

R E P O R T S

Academic Freedom and Tenure

SOUTHEASTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY (NORTH CAROLINA)¹

I. INTRODUCTION

At a meeting in Chicago in 1950, the Southern Baptist Convention decided to found the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary to remedy the lack of seminary provision for the Southern Baptists in the region in which the denomination had originated in 1845. With a student body of eighty-five and a faculty of three, the seminary opened in the fall of 1951, occupying one building on the campus of Wake Forest College, a Baptist institution going back to 1834, in Wake Forest, North Carolina, a short distance northeast of the state capital at Raleigh.

In 1956, the college (now Wake Forest University) moved to Winston-Salem, North Carolina, and the seminary took over the entire campus, allowing it a considerable expansion in numbers of students, to 734 by 1959 and to a peak of 1,246 (full-time and part-time) in the fall of 1984. The enrollment has since declined, to 848 in the spring of 1988 and to 803 in the fall of that year. The regular full-time faculty numbered thirty-four in the spring of 1987, dropping to thirty-one by January 1989.

A largely postgraduate institution (there is a two-year Associate of Divinity degree program for those without the baccalaureate), the seminary offers two- and three-year master's degree programs in Christian education, church music, and divinity, and the advanced degrees of Master of Theology and Doctor of Ministry. Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary was accredited by the Association of Theological Schools in 1958 and by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in 1978.

In 1974, Dr. W. Randall Lolley, a graduate of the seminary and at that time a minister in Winston-Salem,

became its third president. When he left office in the spring of 1988, consequent on events to be traced here, he was succeeded by Dr. Lewis A. Drummond, who came from the Billy Graham Center at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky.

There are in all six Southern Baptist seminaries. Together they enroll more than 10,000 students, a fifth of all theological students in North America. They are agencies of the Southern Baptist Convention, which meets for three days each year; in the interval between meetings of the convention, denominational affairs are administered by an executive committee consisting of the president and the recording secretary of the convention, the president of the Woman's Missionary Union, and from one to five representatives (varying with the size of membership) from each cooperating state. The president names the powerful Committee on Committees, which in turn appoints a Committee on Boards, Commissions, and Standing Committees that nominates the governing bodies of subordinate entities, including the trustees of the six seminaries; those nominations are acted upon by the succeeding convention.

Thirty trustees, so chosen, are the governing body (and, insofar as the concept is relevant, legally the owners) of the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, with the power to appoint faculty and administrative officers and to set policy for the institution. The seminary is "affiliated with and controlled by" the Southern Baptist Convention, which adopts the by-laws, rules, and regulations under which its board of trustees operates. The convention's Cooperative Program provides financial support for the six seminaries equivalent roughly to the yearly income from an endowment of \$400,000,000; consequently, students pay no tuition, though there are modest matriculation fees, lower for Southern Baptist students than for those from other religious backgrounds. Southeastern does not participate in any federal program of student loans or grants, though it can certify eligibility for deferment of repayment of loans incurred while students were undergraduates, and qualified students can take advantage of Veterans Administration benefits.

Southeastern has generally been regarded as the

¹The text of this report was written in the first instance by the members of the investigating committee. In accordance with Association practice, the text was then edited by the Association's staff, and, as revised, with the concurrence of the investigating committee, was submitted to Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure. With the approval of Committee A it was subsequently sent to the faculty members at whose request the inquiry was conducted, to the administration of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, to the president of the AAUP chapter, and to other persons concerned in the report. In the light of the responses received and with the editorial assistance of the Association's staff, this final report has been prepared for publication.

most "liberal" of the seminaries, and its procedures have been more in keeping with those of American universities than are those of the other seminaries. At Southeastern, the entire faculty has been involved in making appointments and in tenure decisions; yearly self-evaluations are required. The teaching load is eight hours each semester, below the norm for the other seminaries.

Upon appointment, as stipulated in the by-laws adopted by the board of trustees in 1950, each faculty member at Southeastern must publicly subscribe to the "Articles of Faith," or "Abstract of Principles," two names used interchangeably for a document drawn up in 1858 and adopted the next year by the Southern

Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville. The other four seminaries use the "Baptist Faith and Message," adopted by the Southern Baptist Convention in 1925 and revised in 1963. The twenty headings in the "Articles of Faith" cover points from the nature of God, the Trinity, the Fall of Man, and election, to the Resurrection and the Last Judgment. Two are of particular relevance here: the first, dealing with Scripture, declares both the Old and New Testaments to be inspired and "the only sufficient, certain and authoritative rule of all saving knowledge, faith and obedience"; the eighteenth is an assertion of individual liberty of conscience, which is subject to God alone, He having "left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men."

II. THE CONVENTION AND THE PEACE COMMITTEE

For many years, as the national press has regularly reported, the Southern Baptist Convention has felt the increasing influence of religious fundamentalism; since 1979 the officers of the convention have been drawn from that wing of the denomination and have thus gained the sweeping appointive powers inherent in the elected officials. The so-called moderates have continued to contest the elections for national offices and in the spring of 1987 organized the Southern Baptist Alliance to promote their views, which continue to prevail in a number of state conventions, particularly in the southeastern part of the United States.

Recently, the term "inerrancy" has come into use to signal the conviction that "Scripture is without error or fault in all its teaching, no less in what it states about God's acts in creation, about the events of world history, and about its own literary origins under God, than in its witness to God's saving grace in individual lives"—these the words of *The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy*, drafted at national meetings of a coalition of evangelical church leaders held from 1979 to 1981. Any limiting or relativizing view of such matters, that *Statement* continues, will irretrievably damage the authority of the Bible. But it is thought by many that, beyond its technical meaning in theology or criticism, "inerrancy" has come to stand among Southern Baptists as a code word for a position in which theological and sociopolitical beliefs are inextricably intertwined. Thus, the leadership of the Southern Baptist Convention has taken widely publicized stands on a number of political and social issues usually associated with the "Moral Majority" or the "New Right," such as opposition to abortion, the Equal Rights Amendment, women in the ministry, and homosexuality, and support for prayer in the schools, the teaching of creationism, and the appointment of Judge Robert Bork to the United States Supreme Court; the Convention itself has taken a stand on some of these issues, e.g., against homosexuality in June 1988, but not on all.²

²There are evidently strong objections to the use of the term "fundamentalism." In an article in the *Raleigh News and Observer* (November 23, 1987), a Southeastern trustee, William D. Delahoyde, wrote: "To call someone a 'fundamentalist' in this day and age is the shortened way of saying they are an anti-intellectual moralist, possessing the sophistication of Gomer Pyle and the sensitivity of Darth Vader. It is one of the last socially acceptable put-downs because the tolerance and fairness extended to most racial, ethnic, and religious groups in recent years has not yet been extended to conservative, Bible-believing Christians." But if "inerrancy" is thought a more appropriate substitute, President Drummond stated in a letter to the Association's staff (August 23, 1988) that "the view of 'biblical inerrancy' is quite nebulous within itself."

At the Southern Baptist Convention in Dallas in June 1985, a special committee that came to be known as the "Peace Committee" was created to look into the causes of controversy within the denomination and to make recommendations concerning them. The Peace Committee was instructed to follow the "Baptist Faith and Message" of 1963 with regard to theological issues, and all trustees, boards, and agencies of the Southern Baptist Convention were enjoined to cooperate with the committee in its work.

On February 4 and 5, 1986, a four-member subcommittee of the Peace Committee—understood to be equally divided between fundamentalists and moderates—visited the Southeastern campus, and during a day-long meeting on February 5 with President Lolley, Dean of the Faculty Morris Ashcraft, and Dr. Charles Horton, the chair of the board of trustees, a number of issues were discussed, among them the "Baptist Faith and Message" and the "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.

The most remarkable of the subjects of discussion was a list of twenty-seven "concerns" voiced by the subcommittee about statements allegedly made or positions allegedly taken by members of the faculty in class and in their writing. 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. On that evening, three of the four members of the subcommittee took part in a nearly four-hour meeting with a group of students belonging to the Conservative Evangelical Fellowship, a meeting of which President Lolley was unaware until late the next morning, and of which the organization's faculty adviser was also ignorant. Seven of the twenty-seven concerns were presented anonymously; of those whose sources are known, eleven came from two recent graduates who are former members of the Conservative Evangelical Fellowship, and the remaining nine originated with members of the fellowship present at that meeting. Among the subjects of the concerns were the historical authenticity of the burning bush and the Virgin birth, the authorship of particular books of the Bible and the authority of Scripture generally, the role of homosexual or divorced persons in the church, and liberation theology. The concerns

involved fifteen members of the regular faculty, one visitor, and one retired professor.

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; as it was, President Lolley asked each faculty member to reply to the relevant concerns. Some answers expressed mystification about the meaning of a concern or suggested that the students had misunderstood or had taken a statement out of context; others, freely admitting the statement or opinion, explained intent and meaning. These answers were communicated by President Lolley to the subcommittee and, in a report dated March 10, to the board of trustees. In August, the subcommittee requested further clarification of some of the replies. The president's response, on September 18, forwarded additional statements by the faculty members, and his covering letter expressed dismay that nothing had been heard from the subcommittee or its chair or from the Peace Committee about the earlier reply, although news releases had informed the Baptist public that three other seminaries were freed from any further investigation. This "extraordinary situation," President Lolley wrote, was "perilously near to the greatest of all ironies—being held hostage, without information, responses, or charges, in of all things, a process seeking peace." No reply was ever made by the Peace Committee or its subcommittee to the president's two communications.

In October 1986, the Peace Committee held a prayer retreat with the leaders of all Southern Baptist national agencies. At that meeting the presidents of the six seminaries unanimously agreed to a document, since

known, from the place of meeting, as "The Glorieta Statement," asserting the supernatural origin of Christianity and the inspired, "God-breathed" character of the Bible, reaffirming the seminary confessional statements, and committing themselves and their institutions to balance in the classroom, to respect for the convictions of all Southern Baptists, and to renewed awareness of evangelism, missions, and the Baptist heritage.

In its final report to the Southern Baptist Convention in June 1987, the Peace Committee called for the cessation of political maneuvering, lobbying, and appeals to the press by the competing factions in the denomination. On the theological front, the committee proposed to take the "Baptist Faith and Message" (though the committee rejected any implication that it is a creed, to which Baptist tradition is opposed) as the doctrinal standard for all Southern Baptist agencies, but the committee discerned two differing interpretations of that document—those who took the first article, "On Scripture," to mean that the Bible was without error in any aspect, and those who held its "truth" to relate only to faith and practice. Those who held to the latter interpretation were called upon to recognize the great number of Southern Baptists who chose the broader position and to learn to live together with their opponents in harmony, as the committee had done. So far as the seminaries were concerned, the Peace Committee assumed the "Baptist Faith and Message" and the Glorieta Statement as doctrinal norms. Trustees were encouraged to investigate the theological positions of faculty and administrators in order to guide them; and the institutions were called upon to bring their faculties into conformity with "majority opinion" among Southern Baptists.

III. THE TRUSTEES IN TRANSITION

The appointing power of the elected officers of the Southern Baptist Convention gradually changed the composition of the Southeastern trustees. After June 1987, there was a narrow "inerrantist" majority. Since June 1988, counting those who adhere to the new persuasion or who have voted with those who adhere to it, the majority has been decisive. 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; two members of the present board list no college degrees on their resumes.

The drift of things was apparent well before the majority in the board had shifted. In February 1987, following a faculty search, President Lolley recommended the appointment of two new members of the faculty, Dr. Roy DeBrand in preaching and Dr. Elizabeth Barnes in theology. The by-laws of the trustees (article 1, section 4:1) specify that the board has the duty "to approve, upon recommendation of the President, the appointment of faculty and administrative personnel," and the board's Committee on Instruction (then numbering five members) is empowered to "consider all changes in the instructional staff and courses of study proposed, after consultation with the Faculty, by the President of the Seminary and [to] make recommendations to the Executive Committee and the Board of Trustees regarding the members of the instructional staff, specifying the terms of their employment in accordance with the approved budget" (article 4, section 8:1).

The Committee on Instruction met with the president and the dean on February 20 and 21, 1987, and interviewed the two nominees, the lead being taken by the chair of the committee, the Rev. Mr. James DeLoach of Houston, Texas, and by the Rev. Mr. Robert Crowley of Rockville, Maryland. It was clearly their intention to determine the stand of the two nominees on the question of inerrancy. In a three-hour interrogation of Professor Barnes, she was questioned repeatedly about the status of Scripture, about the reality of the fire called down by Elijah, and about the historicity of Adam and Eve. 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 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.

The Committee on Instruction voted unanimously to recommend Professor DeBrand to the full board and recommended Professor Barnes by a vote of 4-1. On March 9, the evening before the spring meeting of the board, the committee met again to deal with reports (not subsequently specified) about Dr. Barnes's theology. Considerable pressure was brought to bear to change votes. A member who refused said in a letter to Mr. DeLoach in May that he still felt "the knots on my head that I received that night." The committee's concerns were communicated to President Lolley the next morning, but no change in its position took place

before the board met. The two appointments were approved, Professor DeBrand by a vote of 25-2, Professor Barnes by a vote of 14-13.³ One trustee was heard to say, however, that Professor Barnes would never get tenure, and a moderate trustee told her that she would face real difficulties if she refused to give up "inclusive language," i.e., non-gender-specific language relating to God.

On March 20, Dean Ashcraft wrote to Mr. DeLoach in firm but respectful terms to raise three questions: (1) about the right of the Committee on Instruction to confront candidates with a doctrinal standard other than that established by the trustees and published in the official documents; (2) about the significance to be attached to a committee recommendation if an attempt could be made to reverse it at the last moment; and (3) about the dean's exclusion from the meetings on March 9 and early in the morning of March 10, despite the fact that the seminary's *Administrative Manual* formally names him as the faculty liaison to the committee. Mr. DeLoach's reply, dated April 21, assured Dean Ashcraft that his exclusion from the meetings was an unintentional result of the press of time. He defended the committee's right to change its position, reminding the dean that he and the faculty had in the past revoked a recommendation. On the key point of the use of other doctrinal statements than the "Articles of Faith," Mr. DeLoach pointed out that the Southern Baptist Convention had enjoined the "Baptist Faith and Message" on all agencies and that there was a clear expectation in the denomination that special attention would be given to selection of seminary faculty, an expectation that justified the use of any relevant

³In the fall of 1988, Dr. DeBrand was unanimously recommended for tenure by the Committee on Instruction. The trustees approved the recommendation by a vote of 22-7.

IV. THE NEW BOARD AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

New trustee appointments in June 1987 assured a majority for the fundamentalist position. On August 25, President Lolley delivered a convocation address, "Quo Vadis, Southeastern?"—the same title he had used for the address he gave on taking up his presidency thirteen years earlier. He stressed the often difficult accommodation that must be made between institutions and ideas, explained the "distinctive way of doing theological education" that had characterized Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary from its foundation, and defended the freedom that had been its essential element, including freedom to interpret the authoritative Bible and to draw on other disciplines to illuminate theology. Freedom, he went on, is the contrary of "theological indoctrination wherein truth is determined always by majority opinion. We recall all too vividly that our Lord was crucified with the majority agreeing." A second element in the Southeastern way, he continued, is the idea that the Christian ministry emerges from the spiritual gifts and special calling of a believer, an idea that entails a partnership of laity and ministry, the equal calling of men and women, and a sharing with other faiths. He suggested that the Southern Baptists might have changed more in the thirty-odd years of the seminary's life than had the seminary, which still reflected the consistent expression of the intention of its founders. For

document. He defended his questioning as consistent with the Glorieta Statement, which President Lolley had signed, and, as to inerrancy, he insisted that, until there was a better definition than that in the *Chicago Statement*, he would continue to use it. Mr. DeLoach's letter was printed, without Dean Ashcraft's, in the June issue of the *Baptist Advocate*, a fundamentalist publication.

In February 1987, following from his assent to the Glorieta Statement, President Lolley issued a "Plan of Action" which skillfully attempted to maneuver through the conflicts that surrounded him. He reaffirmed the Baptist heritage, the historic mission of Southeastern, and the essentiality of scholarship and the commitment to seeking truth. He upheld the seminary's confessional norm as "historic and adequate," while promising that charges relating to it would be dealt with seriously and in full accord with due process. He emphasized that faculty selection was the outcome of a partnership of trustees, administration, faculty, and students. He called for steady monitoring in annual evaluations to assure the maintenance of fairness and openness in classrooms. He rejected all forms of "caricature, intimidation, or attack of persons for their theological beliefs" and promised that invited speakers would represent the whole theological spectrum of the Baptist constituency. As is often the result of efforts at reconciliation, the Plan of Action satisfied neither side; some faculty members were angered, despite their deep regard for President Lolley, 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. At its meeting in March 1987, the board of trustees by majority vote endorsed the Plan of Action, but nothing was heard of it thereafter.

himself, he said, if the Southern Baptists wanted a seminary destructive of the central ideas in the Southeastern tradition, then he would not give it "one moment of time or one millibar of energy": he could more easily see the seminary die than see it perverted into a different kind of institution, though he knew, as a Christian, that even an institution, in dying, could be reborn with its central, distinguishing idea revived. A gauntlet was thrown down.

When the board of trustees met on October 12 to 14, the new majority named the Rev. Mr. Crowley as chair, replacing a moderate Asheville surgeon, Dr. Jesse Chapman, who was thus denied the usual second one-year term afforded chairs of the trustees and other elected Southern Baptist bodies. The Rev. Mr. DeLoach was elected as vice-chair and was reappointed to the Committee on Instruction, although he had just rotated off. Thus, the leaders of the board became those who had dominated the interrogation of faculty candidates in February.

The trustees also moved decisively to alter the mode of faculty appointments. (1) Under the old procedure (*Administrative Manual*, 5.3), once a vacancy had been declared and applications and recommendations solicited, the area faculty was convened by the dean to designate candidates from the nominees and those names were then forwarded with supporting materials

to the president and the entire faculty, with the name of the person selected then going to the Committee on Instruction. The new procedure called for the circulation of names of applicants only to the president and Committee on Instruction, with the designation of candidates falling to the president alone, after consultation with the area faculty, the faculty as a whole, the dean, and the Committee on Instruction. (2) Once a candidate had visited the campus, the old procedure called for evaluation in turn by the area faculty, student representatives, the whole faculty, and the Committee on Instruction; in the revised procedure, the faculty role was reduced (and the student role eliminated entirely) by confining consideration of the candidate to the president, after consultation with the faculty. (3) In the old procedure, the recommendation for appointment was made by the president *through* the Committee on Instruction to the board; in the new, the recommendation is made *by* the Committee on Instruction. Relying on an expansive interpretation of the role of the Committee on Instruction as stated in the by-laws, the board of trustees reduced the role of faculty and dean to limited consultation and, while ostensibly placing the pivotal power in the hands of the president, gave the Committee on Instruction an enhanced role in every meaningful stage of the process.

The new trustees had made it plain during an orientation session prior to the meeting that they were uninterested in learning about Southeastern's traditions and policies and were determined that henceforward only inerrantists would be appointed to the faculty. No effort was made to revise or replace the "Articles of

Faith"; rather, the doctrinal statement approved by their predecessors was simply ignored. At one point in the meeting the board voted, 14-10, to go into executive session, over the strong objections of President Lolley, who cited a long tradition of open meetings: although the proceedings in that session have remained confidential, it has been reported that it was bitter and recriminative and that President Lolley's convocation address was a subject of discussion.

On October 19, President Lolley and Dean Ashcraft notified the trustees that they would resign their posts; they were joined by the seminary attorney and by three assistants to the president, for financial development, student affairs, and communications. At a press conference on November 17, the president and the dean reiterated their commitment to freedom, emphasized the impossibility of their carrying on their stated duties in the altered circumstances, and protested against a takeover of the board of trustees by people with no connection with or interest in the seminary but who came with (in President Lolley's words) "a pre-packaged agenda," as much political as theological and quite at odds with true conservatism. A trustee search committee was appointed in early December and steady pressure was put on President Lolley, who was accused of disruptive and wrecking tactics, to resign before the agreed date of July 31, 1988, a step Dr. Lolley refused to take unless his successor were chosen earlier. The search committee announced its selection of Dr. Drummond on February 12, and, following a series of interviews and strongly stated faculty opposition, he was elected by the board at its meeting on March 14 and 15, 1988. He took office on April 1.

V. THE CASE OF MAHAN AND JANICE SILER

Like many institutions, the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary depends on visiting, temporary, or part-time faculty members to take the place of regular faculty members on leave of absence or to cover courses in specialized areas that cannot be offered by the full-time faculty; such appointments can also be a useful way of bringing the perspectives of persons with wide practical experience into the curriculum—particularly in a seminary context where exposing students to working ministers and church musicians and counselors can be valuable training for their future careers. The method of appointment of such faculty members has been governed by a provision in the *Administrative Manual* (5.4) that reads: "Temporary appointments to the instructional staff are made by the President and the Dean of the Faculty following appropriate consultation with the area Faculty." Consistent with the new approach taken by the trustees to appointments generally, that section of the *Administrative Manual* was revised at the meeting of the board in October 1987 to read: "Temporary appointments to the instructional staff may be made by the President with approval by the Instruction Committee of the Board of Trustees." The trustees thereby put their key academic committee into the crucial decision-making role with regard to part-time and temporary as well as regular full-time faculty.⁴

In September 1988, the faculty and the academic coordinator (the faculty member then acting as dean), Dr. Robert Dale, drew up a list of twenty-one persons to serve as adjunctive faculty members in the spring

of 1989. The list was approved at a faculty meeting, with President Drummond in the chair, on September 14. Among the names were Ms. Janice Siler, to be visiting instructor of pastoral care, and her husband, Dr. M. Mahan Siler, Jr., to be visiting professor of pastoral care. Janice Siler had served in the Department of Pastoral Care at the North Carolina Baptist Hospital in Winston-Salem (a major medical center) and is at present in private practice in Raleigh as a marriage and family counselor. Mahan Siler is the pastor of Pullen Memorial Baptist Church in Raleigh and a trustee of Wake Forest University. He had served as head of the Department of Pastoral Care at the Baptist Hospital and is a certified marriage and family therapist. The Silers had taught as adjunctive faculty at Southeastern for six years and had been involved in other ways with campus life; Ms. Siler had, for example, been active in advising the Women's Center. They were scheduled to teach a course in marriage enrichment.

On October 4, a conference call took place among members of the Committee on Instruction, with Mr. Crowley participating, to consider adjunctive appointments. President Drummond explained that it was not "normal procedure" for the trustees to consider such appointments. If that is so, Mr. DeLoach is reported

⁴President Drummond, commenting on a draft text of this report sent to him prior to publication, stated that the board of trustees at its March 1989 meeting brought the process of appointments "more in line with our accrediting agency's request" by eliminating trustee involvement until the final stage of the appointing process.

to have said, then the by-laws must be amended. President Drummond commented that the intervention of the trustees in this matter would probably provoke interest from the accrediting agencies. The names of all the proposed appointments were then read, and various members of the committee objected to five of the names. One man was objected to as "anti-Southern Baptist and . . . too ecumenical," but on the president's assurances he was approved, with the admonition that the president get to know him well. Another was approved after assurances to the committee that he was willing to modify his alleged attacks on the trustees and to refrain from "inflammatory remarks." A third was approved for one term but with the statement that he was never to be considered again. The president had proposed the same solution for the Silers, but this was not accepted by the committee, and their appointment was disapproved. No reasons were stated publicly.

In the minutes of the conference call one member was recorded as saying 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. 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. He made it clear in a letter to his congregation, following the rejection of his appointment by the trustees, that much in homosexual behavior, as in heterosexual behavior, is "promiscuous and abusive of persons" but that he could not accept total condemnation; he called for healthy debate on the subject. Janice Siler did not take part in the conference at her husband's church and has taken no public stands on the question of homosexuality. It is her feeling that throughout this transaction she was not judged on her own merits but merely as an appendage of her husband. It may also be relevant that Dr. Siler was active in the founding of the moderate Southern Baptist Alliance.

The report of the Committee on Instruction was discussed by the full board of trustees at its meeting on October 11 in executive session. Going into executive session was strenuously opposed by some members of the board, one of them, Dr. Mark Caldwell, maintaining that such closed sessions had been used to stifle dissent and to "conduct clandestine intimidation and interrogation" of President Lolley. The Committee on Instruction refused to give an explanation to the board of its decision to omit the Silers from the list of adjunctive appointees, and the board accepted the list as presented. The Silers learned of the decision through the newspapers.

VI. THE APPOINTMENT OF A NEW DEAN

On March 17, 1988, the faculty sent a letter to President-elect Drummond requesting an early meeting to address pressing questions of accreditation, faculty participation in governance, and the establishment of a relationship of openness and candor needed to undergird any effort to maintain sound theological education. Dr. Drummond replied favorably on April 5. He was rarely on campus, however; he explained subsequently that he had many other engagements and that it was thought best by the trustees that he not come to campus before graduation exercises, in the interests of the faculty and to spare Dr. Lolley's sensibilities.

The president and the chair of the board of trustees had agreed, however, on the urgent need for administrative reorganization, and on April 18 a mail ballot on a proposed arrangement was sent to the trustees. It called for three vice presidents. The vice president for internal affairs would supervise the work of the comptroller, the director of management information services, the director of plant services, and the director of student development (essentially a dean of students). Under the vice president for academic affairs, a new post, would come the registrar, the librarian, the director of Formation in Ministry (the ministerial training area), and the director of the child care center. The vice presidency for external affairs—then vacant but subsequently filled by Dr. George E. Worrell, who came to Southeastern in June 1988 from the evangelism department of the Missouri Baptist Convention—was the reporting office for the director of financial development, the director of public relations, and

the director of admissions. A covering memorandum explained that the by-laws did not require trustee approval of the new plan, as no appointments were involved, but that the ballot was being sent to secure as wide a degree of support as possible for the president in difficult times. Two days later, another ballot was sent, with a covering memorandum indicating that the seminary's lawyer had explained that trustee approval was in fact necessary under the provisions of Article VI of the by-laws and was accordingly being requested.

On April 20, 1988, the chapter of the American Association of University Professors at Southeastern sent a letter to the president protesting the administration's proposals and the means adopted to put them into effect without any faculty consultation, contrary to assurances he had given to the faculty. Although the president had solicited the names of nominees for the vacant deanship of the faculty on April 5, the new plan appeared to replace the deanship with a vice presidency for academic affairs. The letter complained, further, that the reorganization plan gave no job descriptions for the new posts; demoted twelve middle-level administrators, nine of them women; apparently violated the by-laws; and in substance and method was another blow to morale in the Southeastern community.

Later that day, the president of the AAUP chapter, then Professor Richard L. Hester, reached President Drummond by telephone in Augusta, Georgia, to notify him of the existence of the letter. Professor Hester reports having read it to him and having been told that the plan was premature and that it should not have been sent out before faculty consultation had

taken place, but it transpired that the vice president for internal affairs, who had sent out the plan, had told one of his subordinates that the plan was accomplished fact. The president protested that he wanted to do the right thing and that he was "just a babe at this. . . I do want to be there and get started, want to work with you." The chapter letter was then sent to the trustees, the two accrediting agencies, and the Association's Washington office.

During a visit to the campus in early May, President Drummond named a transition team, appointed an academic coordinator (i.e., an acting dean), and established a search committee for the dean of the faculty, although he had called for nominations for the deanship a month earlier. Before leaving office, President Lolley had been asked by the executive committee of the board of trustees to explain the procedure for filling the deanship. Under that procedure, as set out in the *Administrative Manual* and subject to the by-laws, article VII, section 4:1, which calls for due consideration by the faculty, a search committee was to be appointed, chaired by the president and including one member from each of the four areas of the faculty (biblical studies, historical studies, theological studies, and studies in ministry); that committee would then collect information on prospective appointees and select one, who would next be visited by the president and invited to campus, where there would be interviews with the faculty of the area in which the academic appointment would be made and with the general faculty. A secret vote of the faculty was to follow, with the president then to decide whether to proceed. If the decision was positive, an interview with the Committee on Instruction would take place, and that committee would vote to recommend the candidate to the whole board, which would elect the dean to a six-year term.

In July, after the search committee had drawn up detailed procedures and had set about its task, it was learned that the president, at a meeting in Nassau, had told a Baptist official that "we have a good dean prospect lined up," a report that suggested that the president was operating independently of the search committee; further reports confirmed this activity. The search committee drew up a list of six acceptable candidates, which did not include the names of Dr. L. Russ Bush III or Dr. Robert Sloan, both of whom had been approached by the president. At a much delayed

meeting of the committee with President Drummond, the committee protested the president's disregard of established procedures. Even at that meeting, the president continued to suggest names that had not been before the committee on the ground that he had to have a nomination that would be approved by the board. On September 27, the faculty instructed the search committee to proceed with a reopened search, and the president gave his pledge not to approach any one about the position who was not on the committee's list. At a faculty meeting on November 16, nine names presented by the search committee were discussed. Three were denied faculty support, but the president insisted that they be kept on the list of candidates. Two days later, the president circulated to the faculty a list of names. Two of the three names disapproved at the faculty meeting were segregated in an "appendix list," as "those who should be given consideration but not as firmly" as those on his main list. Dr. Bush had also been disapproved by the faculty, but his name appeared on the main list, which President Drummond described as consisting of names coming from the search committee, though the search committee had emphatically agreed not to include Dr. Bush. By ballot circulated on November 23, the faculty voted preferentially on the six names chosen by the search committee. On December 6, the search committee wrote to the president, expressing its concern that he was still pursuing the appointment of Dr. Russ Bush to the deanship, despite the committee's opposition and the unanimous rejection of his candidacy by the faculty on grounds of academic shortcomings, lack of administrative experience or evidence of capacity for leadership, narrowness of view (e.g., his being "inordinately concerned to advance the idea of 'creationism'"), and the divisiveness his appointment would bring—all these buttressed by citations to requirements stated in the *Administrative Manual*. Still, on January 20, 1989, President Drummond announced that he would nominate Dr. Bush for the deanship. At a meeting with the faculty on January 27, Dr. Bush responded to questions about his positions, but the faculty voted February 1, with one exception (President Drummond), to oppose the nomination on the same grounds advanced by its search committee. The board of trustees approved the nomination, by vote of 22 to 8, at its spring meeting in March.

VII. THE ACCREDITING AGENCIES

On March 18, 1988, before President Drummond took office, a special visiting committee of the Association of Theological Schools came to Southeastern to inquire into conditions of academic freedom and institutional integrity; that association's report, sharply critical, was released to the faculty on August 1. The Association of Theological Schools report, finding Southeastern to be "a very troubled campus and divided institution," expressed "substantive concerns for the freedom and integrity of the faculty." A special committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools visited the campus from September 14 to 16, and the resulting report, no less severe in its findings, was released on December 5. This report found that Southeastern "is not functioning as a scholarly community" and

observed that "members of the committee cannot recall ever knowing a faculty so despondent." A lengthy trustee reply was prepared by the Committee on Instruction and forwarded to the Southern Association, but the timing and the still informal nature of that response led the regional accrediting association's Committee on Criteria and Reports to defer final action until December 1989, pending receipt by July 1 of a plan addressing the current image of the seminary, faculty, involvement in appointments, perceptions of academic freedom, and the role of the board of trustees in academic governance, and proposing means of developing a more cooperative relationship among all parties on campus.

VIII. THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE AAUP

In February 1987, when the interrogation of the two prospective faculty members by the Committee on Instruction occurred and the developing threat to Southeastern's autonomy was becoming clear, members of the faculty began to organize a chapter of the American Association of University Professors. The chapter was recognized in June, with all of the regular faculty joining as members. One year later, at its 1988 Annual Meeting, the Association conferred its Alexander Meiklejohn Award for Academic Freedom on former President Lolley and its Beatrice G. Konheim Award on the Southeastern chapter of AAUP, both for distinguished contributions to the defense of academic freedom.

On January 19, 1988, the chapter requested an investigation of conditions of academic freedom at the seminary, and, in extended correspondence with the board of trustees and subsequently with President Drummond, the Association's staff attempted to bring about a resolution of affairs favorable to the maintenance of academic freedom and to appropriate academic governance. On August 23, 1988, President Drummond wrote a detailed letter to Associate General Secretary Jordan E. Kurland in response to the stated Association concerns. After pointing out that the Peace Committee was responsive solely to direction from the Southern Baptist Convention, and that the trustees had the clear prerogative to set policies and to select new members of the faculty, he assured the associate general secretary that only the "Abstract of Principles" would henceforth be used as a doctrinal standard. Trustee DeLoach's use of the *Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy* in the interrogations of the preceding February, President Drummond maintained, had been undertaken casually and without an understanding of the ramifications of bringing that document to bear; no such action would occur again. President Drummond also 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.

The general secretary authorized an investigation in October 1988, following the actions taken against Janice and Mahan Siler. The undersigned *ad hoc* investigating committee, having examined the abundant available documentation, visited the Southeastern campus on January 19 and 20. The committee met with representatives of the chapter; with most of the faculty, and individually with certain key members such as Professor Barnes and Professor DeBrand; with former President Lolley and former Dean Ashcraft; with a group of student leaders; and with three middle-level administrators. President Drummond refused to meet the committee, as did other senior administrators with the exception of Dr. Glenn T. Miller, professor of church history, who had succeeded Dr. Dale as academic coordinator. 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. Trustees from the board's majority and minority factions had been invited to meet with the committee, but only one, Dr. Mark Caldwell, an opponent of the board's current majority, came forward. The investigating committee regrets the refusal of the trustee leadership and the current president to take the proffered opportunity to be interviewed on the issues of concern, but the committee believes that there is a sufficiently extensive written record that a fair assessment of the positions of these parties can be made.

IX. THE ISSUES

A distinguished historian, writing recently on the interrelationship of Oxford University and the British Empire, has remarked that Dissenting and Evangelical missionaries in British Africa in the late nineteenth century were less understanding of tribal customs than were high churchmen, because they were so concerned with saving souls that they paid little attention to building communities and entirely neglected ethnography.⁵ That the new majority on the board of trustees at Southeastern is concerned with saving souls, according to their lights, is incontestable. But, however one may view the effects of their policies and actions on the Southeastern community, those are not this Association's primary concern. The Association is, rather, centrally concerned with ethnography, that is, with the established procedures and customs of American academic institutions, sanctioned by common practice and

⁵Sheldon Rothblatt (reviewing Richard Symonds, *Oxford and Empire: The Last Lost Cause?*) in *History of Education Quarterly*, 28 (Winter 1988): 642.

long usage and, in many instances, formulated in official Association-recommended statements of principles and procedural standards. It is, accordingly, to these statements that the investigating committee refers in assessing this complex and sobering case.

A. *Governance.* The *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*, jointly formulated by AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, calls for the joint effort of governing boards, faculties, and administrative officers to carry through the shared responsibilities of institutions whose parts are by their nature interdependent.

(1) To the president, whose power is derived from the governing board and the faculty, it falls to exercise primary leadership, while conforming to the policies established by the governing board and to sound academic practice. Should it become necessary for the president to change the direction of a part (or presumably all) of the institution, the president must

do so in consultation with the faculty and with such outside assistance as may be called for.

It is evident from the investigating committee's inquiries that former President Lolley was fully committed to the idea of shared governance and open communication; if he erred at any point, it was in his irenic effort to give assurances on all sides about the implementation of the Glorieta Statement, an effort doomed to failure before it began. It is equally evident that his successor, President Drummond, has been inconsistent and less than forthcoming. He has kept the 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 flouted expressions of faculty opinion, even when it was unanimous or nearly so. Keeping his eyes on the course laid down by the trustees, he has at the same time had to look over one shoulder at the faculty and over the other at the accrediting agencies. As long as this kind of administrative leadership continues, the prospects for the educational enterprise at Southeastern seem increasingly bleak.

(2) A governing board is entrusted under the *Statement on Government* with the general overview of an institution, while leaving the conduct of administration to the president and deans and the conduct of teaching and research to the faculty. On curricular matters and the granting of degrees the board is expected to defer to the faculty, which also exercises primary responsibility "for appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal"—a responsibility based on the centrality of faculty judgment to general education policy.

By the same token (as indicated in the Association's derivative statement on *Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators*), a search for a dean or equivalent academic administrator should reflect the primacy of faculty interest. Though the nomination remains with the president, "sound academic practice dictates that the president not choose a person over reasoned opposition of the faculty."

The *Statement on Government* recognizes that certain accommodations of general educational policy may have to be made in special circumstances, which may include those set forth in the charter and by-laws of a church-related institution. It is also recognized, however, that when such external considerations "influence the content and manner of instruction or research, they impair the educational effectiveness of the institution."

The investigating committee's inquiries, supplemented by extensive documentation, have amply demonstrated the gross violation of these norms by the current board of trustees of the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. The trustees (or a portion of them) have illegitimately interfered with faculty appointments. Lacking the requisite knowledge of the specialties 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 the 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 (at least as judged by ordinary academic practice) to fit their own purposes, simply ignoring stated procedures when it suited them, and substituting the rule of men for the rule of laws.

Because trustees have final authority in determining the general direction of an institution, it is within the province of the Southeastern trustees to decide that the nature of the seminary should be changed. If they had worked within their own rules, changing those they found ineffective for their purposes and gaining the requisite approval of the new rules by the Southern Baptist Convention, and with appropriate instructions to a president who would honestly and patiently work with the faculty on whom the implementation of the educational mission must depend, the new majority of the trustees might have brought about the changes they desired, although not necessarily quickly or easily. To be sure, had the trustees legitimately exercised their power to achieve their ends, they would, as judged by the application of ordinary academic canons, have converted Southeastern from an institution dedicated to higher learning to one concerned only with prescribed training and indoctrination, a shift from which serious consequences would flow. But, not content to follow such a prudently revolutionary course, they were led—whether by impatience, by ignorance of or contempt for the academic enterprise, by a dubious interpretation of their mandate and obligation to a "constituency," or by an overweening confidence in the rightness of their goals—into a morass of their own making. The investigating committee finds that the responsibility for the incredible present state of the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, despite any claims that it is previous administrative officials or faculty who are at fault, rests squarely with the present majority of the trustees and President Drummond.

B. *Academic Freedom*. It has been the steady contention of the trustees that academic freedom is under no threat at Southeastern. As one such statement (issued before the Silers were denied reappointment) puts it, "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."⁶ President Drummond, in his letter of August 23, 1988, insisted that the trustees and administration are "totally committed to the concept of academic freedom. . . . We hold this principle in high regard and pledge to you our total commitment to maintaining such freedom." Quite apart from the president's extraordinary objection to having that declaration communicated to the faculty, there seems to be a severe misunderstanding or violent twisting of the idea. 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

⁶Eddie Sellers *et al.* in a letter mailed to North Carolina Baptists, November 4, 1987.

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.

The investigating committee finds 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 violence done to proper academic governance, as outlined above, and the systematic reduction of faculty participation in matters that rightfully fall within its province themselves have had a severe adverse impact on the seminary's traditionally favorable climate for academic freedom. (2) The interjection by the trustees, in making faculty appointments and granting tenure, of unauthorized doctrinal standards (whatever later disclaimers may be made) and of political criteria, even by way of questioning, has had a like adverse affect on the climate for academic freedom. (3) The abrupt refusal to reappoint part-time teachers, recommended by faculty and president, on casual and ill-informed grounds, themselves violative of academic freedom, that the board's committee was unwilling to explain even to the full board was unconscionable interference with the freedom of teachers to teach. (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 as established in the administrative regulations 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 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. The determination about unidirectional hiring has been defended with the rhetoric of balance, but that balance has been externally imposed and without prospect of ever being achieved until unanimity in one posture is reached.

Through all of these actions and statements, academic freedom is placed under severe threat at the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary.⁷

⁷The Baptist tradition in the United States has always emphasized the autonomy of its congregations—hence the uncompromising rejection of involvement of church and state—and its freedom from humanly devised formulations or creeds. While this tradition has assigned significant weight to moral and theological discipline and decorum, it has also fostered a considerable range of disagreement on doctrinal matters and has frequently come down on the side of liberal inquiry. It is an interesting coincidence that it was on the campus in Wake Forest that William Louis Poteat, the president of Wake Forest College after 1905, strenuously defended the right to teach Darwinian evolution against the fundamentalist attackers whose campaign reached a climax in the celebrated Scopes trial in Tennessee in 1925. 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 the truth," and admonishing his listeners to welcome truth, and not to "stop to calculate the adjustment and revision her fresh coming will necessitate"—a declaration that the convention warmly commended the next day. (See Suzanne Cameron Linder, *William Louis Poteat: Prophet of Progress* [Chapel Hill, 1966], chs. 3, 6, 7, esp. pp. 123–125.)

C. Other Effects on the Seminary Community. The change in administration, the behavior of the new president, the stated intention of the new trustee majority to add none but inerrantists to the faculty in the future, the alterations in established procedures, and the board's disregard of its own by-laws came as a series of hammer-blows to the security and morale of the Southeastern community. The wider perspective that appears to control these developments, and the contempt implied for the traditions of the seminary and the professional commitments of the faculty and students, have also had severely damaging effects.

Students have their own sense of grievance and persecution, arising, for example, from the elimination of their role in faculty selection and from the loss of a sense of community. The sense of grievance is particularly intense among women students, whose calling to the ministry is clearly discounted among the new trustee majority (a feeling of injustice that was compounded by the abrupt and unexplained closing of the quarters occupied by the Women's Center in June 1988, though six months later, during the investigating committee's visit, a new center was opened). The decline in the number of women students has been so great that Southeastern Women in Ministry, a group that provides support for intending women ministers, has had to scale down its activities. Students have reported a wave of rude and sententious questioning and confrontation in classes, much of it originating with the Conservative Evangelical Fellowship, whose antics have alienated many among the most theologically conservative of students. Some students state that they have been the subject of unfavorable reports to the churches that have sponsored them. Even more disturbing are accounts of clandestine or open hostility to student activism in the form of vandalism and anonymous abusive or threatening telephone calls. Administrators confirm student reports of widespread illness and depression, hardly surprising among young men and women of high ideals and professional ambition caught in the disarray, in which, as one student put it, "trustee presence is felt all the time."

Students have organized to protest and to help: a student chapter of the moderate Southern Baptist Alliance (the only student affiliate) was founded at Southeastern in 1988 and now numbers sixty-five to seventy members. An *ad hoc* group, Southeastern Students for Academic Freedom, formed in the fall of 1987 in anticipation of the changes in the composition of the board of trustees, organized a silent protest at the inauguration of President Drummond, and the yellow ribbons worn by its members were to be seen all over campus; but there has been a steady erosion of leadership by transfer.

Enrollment has fallen sharply, from a headcount of 1,046 in the fall of 1987 to 803 in the autumn of 1988, while the credit-hour count of 8,900 for spring 1988 had fallen a year later to perhaps 7,500. A fall in enrollment means a loss of student matriculation fees and, eventually, a decline in Southern Baptist support, given as it is on capitation scheme based on a three-year average. It may be that students who have departed will be replaced through an active recruiting campaign. The faculty expectation, and to some extent experience, however, is that less rigorous standards will prevail for those who will be admitted.

There were two faculty resignations in 1986, one in 1987, and two in 1988. With only thirty of the thirty-six permanent posts filled, and with four faculty members on sabbatical leave and three retirements looming in the spring of 1989, it has proved difficult to cover

necessary classes and to plan rationally for the future. There has been intense discussion among the remaining faculty and their lay supporters in the Southern Baptist community about the possibility of founding a new seminary elsewhere.⁸

X. CONCLUSIONS

1. The board of trustees and the president of the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, in interfering with faculty appointments, in virtually eliminating the appropriate faculty role in making new appointments, and in disregarding existing procedures and the unanimous faculty will in the selection of a new academic dean, have acted in ways inimical to the principles set forth in the *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*.

2. Members of the board of trustees, in denying reappointment to Dr. M. Mahan Siler, Jr., and Ms. Janice Siler for the reasons indicated, acted in violation of the academic freedom to which they were entitled under the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.

3. A number of actions by the board of trustees and the president, foremost among them restricting further faculty appointments to those holding a particular and narrowly construed ideological stance, have placed academic freedom in peril at the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary.

ROBERT K. WEBB (History),
University of Maryland Baltimore County,
Chair

LESLIE H. PEEK (Mathematics),
Mercer University

Investigating Committee

Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure has by vote authorized publication of this report in *Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP*.

MATTHEW W. FINKIN (Law), University of Illinois,
Chair.

Members: JOAN S. GIRGUS (Psychology), Princeton University; PAUL A. KETCHUM (Biology), Oakland University; DANIEL C. MAGUIRE (Theology), Marquette University; THOMAS D. MORRIS (History), Portland State University; JOEL T. ROSENTHAL (History), State University of New York at Stony Brook; EDWARD F. SHERMAN (Law), University of Texas at Austin; SAUL TOUSTER (Legal Studies), Brandeis University; WILLIAM W. VAN ALSTYNE (Law), Duke University; ERNST BENJAMIN (Political Science), Washington Office, *ex officio*; JORDAN E. KURLAND (History and Russian), Washington Office, *ex officio*; CAROL SIMPSON STERN (Performance Studies), Northwestern University, *ex officio*; RALPH S. BROWN (Law), Yale University, *consultant*; BERTRAM H. DAVIS (English), Florida State University, *consultant*; MARY W. GRAY (Mathematics), American University, *consultant*; JUDITH J. THOMSON (Philosophy), Massachusetts Institute of Technology, *consultant*; WALTER P. METZGER (History), Columbia University, *senior consultant*.

⁸An exodus of students and faculty alike would create a startling irony. In 1833, students at Lane Theological Seminary in Cincinnati rebelled against efforts by the trustees to limit their abolitionist activities and against the installation of a new president supportive of the trustee position. In 1835, the students in exile began negotiations to move to the recently founded "collegiate institute" at Oberlin, and at the same time, the great evangelist Charles Grandison Finney, newly established in New York City, was persuaded to go to Oberlin College as professor of theology (and eventually as the college's second president). The Rev. Mr. Finney laid down some conditions for his removal to Oberlin—that black students and women students be admitted on the same terms as men, and that the trustees must never interfere in the internal governance of the college. The deal was accomplished, and to this day Oberlin is notable for its high degree of faculty autonomy and for the relative impotence of its trustees, a lasting legacy of Finney's insistence on principle. Finney's most recent biographer is Lewis A. Drummond. (Drummond, *A Fresh Look at the Life and Ministry of Charles G. Finney* [Minneapolis, 1985]: 162-167. Cf. Robert S. Fletcher, *A History of Oberlin College*, vol. 1 [Oberlin, 1943]: 150-178.)