



**BAPTIST PRESS**  
News Service of the Southern Baptist Convention

460 James Robertson Parkway  
Nashville, Tennessee 37219  
Telephone (615) 244-2355  
W. C. Fields, Director  
Jim Newton, Assistant Director

June 17, 1966

**Solutions Suggested  
For College Problems**

**REGIONAL OFFICES**

**ATLANTA** Walker L. Knight, Editor/161 Spring Street, N.W./Atlanta, Georgia 30303/Telephone (404) 523-2593  
**DALLAS** R. T. McCartney, Editor/103 Baptist Building/Dallas, Texas 75201/Telephone (214) RI 1-1996  
**WASHINGTON** W. Barry Garrett, Editor/200 Maryland Ave., N.E./Washington, D.C. 20002/Telephone (202) 544-4226

By Jim Newton

NASHVILLE (BP)--The need for a clear statement of purposes and objectives for Baptist colleges and universities was repeatedly suggested here as a major solution to solving problems facing Baptist higher education.

Twenty-two study groups meeting here during the Baptist Education Study Task first national conference on Baptist higher education offered the suggestions for solving problems facing Baptist colleges and universities.

Without exception, every one of the eight reports summarizing the solutions proposed by the study groups cited the need for a clear statement of objectives, purposes and philosophy of Baptist higher education.

The most controversial solution proposed, accepting government aid for Baptist schools, was probably the most talked-about issue to come up, but it was not suggested as a solution by all eight of the sections composed of the 22 study groups.

Two of the sections discussing the problems of financing Baptist schools agreed in their reports that the decision of whether to accept federal grants and loans should be left up to the boards of trustees for each of the 54 Baptist colleges and universities.

Without knowing what the other section was doing, both of the two groups on financing voted to adopt statements saying that the federal aid question should be left up to the trustees.

The 300 Baptist leaders attending the plenary sessions, however, did not at any-time vote on the federal aid question. Reports from the 22 study groups were presented to the entire conference summarizing consensus opinions expressed in the sectional meetings, but the reports were not adopted by the entire conference.

Over and over during the report period, the need for improved communication between the colleges and the average Baptist, and the need for a statement of purpose and objectives were cited.

One conference participant counted more than 85 problems and 125 alternative solutions to those problems in the reports delivered from the 22 study groups and eight sections.

The small groups of about 15 persons each met for two days in an effort to define and list the problems facing Baptist schools, to determine the causes of the problems, to outline the requirements solutions would have to meet, and to come up with optional and alternative solutions to the problems.

No final solutions, however, were reached. The study conducted by the national conference will be summarized in a lengthy and detailed report by an 18-member findings committee in August.

The committee's report will be the basis for discussion by as many as 10,000 Southern Baptists at meetings in 200 selected churches, at many of the Baptist schools, at 50 or so pastors' conferences, and at 24 regional Baptist Education Study Task (BEST) seminars scheduled January through March of 1967.

A second national study conference will be held in Nashville in June of 1967 to determine final proposals, and the 18-member findings committee will again summarize the solutions suggested.

Even then, the solutions will not be binding upon any of the 73 Baptist schools, or the 17 Baptist state conventions which own them. The study will provide background material to help the conventions and schools as they make the final decisions.

The 22 small study groups were divided into eight sections: two on financing, and one each on philosophy, academic scope, religious scope, the Christian college teacher, college-denominational relationships, and academic freedom and responsibility.

The small groups grappled with a myriad of problems facing Baptist higher education. They discussed in detail and in length such questions as:

---Will Baptist schools be able to secure adequate financial support to compete with public institutions?

---Should some Baptist schools be closed, consolidated with others, or allowed to leave the denominational fold?

---Should Baptist schools accept government assistance? Why? If so, what types? Would religious freedom or control of the schools be lost by accepting government financial aid? How far separated should church and state be?

---What is the purpose and objective of Baptist higher education? Is education at a Baptist school truly different and distinctive?

---How can the schools improve communications with the average Baptist on the grass-roots level? Are most Baptists aware of the crucial problems the schools face?

The list of problems, questions, and issues could go on and on, as could the varied solutions proposed as alternatives.

One of the two sections on financing Baptist schools offered six optional solutions on the federal aid question, concluding that the boards of trustees for each school should make the final decision.

Listed in the section's report were: (1) honestly and frankly acknowledge ways Baptist schools currently receive government financial assistance; (2) differentiate between civil rights compliance rules and any efforts by the government to control the schools; (3) accept loans, scholarships, research grants, assistantships, etc., which are made to individual students or faculty members; (4) accept government loans based on rates related to cost to the government; (5) accept assistance for services rendered in areas where objectives of the government and schools are identical; and (6) accept grants for construction of non-religious buildings, provided there are no restrictions in faculty selection, in religious instruction, and admission policies provided race is no barrier to admission.

The other section on financing requested the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs to make a detailed study in depth of the facts in the area of church-state relations, provided the results of the study can be made prior to January 10, 1967.

Both groups said that the final decision on the federal aid question should be decided by the boards of trustees for each school. One section adopted a statement saying: "In view of the current crisis in American higher education to which our federal government has directed its energies and resources, and the desires of our colleges to carry their fair share of the load to remedy this crisis, we suggest that the various state conventions consider authorizing the boards of trustees of the institutions to accept those government aids which, in their judgment, do not interfere with their program of Christian education."

If the conventions follow the suggestion and free the schools' trustees to decide, some observers feel that many, but not necessarily all, of the schools would probably accept either federal loans or grants for building construction.

There was not general agreement, however, among all of the 300 conference participants that this should be done. There was much debate, pro and con, but the two sections on financing generally agreed that the decision should be left to the trustees.

The section on college-denominational relationships cited as a major problem, the question of who is to control the college and how that control is to be exercised.

As a solution to the problem, the four groups in the section proposed that a statement be developed affirming "ownership and control of Baptist colleges by the denomination through its legally constituted trustees."

They also urged each state convention which has not already done so to establish an education commission or committee to clarify the authority question.

The section on college-denominational relationships also urged a clear statement of purposes for Baptist higher education, and increased communication between college and Baptist people on the grass-roots level.

The two groups in the section on religious scope declared that Baptists should continue to maintain their denominational colleges, and that greatly increased financial support is needed.

In a solution proposed to the question of denominational affiliation of faculty members, the groups on religious scope said that most of the faculty members should be Baptists, but other evangelicals should have a right to employment.

A group in the Christian college teacher section said that one solution to the problem of securing well-qualified teachers is to adjust the financial budget and income to pay adequate salaries.

The report from the section on academic scope said that studies at Baptist schools should seek to include all knowledge and to liberate the minds of men, with no question omitted.

On academic freedom and responsibility, the report from that section called for development of a statement clearly defining what is meant by academic freedom and responsibility. The section also said a set procedure should be established at each school to handle disputed instances.

Over and over, the groups called for the need for a statement of philosophy and objectives for Baptist higher education. The section on "A Preface to a Philosophy of Southern Baptist Higher Education" listed 13 postulates in its study as a basis for such a statement.

One group recommended that the BEST second national study conference devote itself to preparation of such a statement of purpose and objectives.

After the reports from each of the 22 small groups and eight sections were presented, one of the conference participants arose to express appreciation for the frankness and honesty evidenced during the entire four-day meeting.

Another called it "one of the most fruitful meetings I've ever attended." An editor commented: "We came with the answers and left with the questions."

An educator remarked: "There is now hope. In the past, sometimes I've wondered."

-30-

#### Religious Days Create Civil Rights Problems

6/17/66

WASHINGTON (BP)--Observance of religious holidays claimed attention in government circles in two instances recently, one in the U. S. Congress and one in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission filed notice of "guidelines on discrimination because of religion," dealing with religious observances during a regular workweek.

The guidelines become a new part of the code of federal regulations and are effective immediately. The action is based on the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In the House of Representatives Emanuel Celler (D., N.Y.), chairman of the House judiciary committee, introduced legislation to establish a Commission on National Observances and Holidays to take care of the hundreds of bills calling for religious and other holiday or special observances.

Celler said the bureau of the budget has expressed concern about the "proliferation of statutes which request the issuance of presidential proclamations calling for the recognition of particular events of groups." The increasing number could detract from the "desired effect" of a presidential proclamation, the bureau feared.

The New York congressman pointed out that between 30 and 40 proclamations are issued annually for special observances and that 10 events are observed annually by past proclamations.

-more-

He said that 394 holidays and celebrations bills were introduced in the House in the 89th Congress.

Besides the cost of printing these bills, much pressure is placed on the judiciary committee "since it becomes more difficult at times to give reasons for enacting one holiday bill and not the other," he said.

The Commission on National Observances and Holidays would be composed of the archivist of the United States, the librarian of Congress, and the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. All proposals calling for national observances and holidays would be referred to the commission for recommendation.

The bill would prohibit the commission from making any recommendation for a national observance honoring a fraternal, political or religious organization, or a commercial enterprise or product.

The guidelines from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission result from complaints about discrimination on account of religion in discharging and refusing to hire persons whose religious observances require him to take time off during the employer's regular workweek. These usually involve employees who regularly observe Saturdays as the Sabbath or who observe certain special holidays during the year.

The commission says "the duty not to discriminate on religious grounds" includes an obligation by the employer to accommodate to the "reasonable religious needs" of employees where it can be done without "serious inconvenience to the conduct of business."

However, the commission says the employer is free to establish a normal workweek generally applicable to all employees, even though it may not be uniform in effect upon the religious observances of all employees.

"An employer who is closed for business on Sunday does not discriminate merely because he requires that all his employees be available for work on Saturday. Likewise, an employer who closes his business on Christmas or Good Friday is not thereby obligated to give time off with pay to Jewish employees for Rosh Hashanan or Yom Kippur."

The guidelines state that an employer may permit absences from work on religious holidays, with or without pay, but must treat all religions equally in this respect.

-30-

Mrs. W. O. Carver Dies  
In Louisville at Age 92

6/17/66

LOUISVILLE, Ky. (BP)--Mrs. William Owen Carver, widow of a seminary professor, died here June 16 at the age of 92.

Dr. Carver was associated with Southern Baptist Theological Seminary here for more than a half-century, including 45 years as professor of missions. He died in 1954.

Survivors include Mrs. Maxfield Garrott, a Southern Baptist missionary to Japan; George Carver, a Louisville realtor; W. O. Carver, Jr., a retired Louisville newspaperman; Mrs. M. B. Cramer of Pennsylvania; James E. Carver of Laurinburg, N. C., twelve grandchildren and sixteen great grandchildren.

Funeral services were held June 18 with internment at Cave Hill Cemetery here.

-30-