounced conference between the Peace Committee Subcommittee and the members of the Conservative Evangelical Fellowship (CEF) violated the process and the spirit of good order outlined in the bylaws of SEBTS (See "Response of the Board," Exhibit C, p. 10). President Randall Lolley did not act as the official medium. In particular, the president could not exercise "supervision" (Section 1, 1) or "be responsible for discipline" (Section 1, 3) of the school, and certainly was not in a position to serve as the "official channel" (Section 2, 9) for communications with a group which was performing responsibilities clearly the domain and essentially in the stead of the trustees. Finally, just as the president is allowed to attend all meetings of the Trustees (Section 2, 7), the Peace Committee had deemed it imperative that the president be involved in the official visit (Guidelines for the Subcommittees, 2). Therefore, he should have been included in the session with the CEF. He was not, and, according to the record, this was the intentional decision of the chair (page 162 and following).

A spirit of openness, mutual support, and concern for due process was wholly lacking in the subcommittee
visit. During the period of an official visit, off campus, and in secret without the official representatives of the seminary, the subcommittee met with a recognized student group, and only with this group, which was characterized by the same antagonism toward the seminary as that in the leadership of the subcommittee. Because other recognized student groups were denied access to the subcommittee it must be assumed that a one-sided report was preferred.

Functionally, the Subcommittee visit caused the faculty to have to answer to, not one, but two authorities, the trustees and the subcommittee. Moreover, in terms of the right of investigation, the subcommittee actually acted in the place of the trustees. It also created a situation where the faculty did not have the protections of due process which an investigation by the trustees would have mandated. The Subcommittee, an outside group composed of some of the seminary's fiercest foes, came to the campus without the blessing of the faculty, without a faculty member on it, without the opportunity for peer review (the universal criteria for dealing with charges and concerns in academia), and, in the end, an elaborate, trying process never allowed closure for the
defendants or their advocates.

Summarily, the Peace Committee Subcommittee visit presented a plethora of threats to academic freedom. The trustees were not defending the institution and faculty against its antagonists. An external agent was acting in the place of the trustees in the investigation of the faculty. The subcommittee did not act according to protocols outlined by the Peace Committee or the seminary bylaws for investigation of faculty. In meeting with the CEF members in secret, the subcommittee subverted the possibility of the president acting in his assigned roles for supervision, discipline, leadership of the faculty, and general responsibility for the welfare of the school.

As matters of procedural hindrances to academic freedom, the appointment experiences of Elizabeth Barnes and Keat Wiles should not to be omitted. When Elizabeth Barnes was interviewed by the Instruction Committee of the Southeastern Board of Trustees in February of 1987 she was asked repeatedly by the Chairperson of the Trustees, Robert Crowley, regarding her position on inerrancy, as well as her views on abortion and divorce ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, p. 37). Jim DeLoach, the chairperson of the
Committee on Instruction quizzed her on the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy, employing it as a "standard for judging the biblical stance" of both Professor Barnes and Professor Roy DeBrand, who was also up for appointment ("Southeastern Baptist," 1989, May-June, p. 37).

The Chicago Statement had no standing at Southeastern Seminary as a criterion for membership on the faculty, nor does inerrancy, and no position regarding abortion or divorce is described in the documents pertaining to the election of faculty. Furthermore, the interview has been described as "horrible... brutal treatment" by former Dean Morris Ashcraft, and as an "interrogation" by Dr. Barnes herself (personal communications, August 25 and October 16, 1992, respectively). Finally, after agreeing to nominate Dr. Barnes to the faculty and having communicated their intent to her in good faith, there was a meeting called March 9, without the Academic Dean's knowledge, designed to shift votes on the committee and scuttle the nomination. Therefore, in terms of the foreign tests employed to assess her candidacy, the antagonistic spirit of the interview, and the attempt to sabotage her nomination at the last
hour with no just cause presented (Correspondence from C. Frank Jordan to Jim DeLoach, May 12, 1987, included in Hester, et al., 1988), the procedure of Dr. Barnes' interview was in violation of her academic freedom.

Keat Wiles joined the faculty on presidential appointment (not the permanent tenure track) under Randall Lolley in the fall of 1987. Under the school's guidelines and accreditation agency standards, faculty on appointment are expected to receive 12 months notice of the institution's intent to renew or not renew their contract. With the arrival of the fall, 1988, term, the 12 month lead time was already passed. However President Lewis Drummond delayed making a decision on Wiles' appointment until November 16. At that point, Wiles was given a twelve month extension.

In the fall of 1989, the seminary administration was again delinquent in notification of Wiles. This time the delay stretched until January 2, 1990. At that late date Drummond issued a 12 month contract extension, but advised Wiles to seek employment elsewhere at the conclusion of that period. In May, 1991, Wiles completed his stay at SEBTS.

These two delays in granting notice constitute a procedural impropriety. Its significance as a
violation of academic freedom is clear in that the security of the teacher is tenuous, distracting the teacher from the tasks incumbent on a faculty member in favor of basic survival issues. Furthermore, the decision to renew or not renew a contract on the part of the administration is increasingly confounded by countless pressures, not all relevant to teacher effectiveness.

It also seems inappropriate and unfortunate that faculty members (Keat Wiles and Roy Debrand, personal communications, July 31, 1992) felt so insecure about commitments made by the president to faculty that the professors deemed it necessary to provide the initiative in documenting those agreements themselves in the form of letters. This inverts the process. Under these circumstances, faculty are providing administrative support. This activity and the insecurity which gave rise to it affect ideal institutional polity. It is an academic freedom issue because faculty attention is diverted from teaching, research, and writing, and toward functions tangential to their assignment. Furthermore, because confidence in appropriate forms of executive support is shaken, faculty cannot function at their optimum.
Did authoritarian controls anticipate non-conformity? Were departures from the norm expected and lead to actions intended to curb opportunities to act or think with freedom? "Authoritarian controls" suggests a willingness to operate arbitrarily outside the general interests or rules formed by or for the community.

On the occasion of the creation of the Peace Committee, the Southern Baptist Convention was advised "that to accomplish its work, this Committee shall recognize the role of trustees and shall work with and through appropriate Boards...of the Southern Baptist Convention" ("Report of the Southern," 1987, p. 3). The Association of Theological Schools suggests the role of the trustees to:

Be responsible for the establishment, maintenance, exercise, and protection of the institution's integrity and its freedom from unwarranted harassment or inappropriate external and internal pressures and destructive interference or restraints. (Bulletin 40, Part 3, Procedures, Standards, and Criteria for Membership, June 1992, p. 29).

The trustees did not defend the faculty from
unwarranted harassment. The subcommittee did not operate by due process, but invented a process foreign to the seminary documents. The President, the Subcommittee and Peace Committee exposed the faculty to external pressures by singling out faculty members, exacted responses from the faculty, and did not conclude the affair with a report to the accused faculty. The lack of closure constitutes, in the end, not assessment or a hearing, but harassment. This is especially poignant in light of the second wave of requests for clarification. Neither the Subcommittee nor the Peace Committee acted according to the guidelines of ATS in a specific sense and MacIver's insistence on responsible order rather than authoritarian acts.

There was an underlying assumption in the process of asking the faculty members implicated by the CEF students to supply responses to the concerns registered. The subcommittee appears to have given the student's report of the faculty member's theology or position the benefit of the doubt. The integrity of the student is not doubted, though the borrowing of Nancy Petty's notes under false pretenses suggests caution in this regard (pages 175, 176 of this study).
Nevertheless, the student's opinion is placed above that of the faculty member. It appears that the subcommittee was not inclined to follow up with the CEF students in order to clarify the meaning of certain concerns. Nor did the subcommittee seek corroboration from other students.

For instance, the committee wrote back to President Lolley requesting clarification from professor Alan Neeley: "Dr. Neely...indicates that there may be salvation outside of Jesus Christ. Please clarify." Actually, this is not the case at all (perhaps indicating that Neely's response had not even been read). ("A Report From," 1986, March 10, p. 7).

Neely responds:

I did not/do not indicate this. The indication is that of Mr. ________'s giving his interpretation of what he reports I said in class. I do not accept his interpretation of my position as being true, accurate, or adequate. My position in regard to salvation is well known to all members of my classes who listen to what I say. It is supported by nearly twenty-five years of involvement in the doing and teaching of missions. Moreover, my beliefs on this subject are published
In his original draft Neely had added "If the members of the Sub-Committee choose to accept Mr. ______'s word rather than mine, then they should justify their decision as well as be prepared to accept the implications of their decision." In another request for clarification Neely penned:

I did not intend to leave any doubt in regard to Mr. ______'s accusation. The only way I could be clearer than my initial response, viz., "I categorically and emphatically deny having said this in any fashion," would be to accuse Mr. ______ of not telling the truth. Rather than accusing Mr. ______ of being willfully untruthful, I prefer to believe his memory is faulty. ("Response to the Sub-Committee of the Peace Committee by Alan Neely," August 25, 1986, unpublished original draft)

Neeley struck from the final copy a stinging accusation in the form of an invitation, "There were more than 75 students in the class, H 2200, in the Fall
of 1981. I am enclosing a list of all the persons in
the class. Perhaps the members of the Sub-Committee
will want to talk with them."

In not seeking or allowing the statements of other
students, there appears to be the message that the
sub-committee sought pejorative accusations against the
faculty rather than the facts. The self imposed
limitation to one, relatively small, group of students
appears to indicate they were preoccupied with
exceptional accusations rather than the majority
sentiments. This is ironic, of course, in that the
fundamentalist resurgence was based on a mandate
theoretically supplied by a majority of votes at the
annual Convention. Yet, when it came to factual
assessments of the problems at Southeastern Seminary,
the committee was quite willing to depend on a
decidedly minority viewpoint at Southeastern Seminary.
For instance, the several statements of appreciation
and support on the part of the student council and
student body for the faculty and administration appear
to be sources of significant student consensus. Yet
the trustees responded indifferently to the interests
of the students acting in defense of their teachers.

The approach of the Peace Committee Subcommittee
is in all ways inconsistent. It appears that the faculty was not allowed a fair and impartial hearing. There appears to have been a predilection to assume guilt/heresy in the faculty, especially on the parts of subcommittee members Jim Henry and Jerry Vines. The Peace Committee closed the books on the investigation for ten years. It is impossible to stifle the unavoidable suspicion that the Peace Committee desired to avoid any lingering scrutiny over its work. In any other court the unproven accusations of the students would have been considered misunderstandings, misrepresentation or slander. In all courts the unresolved concerns would be an injustice to the 16 faculty members accused.

Therefore, the actions of the Peace Committee Subcommittee and the complicity of the trustees in this affair are regarded as arbitrary acts. Guidelines, due process, and simple acts of fairness were regarded with irreverence. In the course of proving their case, authoritarian actions anticipated non-conformity and curbed opportunities to preserve and defend the academic freedom of the faculty.

It must be admitted that SBC polity allowed for the changes in the make up of the board of trustees at
Southeastern. However, as guardians of the principles of academic freedom, the trustees are stewards of the rights of the minority, too. At Southeastern, wholesale changes were made irrespective of protections of diversity in the academic community. That is a violation of the spirit of academic freedom.

The Peace Committee Subcommittee visit guidelines offer that "if any faculty member or agency employee whose name enters into the discussion wishes, he or she shall be given opportunity to speak or present a written statement" ("Response of the Board," Exhibit O: "Guidelines for the Subcommittees," 1988). It would not accurate to describe the behavior of the 16 faculty members who were singled out to respond to the subcommittee concerns as engaging because they wished to, as the visit guidelines suggested. Instead, the teachers were required by the Committee through the President to respond (p. 180). This is an authoritarian act not in keeping with conditions of freedom, due process, and the guidelines of the school.

In another vein, the Association of Theological Schools details the acceptable standards for review of faculty.

Theological schools have come to value peer
assessment and to judge themselves by standards shared by graduate professional schools as a whole. Such peer assessment is the function of ATS which reflects both the standards of graduate and professional schools as well as a sensitivity to the denominational standards of churches for ministry. Schools have sought such peer assessment without compromising their loyalty to their denominations. In fact, church affiliated schools understand themselves as serving their respective churches better because they hold themselves accountable to standards of quality and governance established by accrediting agencies such as ATS. These developments have been in keeping with the dual context in which theological schools exist and from which they derive their identity, namely, higher education and the church. (Association of Theological Schools in the United states and Canada (1992), Bulletin, 40, Part 5, p. 46)

On the other hand, the Peace Committee was asked: To seek to determine the sources of the controversies in our Convention, and make findings and recommendations regarding these controversies,
so that Southern Baptists might effect reconciliation and effectively discharge their responsibilities to God. ("Report of," 1987, June 16, p. 3)

The tack taken by subcommittee members Jerry Vines and Jim Henry was not in the spirit of collaborating with seminary personnel in the mission to reunify the convention. Rather, couched in the language of "concerns," they inquired as to whether individual faculty members were guilty of heresy. The two subcommittee members turned the research and dialogue assignment into an investigation of individual personnel.

This was an "authoritarian" departure from the original limitation that "this committee... recognize the role of trustees and... work with and through appropriate boards... of the Southern Baptist Convention" ("Report of," 1987, June 16, p. 3). The subcommittee acted with indifference to the standards adopted by the trustees when the school embraced the criteria for ATS membership. In particular, in no way could the Subcommittee review be described as "peer review." This was a compromise in the protection of academic freedom of the SEBTS faculty.
When the Subcommittee of the Peace Committee made its report to SEBTS President Randall Lolley in the fall of 1986 (included in "A Response of the Board," 1986, pp. A-12, A-13), they suggested:

That we make available to the administration and Trustees our records of concerns and responses relative to specific professors. ("A Response of the Board," 1986, pp. A-12, A-13)

What makes this particularly injurious is that, according to the Chairperson of the Peace Committee, Charles Fuller, the minutes and records of the Peace Committee were unavailable to the faculty of Southeastern when the professors were asked to make their responses to subcommittee questions. On the other hand, the Subcommittee appears to have been quite willing to make available the sequestered material to the trustees, who, as a group had grown increasingly antagonistic to the faculty. This prejudicial approach and casual use of confidential materials indicates that authoritarian controls were in place and not responsible commitment to due process which would maintain the academic freedom of the faculty.

The fundamentalist trustees believed the key to changing the identity of the school was in the
appointment of faculty who shared their views. While the inerrancy perspective is not represented in the documents as an obligatory position, it is clear the eventual goal was to have only inerrantists on the faculty. Trustee Robert Crowley indicates:

When I came on they laughed at me...in fact, one of them said, "This is really something. Before Crowley came on board we were talking about parity, and now he's talking about every single member of the faculty being an inerrantist."

I made this statement and I took all kinds of heat...that I would never vote for anybody that was not an inerrantist...In the providence of God parity is laughable. We don't want parity anymore. We want to teach truth. And if you are teaching truth parity doesn't enter into truth....Either we are absolutely and totally wrong or they are absolutely and totally wrong. (Personal Communication, October 19, 1992).

Furthermore, the search and appointment processes of the president (pages 293 and following of this study), and vice president (pages 324 and following), show evidence of individuals functioning outside or ahead of standard operating procedures. Faculty,
student, and alumni input, required by the bylaws, was virtually ignored in the selection of the president and vice president for academic affairs.

Trustee Jim DeLoach's assessment was that Roy DeBrand was only a "stated inerrantist" (personal communication, October 26, 1992). He added, "Roy DeBrand in my opinion is a charlatan....As soon as he came on board, he immediately took a position directly contrary to the trustees" (Personal communication, October 26, 1992). DeLoach appears to assume that theology, specifically inerrancy, would have predicted a particular "political" sentiment, that is, support of the fundamentalist trustee agenda.

This example and the pressure, described elsewhere, which was applied on DeBrand to come out as an inerrantist or not receive tenure, illustrate that faculty members did not have permission to participate as free citizens in the academic community. Unofficial, unauthorized norms brought pressure to bear on faculty members to conform.

Keat Wiles, already at Southeastern Seminary on presidential appointment, was passed over twice in faculty selection processes for tenure track positions. The reasons supplied were: lack of institutional
loyalty (Wiles, undated), the use of the historical critical method of the interpretation of the Bible (Wiles, undated), and liberalism (Robert Crowley, personal communication, October 19, 1992). These criteria are not listed in the requirements for appointment to the faculty. Declining to appoint Wiles can only be described as operating outside of the rules of the community.

The fundamentalist trustees discarded regular protocols in commandeering the adjunctive faculty nomination process in 1988. The October 4 telephone conference call of the Instruction Committee (page 313 and following of this study) illustrates the willingness of the trustees to take the selection process out of the hands of those who best understood curricular matters and who were accorded those responsibilities by the by-laws.

Furthermore, the Silers were not reappointed for reasons unrelated to the course they were teaching and not apparent in any official document of the school. They did not learn of their non-appointment through seminary channels, but through the media. Finally, Janice Siler was dismissed without any comment at all. Apparently her name was dropped from the list for the
simple fact that she is married to her husband

It is true that the trustees were not obligated to
rehire the Silers because they were adjunctive and not
permanent faculty. But the process and rationale which
resulted in the decision to delete the Siler's from the
proposed list fall outside the pale of academic
freedom. The Siler affair is an example of imperious
action resulting in a corruption of regular procedures
outlined in the school documents and advocated by its
accrediting agencies. This example of autocratic
inclination without appropriate restraint threatens
academic freedom. If trustees are willing to operate
outside the rules in the case of the Siler's, then no
one's freedom is protected.

An inquiry into the existence of authoritarian
controls concludes in the affirmative. The Southern
Baptist Convention applied this kind of power in
invading the jurisdiction of the trustees with the
commissioning of the Peace Committee. The Peace
Committee subcommittee process intentionally exposed
the faculty to external pressures: by substituting
itself for peer review of faculty, through a biased
approach to investigation, with the casual treatment of
its documentation, and willingness to break its own
guidelines and those of the Peace Committee.
Furthermore, if the subcommittee visit was not an
investigation, then requiring the faculty to testify in
response to the "concerns," rather than participating
voluntarily, was out of order. The faculty members
could not act as free citizens in the academic or the
Convention community.

The evidence suggests that the SEBTS Trustees and
the Peace Committee Subcommittee in their actions, and
Peace Committee in its recommendations to the
Convention, did not hold a high regard for the
preservation and protection of diversity of opinion.
Input from key constituents was marginalized in the
selection of the president and vice-president for
academic affairs. The trustees aggressively
commandeered the adjunctive faculty process. Mahan
Siler, Janice Siler and Keat Wiles were censured
arbitrarily by the trustees in the application of norms
not present in the seminary documents. Therefore,
authoritarian action did expect non-conformity and lead
to measures which inhibited the opportunity to act and
think with freedom.
Chapter 6

Conclusion

A survey by Edward Gross of faculty and administrators regarding institutional priorities indicates that academic freedom consistently ranks near the top (1968). Yet the ideal called academic freedom is defined by economic, social, cultural, political, and technological circumstances. Definitions of educational mission, institutional history, and constituency are especially relevant variables. For some institutions, forms of church relatedness and theological/philosophical assumptions are nuances that pose potential difficulties for the enterprise.

Theological education is a small, but socially and historically significant, part of higher education. Concern is escalating regarding the multiplication of academic freedom crises in this arena. One center of disquietude has been Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Wake Forest, North Carolina, whose story is the concern of this study.

During the years 1979 to 1989, fundamentalist-
conservatives assumed control of the Southern Baptist Convention, and, concurrently, a majority on the board of trustees of Southeastern Seminary. As this group attempted to turn the school in a more conservative direction, concerns mounted for the state of academic freedom at the school. This study asks if the academic freedom of the faculty was violated at Southeastern Seminary during this transition decade.

Concerns relevant to an assessment of academic freedom are suggested by Robert M. MacIver (1955). These areas of interest were recast as inquiries into the academic experience at Southeastern. The questions and conclusions are as follows.

Summary

Were Faculty Members Free to Investigate in Their Fields?

The struggle for control of the Southern Baptist Convention and its agencies possessed the minds, hearts and energies of its people. The faculty at Southeastern Seminary was similarly preoccupied and distracted from the duties of research and teaching. Consequently, the faculty was not as optimally free to pursue their academic interests as they might have
Their work under intense scrutiny by fundamentalist leaders and the leaders' deputies, Southeastern faculty members did not feel completely free to investigate in their fields because of the potential backlash as well. The range of possible inquiry was restricted, and, with it, academic freedom. Were the conclusions of study and research freely drawn?

Sources external and internal to the seminary sought to influence the conclusions of study and research of faculty members. In the case of professor John Durham this manifested itself as trustee review and mild censure regarding his conclusions in a study of the Satan of the book of Job in the Old Testament. Under pressure to provide theological balance in the curriculum, faculty member Claude Stewart felt compelled to imbue his courses with fundamentalist literature he regarded as "subpar" (personal communication, September 9, 1992). Stewart later regarded this concession with regret. The experience of both teachers constituted a violation of the liberty to freely draw conclusions, render judgments, and make decisions regarding the content of what they shared.
with the learning community.

Were faculty free to share their knowledge and skills?

Living under the microscope of antagonists without, students spies recruited to report on evidence of heresy, and increasingly combative fundamentalist students disrupting their classes fostered an environment inhospitable to good teaching.

Fundamentalist leaders of the Convention takeover led under the banner of inerrancy. The object was to sort the faculty by this test. Faculty in opposition to the takeover were singled out for harsh criticism.

In these ways, the members of the faculty at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary were not free to share their knowledge and skills without potential repercussions.

Was anyone censored directly? Indirectly?

Censorship was evident in the fact that, after the firestorm year, 1987, faculty enjoyed fewer invitations to consider employment in other SBC agencies. In a sense, the SEBTS faculty lost its voice in Convention life.

Censure, the evidence of strong disapproval, was evident in the identification of the 16 faculty members required to respond to the concerns of the Peace
Committee Subcommittee. In addition, most were required to clarify their explanations in a second round of responses to the Subcommittee. The faculty members were never accused of heresy, but they were not cleared of suspicion either.

Later the Peace Committee Subcommittee recommended that the Southeastern trustees launch their own investigation of faculty, implying reasonable suspicion of theological error within the faculty. The trustees simply had to find it. The faculty would have to prove their innocence. The formal recommendation of the Subcommittee constituted a form of censure.

Professor Elizabeth Barnes was advised she would never receive tenure on the very day of her appointment, reportedly because she advocated the use of gender inclusive language in the classroom. Keat Wiles was not seriously considered for appointment because of his support of the pre-1987 faculty and administration, his use of the historical critical method of the study of the scriptures, and because he was considered a liberal. The Barnes, Wiles, and "Sixteen" examples are representative of impingements on academic freedom because efforts of the Peace Committee Subcommittee and the trustees set them apart.
in pejorative terms.

There is evidence that arbitrary censure was applied to the whole faculty. President Drummond, Vice President Bush, and the trustees acted on the rumor that Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary lay outside of accepted Southern Baptist orthodoxy, an accusation which was never dealt with formally, so as to be confirmed or denied.

The Glorieta Statement issued by the seminary presidents appeared to concede that the theology taught at the seminaries was indeed a primary source of the Convention controversy. At the root of the problem was the theological integrity of the faculty.

The Peace Committee proposed and then provided in their subsequent report minimum standards of belief for agency employees. This (tenure) condition was not imposed on members of the Southern Baptist Convention, however. The imposition of an additional burden invoked a double standard on Southern Baptist faculty, a form of censorship where their studies were concerned, and limitation of academic freedom unpalatable to the profession.

Finally, the fundamentalist trustees advertised that they intended to replace all the faculty through
attrition, an indirect put-down of the faculty hired prior to 1987. In all four examples, the Southeastern faculty was censured as a group for not adhering to a particular line of theological thought. Were tenure and status conditions manipulated in such a way to insure conformity to religious principles?

Inerrancy and adherence to the fundamentalist party line were required in order to achieve tenure in the case of Roy DeBrand. Similar stipulations were evident in the failed application process of Keat Wiles to the faculty. Apparently Elizabeth Barnes did not meet with the conditions of certain trustees for tenure either.

These tenure conditions, as well as the faculty's sense of tenure insecurity (examined by Lavenue), and the depreciated value of tenure (addressed by Durham), were precipitated by efforts of fundamentalist trustees to reframe the seminary according to their religious principles.

Conditions for tenure and the fragmentation of tenure conditions impinged on the academic freedom of the faculty.

The status conditions of the faculty were frequently attenuated in order to reduce the power of
the faculty, press the agenda of the fundamentalist trustees, reward compatriots and demonstrate non-support for adversaries of the fundamentalist agenda. The key incidences include: the changing role of the faculty in the appointment process; the restructuring of the academic dean's position without faculty input; advancing and electing candidates for president, vice-president for academic affairs, as well as the faculty which did not receive the support of the faculty; non-support by the trustees for faculty initiatives like AAUP chapter recognition and a gender inclusive language policy publication; decisions and actions which led to enrollment and financial crises; and, the apparent difference in treatment between old and new faculty in rank, course scheduling, press releases, and so on. Whether as an inducement to adopt trustee approved behavior or as a consequence of resisting trustee action, the status of the faculty was depreciated and the traditional rights and privileges of academic freedom were transgressed.

Were there direct or indirect curbs to faculty mobility?

As fundamentalist trustees solidified their control of the school and redesigned its reputation,
the professors who sought to leave found it increasingly difficult to find work elsewhere. Their association with the school was held as a liability and their professional expertise was sometimes questioned because of their relationship with a "fundamentalist" institution. There is evidence that personnel from other seminaries and divinity schools outside of Southern Baptist life were wary of the war-weariness of Southeastern faculty which might affect productivity. It is difficult to pin-point active intervention which might curb faculty mobility, but indirect curbs are quite evident.

**Did institutional policies or procedures impinge on academic freedom?**

As has been described elsewhere, the fundamentalist trustee policy appears to have been to base the agenda for change at Southeastern Seminary on perceptions of the school, not facts distilled through even-handed investigation. The trustees were quick to act on SBC legislation which ran counter to traditions of many years of the school. These measures are foreign to the usually careful trustee oversight of institutions of higher education. The threat to academic freedom is inherent in haste to act according
to popular whims of sometimes slim majorities meeting once a year. When the value of faculty scholarship and vocational security are subject to changing tides of theological opinion, free inquiry and expression is severely restricted to whatever is politically and temporarily expedient. This is not academic freedom.

A policy was advanced from fundamentalist quarters commending balance in the curriculum as well as in the theological viewpoints represented on the faculty. Translated simply, the advocates of this policy desired a more substantial voice for fundamentalist viewpoints at the Southern Baptist seminaries. However, the difficulty in successfully implementing this policy is clearly evident: who decides what balance means? The threat to academic freedom in seeking "balance" is that the policy would be advanced and measured from outside the academy. Seeking balance would compromise the autonomy of the institution, and, ultimately, the academic freedom of its members.

The unrelenting pressure to legislate and enforce the doctrine of inerrancy on Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary and its faculty is directly in opposition to the open nature of the academy, the documents of the school and of the Convention. In
advancing one theology, the range of conclusions in the pursuit of truth was narrowed. Any semblance of academic freedom was lost in the effort.

The trustees and the presidents of Southeastern Seminary were in some ways more responsive to the Southern Baptist Convention than their other constituencies: the faculty, administration, students, and other sources of support. The trustees did not protect the seminary from outside interests, like the fundamentalist resurgence in general and Peace Committee Subcommittee initiatives in particular. The trustees were, in fact, agents of those interests. Contradictory statements in the documents of the seminary regarding who governs the institution may have led to this. In any case, it appears that the Convention and Southeastern Seminary live in a tangle of multiple and sometimes contradictory understandings of who is in charge of what. This enmeshment with the SBC contrasts sharply with the traditional policy of institutional autonomy which protects the faculty from unwarranted harassment.

Another compromise of academic freedom arising from seminary policy was the public differentiation of pre-1987 and post-1987 faculty members. This alienates
the less honored members of the community and reduces the free exchange of ideas which richly enhance the academic community. This policy, observed at Southeastern, impinges on the spirit of academic freedom.

As a procedural matter, the Peace Committee Subcommittee visit to the campus provided a surplus of threats to academic freedom. The trustees did not defend the institution and the faculty against its antagonists. An external agent was acting in the place of the trustees in the investigation of the faculty. The subcommittee did not act according to protocols outlined by the Peace Committee or the seminary bylaws for investigation of faculty. In meeting with the Conservative Evangelical Fellowship members in secret, the subcommittee subverted the possibility of the president acting in his assigned role for supervision, discipline, leadership of the faculty, and general responsibility for the welfare of the school.

The appointment experiences of Elizabeth Barnes and Keat Wiles evidence procedural anomalies which depart from the protections principle of academic freedom. Twice the administration was overdue in advising Wiles of his status with the school; an
expectation held universally in higher education.

The SEBTS Committee on Instruction approved Elizabeth Barnes' nomination and advised her of their intent to advance her candidacy for the faculty. In good faith she accepted their word. Prior to the meeting of the board, however, an attempt was made by members of the Committee to sabotage her nomination. The procedures which put the status of professors Wiles and Barnes at risk impinged upon their academic freedom.

Did authoritarian controls anticipate nonconformity? Were departures from the norm expected and lead to actions intended to curb opportunities to act or think with freedom?

The Southern Baptist Convention applied authoritarian power when they created the Peace Committee and, by all appearances, gave it license to invade the jurisdiction of the trustees of Southeastern Seminary. The trustees chose not to defend the faculty from unwarranted harassment which arrived in the form of a Peace Committee Subcommittee. The posture of the primary members of the committee toward the faculty was plainly hostile.

The subcommittee did not operate by due process,
but invented a process foreign to the seminary documents. The Subcommittee refused to meet with official campus groups, while at the same time gathering in secret session with students most critical of the seminary. The President, the Subcommittee and Peace Committee exposed faculty members to external pressures by singling them out. They also required responses from the faculty in spite of the fact that due process procedures had not been initiated. In the end, the Subcommittee demonstrated a lack of discretion when it volunteered its documentation to the trustees in order to begin the trustee's investigation, a departure from the Peace Committee decision to lock up all its materials for ten years.

The affair was never concluded. The lack of closure transformed the meaning of the experience from investigation to harrassment, and in that sense, from bad to worse. This is especially poignant in light of the second wave of requests from the subcommittee for clarification of responses by the faculty.

Therefore, the actions of the Peace Committee Subcommittee and the complicity of the trustees in this affair are regarded as arbitrary acts. Guidelines, due process, and simple acts of fairness were regarded with
irreverence. In the course of proving their case, authoritarian actions by the Subcommittee anticipated non-conformity and curbed opportunities to preserve and defend the academic freedom of the faculty.

In addition, the evidence suggests that the SEBTS Trustees and the Peace Committee Subcommittee in their actions, and the Peace Committee in its recommendations to the Convention, did not hold a high regard for the preservation and protection of diversity of opinion, a marked feature in a context where academic freedom is honored. Similarly, input from key constituents was marginalized in the selection of the president and vice-president for academic affairs. The trustees aggressively commandeered the adjunctive faculty process. Finally, Mahan Siler, Janice Siler and Keat Wiles were censured arbitrarily by the trustees in the application of norms not present in the seminary documents. Therefore, non-conformity was expected and authoritarian actions led to measures which inhibited the opportunity to act and think with freedom.

Conclusion

MacIver's principles of academic freedom were violated at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. As fundamentalist-conservatives assumed a majority on
the board of trustees of the seminary and concurrently attempted to turn the school in a more conservative direction, the academic freedom of the faculty was compromised.

Implications

Harold Howe II, Commissioner of Education in the Johnson Administration, once remarked:

Academic freedom is not divisible. You can't have just a comfortable proportion of it or the part of it which produces the ideas you happen to like. You have to keep it whole and complete without compromise, or you don't have it at all. (From an address entitled: "Responsibility and Academic Freedom," delivered at the Adelphi University Commencement, June 9, 1968; cited in Hunt & Connelly, 1969, p. 59)

The spirit of this agrees with MacIver's intent and the approach of this study. Academic freedom is not only defined by the experience in the classroom, as important as that is. Academic freedom is impacted by the multitude of issues, processes, decisions, guidelines, and experiences of those participating in the community of learning. Economic, social, cultural, political, and technological issues impact
the status of academic freedom. Educational mission, institutional history, the various and evolving constituencies of the school, religious movements warrant our attention in the study of the status of academic freedom in a particular context.

There is a temporal dimension as well. To adapt a phrase, vigilance is the price of academic freedom. Relationships, definitions, agreements, goals, and policies must be revisited, reviewed, and renewed. Even the best of academic freedom policies are based on the assumptions of the day in which they were written.

This study of the academic freedom experience at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary illustrates that requirement. Without contemporary clarification, all manner of complications are invited. Clearly, the faculty and administration at Southeastern before 1987 had a different understanding of the nature of the institution, the responsibilities of its personnel, and, consequently, the definition of academic freedom than did the new fundamentalist trustees.

The study also revisits the perennial dilemma of how to balance the need for accountability to a denomination with the desire to maintain worthy standing within higher education. It is unlikely that
this tension can be resolved. It may be well not to suspend it altogether. Under the best of circumstances each corporate personality challenges the other to higher standards of excellence. Under difficult circumstances, choices are made which affect the identity and mission of the school. The relationship with the church or with institutional peers may be affected adversely.

Similar stress exists between "maintaining religious traditions and doctrinal purity while supporting a climate of free inquiry for faculty and students" (May, 1988, July - August, p. 23). Once upon a time, it might have been assumed that, with the reverence Baptists hold for religious liberty, soul competency, and freedom of conscience, this tension could be managed without denominational war. This study invites those involved in church related higher education to avoid such assumptions.

It is tempting to conclude from the Southeastern story that the possibility of true academic freedom in church related theological education is doubtful. The Concordia Seminary, Missouri, and the Charles Curran affair at Catholic University do not encourage a more hopeful assessment. However, says Bill Leonard,
From a historical perspective, ... some of the best theological interchange occurs in the midst of crisis, struggle, and debate. As Martin Luther observed, an individual becomes a theologian "by living, nay dying and being damned, not by thinking, reading, or speculating." (1988, Fall, p. 46)

Perhaps this will be the good fortune of academic freedom in theological education. Professor Richard Hester remarked at a press conference during the hottest part of the firestorm, the fall, 1987, board of trustees meeting:

"I want to reflect with you on the images that come to my mind as I think about the last three days on this campus. Who can ever forget the rally where a thousand people gathered in the Alumni Chapel to say, 'We want to sustain the 37-year tradition of powerful, free theological education at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary?"

"Who could forget the image of a courageous president who has stood tall throughout this entire meeting and spoken the truth again and again?"
"Who will forget the courage of this faculty that has stood together solidly, every single one, saying we stand for the most responsible course and that is to maintain and protect academic freedom at all cost?

"Who can forget the courage of a new generation of young people -- seminary students -- who have sent this week a powerful message to Southern Baptists that there is on the way to you a new breed of people, a new breed of ministers, who are never, never going to give up the fight for the truth and for openness and for multiplicity of a point of view? Who can forget that -- a group of seminary people who have not learned the meaning of giving up?

Who can forget the press who has been on this campus every day, all day, making sure the shades are pulled up and the work of the fundamentalists is done under the careful scrutiny of the public eye?...

"Who can forget that people have stood together? Nobody broke ranks, nobody gave in, nobody compromised, everyone was united, and we have a president who can sing bass.
"When you look back, the images are unforgettable. They are images of courage, they are images of strength, they are images of determination and they are images of a group of people who are saying, 'No matter what happens here in the terms of the structures of this school, we have a mission. We know what theological education is really about, and we are going to keep doing it and, we're going to keep telling our story.'" (High & Puckett, 1987, October 15, pp. 3, 4.)

The better part of this study may have been simply the telling of the story of the pursuit of the understanding and preservation of academic freedom. It is hoped that something is learned by it.

**Possibilities for Future Research**

**Education**

What will happen to Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary? A longitudinal study regarding institutional viability is suggested. Will Southeastern survive the change in ethos and mission? If it does, what kind of seminary will it be?

Specific considerations would be interesting, like the nature of the curriculum. Prior to the dramatic
changes at Southeastern, Joe Edward Barnhart charged:
They (Inerrancy Party members) rightly criticize their opponents for being less than candid in informing the Baptist people about what is going on in the seminaries and college religion departments, but they themselves are wolves in sheep's clothing, disguising from the same Baptist people their goal to obliterate the ideal of education and establish slick indoctrination programs in its place. (Barnhart, 1986, p. 86)

Will texts selected reflect a narrowing or broadening of awareness of the scholarship in the field. Will teaching styles reflect increasingly classical or newer pedagogical forms. Will test score feedback to students by graders reflect a shaping toward new values? In short, how will the curriculum change?

Were the new, fundamentalist students of lower quality than their predecessors as professors Balentine (personal communication, August 25, 1992) and DeBrand (personal communication, July 31, 1992) suggested? It might be possible to get data from the seminary admissions office regarding the student undergraduate college and record, graduate entrance examination
scores, and perhaps even their academic records.

How much do faculty members teach from their discipline that they do not believe? This might be a content analysis or a matter of personal report. Also, do seminary graduates actually teach what they learned in seminary? How much actual utility is there in a seminary education?

What do trustees actually know about the institution they serve, its documents, and its regulations?

Are the accrediting agencies changing with the addition of more evangelical institutions? Will the Association of Theological Schools and/or its ideals survive? How effective are the accrediting agencies at enforcement of membership criteria? Are they, indeed, "toothless tigers"? (Malcolm Tolbert, personal communication, October 30, 1992)

It would be interesting to assess quantitatively the actual degree to which Southeastern faculty writing productivity dropped, stayed the same, or increased during the decade just reviewed. The dean's office keeps records on faculty publications.

The Students

This investigation took a look at the academic
freedom experience of the faculty. The academic freedom of the students at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary is an issue which invites further study. There were "threats by an unidentified caller to a female student to cease her activities on behalf of academic freedom on the campus" (Payne, 1989, March 2 - 9, p. 9). A divorced minority female student with one child was denied married student housing on the grounds that hers did not constitute a legitimate family (Ackerman,' 1987, October 10, p. 35A). A member of the Board of Trustees soundly criticized the student editor of the campus newspaper for expressing an opinion unfavorable to trustee actions (Ackerman, 1987, October 10, p. 35A). The Women's Resource Center on the campus of Southeastern Seminary was closed without advising the leadership of that center. (Fox, 1988, September 29, p. ID) A female student was admonished by her "home-town pastor concerning the 'inappropriateness' of her speech and behavior at the Seminary relative to current campus issues." There were undocumented reports of vandalism on cars, which all happened to belong to moderate students. (Payne, 1989, March 2-9, p. 8)

Marty Cauley was one of the conservative students
who met with the Peace Committee Subcommittee. He says:

The Peace Committee [Subcommittee] asked us to share some of our frustrations with them. The conservatives on the committee asked us to write out a list of some of the things our professors were saying and sign our names to our respective lists. We did so. They told us they would not share these lists with the administration of the school or our professors but simply use them in evaluation. They lied. (1993, August, p. 7)

Cauley goes on to describe caustic and intimidating denunciations of himself and other CEF students.

In short, did the faculty, administration or trustees contribute to the decline at Southeastern as a community of learning by compromising the academic freedom of the students?

Historical and Sociological

In the course of the literature review, striking parallels became apparent between the Southern Baptist Convention and the Catholic Church, the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary crisis and the Charles Curran case at Catholic University. Both denominations
have struggled with the notions of the mission of higher education, dogma as opposed to discovery, the institution versus the individual, license and liability, the use of confessional statements in the defense of freedom or as a discriminating test to define orthodoxy. Comparisons of the literature, struggles, and decisions might elicit interesting outcomes.

What effect will the fundamentalist takeover of a major supplier of trained ministers to the southeast coast of the United States have? Will the character of the churches change?

If denominationalism is on the wane, then is the fundamentalist takeover not evidence of strength, but fragmentation? What will happen to the church related institutions of higher education in the process?

Organizational Dynamics

More work needs to be done in the area of democratic congregational systems in denominations and churches. How do you maintain academic freedom in a purely democratic society? Absolute congregationalism can prove tyrannical.

What about the language of war in the church? How much is rhetoric and how much is honest theology? For
instance, when the fundamentalists said inerrancy, did they mean inerrancy, or was it a password for party membership?

The Faculty

What impact did the stress of the Southeastern crisis have on the health and well being of the participants? Furthermore, what effect did the experience have on the families of faculty members? Carolyn Wiles, spouse of former faculty member Keat Wiles said, "Children would have an interesting story to tell....I know early on, Colyn Hawn, Michael's wife,...sent Michael to see [Dean Morris] Ashcraft and to ask Ash, because he had lived through other institutional shakeups, "What did this do to your children, because we want to know what it's going to do to our children." Ash said, "Our children have grown up to be fine upstanding people who will not darken the door of a church." Since then one of them has gone back to church,...but this totally turned them off to church. (Personal communication, July 31, 1992)
Conclusion

As fundamentalist-conservatives pressed their agenda in Southern Baptist Convention life, and, in particular, as they assumed a majority on the board of trustees of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Wake Forest, North Carolina, the academic freedom of the Southeastern faculty became an issue. The voices of the participants in this drama voted according to their perspective and distinct interests. Concerns articulated by Robert M. MacIver (1955) provided another vantage point for consideration of the record, as well as guidelines through which to scrutinize the academic freedom experience of the faculty.

This study concludes that the academic freedom of the faculty in the decade 1979 to 1989 was compromised. The following areas of infringement on academic freedom were identified: the ability of the faculty to investigate in their fields, draw conclusions, and share their knowledge and skills with freedom; the censorship of the faculty as a collect, as well as some individual members; indirect curbs to faculty mobility; the manipulation of tenure and status conditions of the faculty to insure conformity to religious principles;
and, institutional policies and procedures which impinged on academic freedom.

Further research of the Southeastern experience is invited. Chronicling these events illuminates a host of other considerations worthy of research relevant to higher education, organizational change, and the human experience in community.
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