

Report of the Proceedings

The following petition, which was filed with the Secretary of the Board of Directors of SOUTHWESTERN on October 10, 1930, was received by the Board and given full and careful consideration at the annual meeting held at Palmer Hall in Memphis, on Tuesday, February 3, 1931.

The ministers had planned quietly to discuss the matter of the charges contained in the petition at a meeting of the Presbyterian Pastors' Association on Monday, December 22, 1930. In some unknown way, the newspaper reporters found out about this meeting and were present. It was decided by the ministers that the meeting should be an executive session, and the newspaper reporters were barred. However, the matter thus became public, and was carried by the Associated Press dispatches all over the country.

THE PETITION

Memphis, Tenn.
October 6, 1930.

To the Honorable Board of Trustees of Southwestern.
Brethren:

The undersigned members of the Memphis Presbytery are deeply concerned over conditions at Southwestern. We hold in our possession, and have access to information which causes us to believe:

1. That the President of the college is not what may be called "Sound in the Faith", that he disbelieves in the full inspiration of the Scriptures, and does not adhere to many of the teachings of the Standards of the Presbyterian Church in the United States; that he teaches these views to students in the college, which views are at variance with our Standards, with the result that the faith of some of the students has been endangered, if not actually destroyed, and we apprehend, with almost certain danger in the future, to the faith of others.

2. That the President of Southwestern is a reckless administrator in the handling of the funds belonging to the college.

3. That it is our belief that the Presbyterian constituency of Memphis has lost confidence in the administration of the President of the college.

We have not hastily arrived at these conclusions. Action would have been taken long ago, but we were urged to wait until the financial distress in which the college found itself was past. Happily now the college is out of debt, and in justice to our convictions, to our beloved Church, and to the college, we can remain silent no longer.

We, therefore, urge upon the Board, that it take appropriate action which it shall deem wise and right, looking to remedying of these conditions.

Respectfully,

(Signed) R. GIRARD LOWE	(Signed) J. P. ROBERTSON
F. D. DANIEL	H. B. WADE
J. V. JOHNSON	J. J. HILL
JAMES V. COBB	TURNER B. RODDY
E. M. NESBITT	A. C. DUDLEY
	W. E. POWELL

PREPARATIONS FOR THE HEARING

On January 22, 1931, the Secretary of the Board sent out a letter to all the petitioners, notifying them of the time and place of the meeting, inviting them to be present, and asking them "to bring such proofs" as they "may have for consideration by the Board." The following petitioners were present: Dr. J. P. Robertson, Rev. H. B. Wade, Dr. J. J. Hill, Rev. Turney B. Roddy, Rev. A. C. Dudley, Rev. R. Girard Lowe, Rev. F. D. Daniel, and Rev. James V. Cobb. It was reported that the Rev. E. M. Nesbitt was sick, that Dr. J. V. Johnson had removed to Miami, Florida, and that the Rev. W. E. Powell lived in Somerville, Tennessee. Dr. W. S. Lacy, former Executive Secretary of SOUTHWESTERN, was also present.

Representatives of the press were present, and a court stenographer took down the proceedings, the complete record of which is in the possession of the college and may be read by those who desire. The meeting was open to the public, and as many visitors as could be seated in the Directors' Room were present at the hearing. Many others, for whom there was no room, crowded about the window.

THE HEARING

The meeting of the Board with the petitioning ministers was called to order by the Honorable Watkins Overton, Mayor of the City of Memphis, acting as Chairman. The following members of the Board of Directors were present:

ALABAMA:

Jerome T. Fuller
A. B. Curry
Donald C. MacGuire

LOUISIANA:

Alfred C. Glassell
E. B. LeMaster
W. McF. Alexander
Robert E. Craig

MISSISSIPPI:

J. D. Duncan
S. Watkins Overton
Fred R. Graves

TENNESSEE:

James I. Vance
T. H. Tutwiler
Moore Moore
B. A. Patch

Chas. E. Diehl, *ex-officio*

The other two members of the Board, Mr. J. V. Arnold, of Alabama, and Dr. Grayson L. Tucker, of Mississippi, were kept from attending the meeting because of illness.

The hearing proceeded:

DR. JAMES I. VANCE: Mr. Chairman, these brethren who are signers of the petition desire to be heard through one speaker, Dr. J. P. Robertson. They have prepared a paper which they say contains what unitedly they desire to bring before us. After this paper is read, we desire to ask them some questions, if they are willing to be questioned, and of course, if we should ask them questions which they do not want to answer, they have the privilege of declining to answer. I suggest that we now hear this paper from Dr. Robertson.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, that procedure will be followed.

STATEMENT OF DR. J. P. ROBERTSON

DR. ROBERTSON: I am directed by my co-petitioners to request that all who are not members of the Board and petitioners be retired, because we feel that this is a family matter, and that it ought not to be discussed publicly until you can go into it thoroughly and are prepared to decide and have a digested opinion. That is our request, that no newspaper reporters, or anyone else, be here.

DR. VANCE: Dr. Robertson, we have already discussed that matter very fully, and have ruled and decided that this matter should have the utmost publicity, and we have a court stenographer here who will take down what is said, and that has already been given to the papers. It is a matter that has been discussed in the press all over the South, and we think that the public has a right to know everything that is said and done by both sides in this hearing today, and that every fact in connection should be brought to the surface. We have, therefore, decided that this meeting must be open.

DR. ROBERTSON: May I say, by way of explaining the attitude of myself and of my co-petitioners, that we from the first desired that it be absolutely private, so that it need not do any harm, or cause any more agitation than could be avoided, and that the publicity that has been given to it was by others, and not by ourselves. We felt that this petition should be directed to the Board as a body, and that individual members had no right, in propriety, to divulge the contents of it until the Board itself had taken final action and decided what to do with it.

That is one thing, and another is that we have evidence that the newspapers, having heard one side entirely, almost entirely, anyhow, and that being against us, that the newspapers are against us, and if it is given publicity, it will go to the press in a one-sided style, because we believe from what we have heard that that is the attitude. The editors of both of our great papers have come out in editorials siding with Dr. Diehl.

Then, another reason is that there are contents in this paper that it would be hurtful to the college to have published at this time, and we would rather not have them published. We are not refusing, but we are here before you to give you the facts, and to give them just in the way that you wish it.

CHAIRMAN OVERTON: I would like to say that not only did the Board this morning decide that the meeting should be open, that the public might know all the facts, but we have employed a court reporter in order that an official record of the whole proceeding could be kept, and that anyone could know exactly what transpired. The Board felt that this matter was of sufficient importance that an official record should be kept, and everyone given an opportunity to see it. So, unless there is some motion of a member of the Board to re-consider the action taken this morning, the Chairman will be forced to rule that the meeting be open to the press, that action having been taken by the Board.

DR. VANCE: I just want to say one word in reply to Dr. Robertson's statement in regard to the initial giving of this petition to the public.

We do not know who did it, but we are absolutely certain that no member of this Board had anything to do with it. We do not know who did it.

DR. ROBERTSON: Mr. LeMaster was quoted in the press repeatedly as giving information.

DR. VANCE: Mr. LeMaster is here, and can speak for himself.

MR. LEMASTER: I never gave out any information in regard to this petition, but, on the contrary, matters that came out before the meeting were facts that were gathered by the reporters, and not from me.

Dr. Robertson then proceeded to read the following written statement:

"To the Board of Directors, of Southwestern, Memphis, Tenn.
Gentlemen:

Sometime ago we came into possession of information which we felt it was our duty to lay before you as those responsible for the safe guidance of SOUTHWESTERN. Since, 'All proceedings of the Board . . . shall be considered as confidential, and shall not be divulged,' (By-laws Art. 1, paragraph 5) we naturally assumed that so grave a matter as we were presenting to you would at least not be discussed until the Board could meet and receive the evidence upon which our statements were made. But someone, apparently a member (or members) of your Board, began to divulge the nature of our address to you. This was a grave injustice to these ministers who were only seeking to help a school they love. Furthermore, it has done irreparable injury to the institution, to say nothing of the cause of Christ otherwise. A just cause needs no such defense! On the part of many, judgment has been rendered without having the evidence. And, those who held the evidence have been falsely accused without a hearing.

In spite of this injustice and the effort to make us appear ignorant and unwise enemies of SOUTHWESTERN we have felt, knowing Presbyterian procedure, that proper conduct on our part required us to remain silent until the Board could render its opinion officially. The public, which has been so adroitly led as to inject itself into an affair that belongs wholly to the Presbyterian Church will, in time, see how indecorous have been its 'resolutions'.

In the interest of clearness may we state that SOUTHWESTERN is a Presbyterian institution. As such it professes a loyal and abiding adherence to the things of historic Presbyterianism. Its loyalty in these things has been its greatest asset in appealing for support. But for an assured belief in this matter, repeatedly affirmed, the doors of our churches would have been closed and vast sums of money you now have would never have been given. If at any time in SOUTHWESTERN, anyone's belief or teaching is contrary to the standards of our Church, money obtained while these conditions existed, or money sought if they now exist, is money gotten under false pretenses if gotten from Presbyterians who give because they believe the faith and teaching of its personnel rings true to the standards of our Church.

We bring this sharply to your attention because some have affirmed that such matters as orthodoxy properly belong to the Presbyteries to which ministers are attached. That would be true were their continuance in the ministry under review. What we ask you to examine is not their right to remain in the ministry but their right to remain as employees in SOUTHWESTERN judged by their adherence to the Standards of our Church. Such a suggestion is made fallacious in principle, and could hardly be brought forward except as a subterfuge because some of the members of the faculty are wholly without the jurisdiction of our courts, not even registered as members of our Southern Presbyterian Church. But more than that, your By-laws define specifically what your duties are in this matter and provide for no shifting of this responsibility to Presbyteries or anyone else: (The Committee on Instruction

shall consist of five members of the Board, and, subject to the control of the Board, shall have general supervision of the instruction given by the college. It shall consider all changes in the instructional staff proposed by the President of the college, and shall recommend to the Board such action as it shall deem for the best interests of the college regarding the modification of the curriculum, the length of the term of study, and the appointment, removal or advancement of officers of instruction. It shall also be the duty of this Committee to examine the system of instruction, educational management, rules, discipline, and all other matters pertaining to the educational problems of the college, and to report and make recommendations thereon to the Board).

"Such investigation, therefore, as is made is incumbent upon you. If your investigations result in 'charges', it is for you to make them. Any argument that ensues is between you and your employee thus 'charged' not between us and them or between you and us! We charge no man with anything! We are merely laying before you what has been brought to our attention. Most of it in substance has been a matter of common conversation for years. Nothing but a 'gentleman's agreement' has kept it silent this long. All efforts to make it appear as 'new' or 'hasty' is absurd and scarcely deserve the dignity of a denial.

"In light of the fact that the matter which we desire to bring to your attention is so grave and has so many ramifications it would be manifestly impossible for you, sitting as a Board today, to review the evidence and pass judgment. To that end and for that reason we respectfully request of you the appointment of a committee consisting of four members from your Board and allow us to choose four men, one from each of the Synods who, together with your representatives shall form a committee which shall make a sweeping investigation into the affairs of SOUTHWESTERN. We will be glad to lay before such a committee everything that has been brought to our attention; put them in the way of ascertaining the facts about much that has been brought to us and assist them in every way possible. This committee could report its findings to the President of your Board within thirty days. He, by letter, could transfer the same to each member of the Board and if their findings warrant a called meeting of your Board, you could assemble and act intelligently upon their expert advice."

That is our request, and my co-petitioners ask me to stop here and see whether you would be ready to appoint that committee, and not demand a further reading of this report, in order to avoid publicity.

DR. VANCE: I do not know what the desire or wishes of the Board may be, but I would say that the time has passed for that request. You have already petitioned us. We do not propose to shirk the responsibility of this thing, or to shift it to other shoulders. We are the people to handle this thing, and we have not been inactive since the petition came to us; we have been investigating in an attempt to discover whether there is any justice in the charges that are presented in your petition, if you can call them charges. They are not charges in the legal sense of the word, because they are not preferred, but they are faults that you felt were serious enough to bring to our attention, and probably, in the estimation of some of us, serious enough to warrant the removal of Dr. Diehl from the presidency of this institution. Now, if you have facts to present, here is the place to present them, and now is the hour, because we are going to act.

DR. ROBERTSON: I wish to say right here, before I read further, in the interest of my co-petitioners, that it has been published in the papers that we changed our original petition. We did not do that. In conversation

with Dr. Diehl, one of our members mentioned the social activities in the college that caused us to be doubtful about whether they should be permitted, or not. It was mentioned, but it was never mentioned in our report or petition at all. The only change made in our petition was that we addressed it at first to Dr. Curry and Dr. W. McF. Alexander, and Dr. Curry asked us not to address it to them, but to the Board, and so we re-wrote it in order to change the address, the way of addressing the paper, and the pronouns that were used in the body of the paper. That is the only change that we have made.

CHAIRMAN OVERTON: Pardon me. To keep the record clear, this matter was set this morning for a full hearing at two o'clock. That remains the order, unless some member of the Board wants to make a motion changing that order and taking some other action. I just wanted to make sure whether any member of the Board wants to make that motion, and if so, we would have to vote on it. Otherwise, we will proceed under the order.

DR. ROBERTSON (continuing reading):

"Speaking to the point of the first matter mentioned in our address to you, may we call your attention to a conversation between Dr. Diehl and Dr. Curry, which Dr. Curry told to four of our number and himself later repeated before the Presbyterian Pastors' Association. Dr. Diehl frankly said that he did not believe in the full inspiration of the Bible, but that he believed only parts of it were inspired, leaving errors and mistakes in other portions. He said he did not believe in the historical or scientific accuracy of the first part of Genesis. Nor did he accept the imprecatory Psalms as of God. Nor did he believe God commanded Joshua and the Israelites to destroy the Canaanites. When Dr. Curry asked Dr. Diehl how he could distinguish between what portions were inspired and what portions were not inspired, Dr. Diehl replied that it was by using his sanctified consciousness or common sense. Dr. Curry told us he said to Dr. Diehl, 'Doctor, you are a Modernist'. At a later time Dr. Curry, speaking to a group of ministers about Dr. Diehl's views of inspiration, said he told Dr. Diehl that such were not his own views nor did he think they were the views held by our Southern Church and that according to such a view 'we would have as many Bibles as we have thinking minds.' Dr. Diehl has expressed these same views to Dr. W. S. Lacy and to the four ministers who waited upon him who are prepared to witness to the truth and accuracy of his remarks.

"Where a President holds such a view of inspiration it is only natural to suppose that in the choice of teachers he would not require them to believe in the full inspiration of Scripture agreeable to our Confession of Faith. Mr. William Orr, a former student, when asked the direct question as to whether he was taught to believe in the full inspiration of Scripture while a student of SOUTHWESTERN, frankly answered he was not so taught. A little later he spoke of the Bible as 'containing the Word of God.' A student who attended SOUTHWESTERN five years ago said he was shocked then at 'their attitude towards the Bible', and added that he thought he could very clearly see at that time which way they were headed. A prominent elder in our city wrote SOUTHWESTERN two years ago that he would force them to sue him before paying his pledge after learning Dr. Diehl's view of God's word at that date.

"No one thing is so dangerous to the peace and unity of our church as for a teacher of religion, or any employer of teachers of religion, to hold such views and be allowed to remain in a place of preeminence and power. It means the opening of the flood gates of Modernism in its myriad forms. Speaking before the Presby-

terian Pastors' Association Dr. Curry said he felt such views were 'most dangerous'. Furthermore he said he felt sure they were not the views held by the four controlling Synods and that the views held by these Synods should be the views taught at SOUTHWESTERN.

"To speak of such views as 'most dangerous' seems to be putting it mildly. Such views are utterly subversive of everything for which as a church we stand. If we are to trim our sails to suit the current notions of accepted ethical standards in this age or entertain doubts because present day 'theories' of science or criticism fail to conform to the plain and evident teachings of God's word, we will soon be without chart or compass, resulting in the church becoming a derelict, fit only to be destroyed as a menace to wise navigators who sail by a fixed standard.

"May we now direct your attention to the teaching of our Confession of Faith relative to the inspiration of God's word. It says, 'The infallible rule for interpreting Scripture is the Scripture itself The Supreme Judge can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture'. (Art. 1, Sec. 9, 10). This utterly excludes all current 'theories' about science, ethics, etc., as guides in interpreting Scripture. In fact, 'when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture, (which is not manifold, but one) it may be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly' (Art. 1, Sec. 9). Moreover, 'The authority of the Holy Scripture dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth) the Author thereof; and, therefore, it is to be received because it is the word of God'. (Art. 1, Sec. 4). Therefore, according to the historic position of Presbyterianism the Bible stands solitary and alone as a book not given by human wisdom and not to be interpreted according to the teachings of human wisdom. The Holy Spirit who wrote it is Himself its interpreter and we are explicitly forbidden to go outside the Book to find or use things in the interpretation of it which contravene its plain and evident meaning.

"This in no sense sets our church at variance with the pursuit of learning or the findings of scholarship. No church has been more the patron of education than the Presbyterian Church. It merely announces such a belief on our part in the truth and accuracy of all matters contained in God's word, that nothing will be discovered and proved which contravenes its plain meaning. And until, or unless, something is proven, beyond the shadow of a doubt, we have no moral right to teach it as a fact or teach according to it inferentially as a likely 'theory' leading to the truth where it runs counter to the plain statements of God's word. It is for maturer minds to examine all 'theories' in the laboratories. Until a theory becomes a proven fact, the professor has no right to confuse immature minds with it. And if a 'theory', which contravenes God's word is brought to younger minds, thereby altering the faith with which they came to college, it is a crime. And for such a thing to happen in a church supported school, it is a crime unspeakable. Our only excuse, as a church, for being in the business of educating the youth is to teach them what is known in the field of learning and to give them a reason for the faith that is in them. If in our school the faith given these young people in childhood is marred, we are faithless to our trust. If teachers cannot be found who will teach only what is known, we can at least have the honor to close our doors. But such a suggestion is an aspersion on scholarship.

"Upon this question of inspiration there can be no compromise or quibbling. A man either believes or he does not believe that the Bible is the supreme and final statement of the truth about all matters contained in it. It must be received as a Divine and supernatural revelation before which the changing scientific and ethical 'theories' of different ages must bow as untrue where they conflict with the Bible. That is to say that no statement in Scripture is subject to denial or doubt because some theory of man contravenes its plain and evident meaning. The Church does not insist that the world share this view with us, but it does insist that those who

share our ministry shall believe and teach this without any equivocation or mental reservation. We are not interested in making the Bible more palatable to men of science by altering this view. Any lowering of the Standard to win their approval, or any compromise, is cowardly.

"For one of our ministers to say that he does not accept certain passages of Scripture as of God or that he does not believe in the history or science of the first part of Genesis, he has dealt a blow at the bulwark of Protestantism for upon the infallibility of the Bible, Presbyterianism took its stand when it denied the infallibility of the Pope. Hence the sharp and accurate meaning of our Confession of Faith which every Presbyterian minister must accept before he is ordained to minister in the Word.

"Much has been said about Dr. Diehl's view of our Lord's Atonement. To four of us who waited upon him he frankly said, he 'held no set theory of the atonement.' The Southern Presbyterian Church long ago found, 'a theory of atonement' which completely satisfies it. This theory is too well known to need any statement here concerning it, and if Dr. Diehl cannot subscribe to it as his sincere and unqualified belief he is at variance with the Standards of our Church at this most vital point. His view about the atonement occasioned Dr. Lacy to ask him what about Acts 4; 12, in its bearing on the salvation of the heathen. This passage says, 'Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under Heaven, given among men, whereby they must be saved'. To this Dr. Diehl is reported as saying, 'Oh, that is repeating old formularies.'

"If there is any document which our beloved church loves, honors and reveres, it is the Shorter Catechism. The Shorter Catechism is an exposition of what we believe based upon our Confession of Faith, using the method of questions and answers for the better elucidation of the same. By common consent our church regards it as the very finest and most accurate expression of what we believe. Under Dr. Strickler in Union Seminary, Fisher's Shorter Catechism was the 'text book' for the junior year in theology. And yet we have a letter over the signature of Rev. W. H. McAtee which says that he must reluctantly admit that, on one occasion, Dr. Diehl made the assertion to him that the Shorter Catechism was the bunk. To another minister he spoke of it as 'violating every rule of pedagogy.' If the Shorter Catechism is to Dr. Diehl 'the bunk,' by the same rule, our Confession of Faith is 'the bunk.' If it is 'pedagogically unsound,' so is our Confession of Faith. Rev. McAtee's letter also adds: 'at another time he said that all the pay a minister would get for preaching there is a hell was to make a laughing stock of himself, and he (Dr. Diehl) went on to explain to me why he did not believe in an eternal hell.' If Dr. Diehl entertains any such views he must know that he holds them contrary to our Confession of Faith. (See Ch. 6, Sec. 6) (Every sin, both original and actual, being a transgression of the righteous law of God, and contrary thereunto, doth, in its own nature, bring guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God, and curse of the law, and so made subject to death, with all miseries spiritual, temporal and eternal). The logical sequence of such views would seem to eventuate in universal salvation or Russellism's annihilation of the wicked after a second probation or some equally unpresbyterian view. Such views are not surprising where the meaning and matter of Scripture are not held sacred and inviolable against any and all outside adverse opinions, theories, etc. Now is it surprising, if his views of Scripture are correctly reported, that he should get the consent of his mind to say that he believes certain things are the moral equivalent of adultery and are to be regarded as adequate grounds for divorce, as recorded in the minutes of our General Assembly, 1929, (page 147).

"The Presbyterians of these four controlling Synods assume that the President of our college is loyal to the standards of our Church in every particular. And that in contributing to the support of SOUTHWESTERN they are helping a college where our

youth will be trained according to our standards. That they will not be taught one thing at home and have it made questionable by training at college. It is begging the question to say that SOUTHWESTERN is not a theological seminary. Certainly it is a Christian college whose only reason for existence as such under our Church is that it will not only employ only such men as devoutly believe these Standards, but only those who will teach nothing contrary to them.

"In the matter of Dr. Diehl's extravagance as an executive we are prepared to accept the open statement of members of the Board as correct. We appreciate that you have sought to curb him in this regard. The very fact that you have resorted to such a sharp hedging of Dr. Diehl so as to keep down his extravagance, evidences your own views in the matter. But how is it when the college was facing financial ruin he could secure money for a bulletin board costing \$400.00, street signs which have no meaning, costing \$200.00, monogrammed dishes perhaps \$1400.00; such a prodigal waste of money as that for monogrammed dishes shows a hopeless view of economy in handling sacred money. Or why should Dr. Diehl press the Rev. Edgar Williams, after the Board had ordered no honorarium be sent, to receive an honorarium of \$100.00, after three refusals, until it had to be flatly refused. You are in a better position than we are to judge the accuracy of such things which have been reported to us. It seems that there is but one way to get at the facts in such a matter so as to satisfy the inquiries abroad, and that is, for you to employ an auditor who will make a thorough audit of the books—all of them—and present an itemized statement of exactly how every dollar has been spent, listing items and amounts in such a way as to make plain the facts. Then have this audit presented to the four controlling Synods as it comes from the auditor's hands and let them judge for themselves about this matter.

"We want it distinctly understood that we are in no way accusing anyone of dishonesty. We are not even suspicious of such a thing, but business is business, and we have a right to know where our money has gone, and in what amounts it was spent for different things.

"This matter of extravagance has led to what we mentioned as the third point in our address to you. Many things have combined to produce the result of which we spoke. For example, it is rather generally known that the \$300,000 endowment which the school owned while in Clarksville was all spent in a few years, except about \$25,000. It is well known that Dr. William Ray Dobyms and Judge S. F. Hobbs refused to serve on the Board because they continued to spend endowment money. It is also known that Dr. Wallace Buttrick and Secretary Thorkelson of the General Education Board visited Memphis with the view to the placing of some endowment here, but when they learned that the former endowment had been used as indicated, they said, 'did it ever occur to you that it was not moral' and left without aiding SOUTHWESTERN. Furthermore, last summer \$70,000 of money, which should be bearing interest, was taken from the endowment funds to clear the college of indebtedness and a promise of like amount was substituted to guarantee its integrity. Does this comport well with the article on 'classification of funds' as stated in Charter and By-laws, page 18; ('The endowment funds shall neither be expended nor hypothecated for current expenses, but shall be retained and preserved inviolate. Investments of endowment funds shall be made as heretofore provided by the Committee on Finance. Endowment funds, annuity funds, funds for special purposes, and building funds shall not be deposited with or combined in any way with the current funds of the college). Regardless of any statement in your By-laws, is this the proper view to take of endowment money? What was your promise to the people of Memphis about this very kind of thing?

"We know that Dr. Diehl may say an emergency arose which necessitated the use of endowment funds or close the school. But what protection is there for the present endowment if a like emergency should again arise?

"Again, when the Presbyterians of Memphis made this last campaign we were told that the churches would not be asked to underwrite any amount nor be asked to collect these pledges. And yet in the face of these promises every effort was made to get each church to underwrite the unpaid portion of the pledges already made and the responsibility of collecting these pledges was placed upon the churches and their officers. Many of our leading officers regarded this as breaking faith and refused to be a party to it. The results are well known.

"At that time also we were told that \$30,000 was needed to pay off the debt. Later we were told that it was \$90,000 that was needed. When asked why the additional \$60,000, we were told that part was used for interest that would have to be paid upon retirement of the bonds and another part for attorney's fee for handling the transaction. But that about \$35,000 had been taken from funds which were in the bank with which to pay the indebtedness, it would be necessary in this emergency to raise that \$35,000. This is contrary to your By-laws as above quoted.

"Dr. Diehl said that this was most unfortunate but was done by the Bursar while he was out of the city, and that he knew nothing about it until he returned. Such handling of funds does not inspire much zeal for the administration of SOUTHWESTERN.

"What a commentary it was upon the state of things that a college like SOUTHWESTERN, in what looked like its last dying moments, did not have friends enough to raise a paltry little sum to save it for the Church! In the absence of friends, it had to bond real estate; give pledges for security, and then, contrary to your By-laws, borrow \$70,000 from the endowment to clear the debt. We are told that more than one third of the bonded debt of \$625,000 was paid out of the assets of the college.

"And this leads us to take note of the statement widely heralded of late about Dr. Diehl 'having saved SOUTHWESTERN for our Church.' The most that can be said is that he certainly worked hard. But as for him having saved SOUTHWESTERN, the idea is absurd. It is the belief of a great many that the money was raised in spite of the opposition to him and not because of him. It is freely reported in Mississippi that as much as 90% of the ministers are opposed to Dr. Diehl's administration. In Alabama we are surprised at the amount of strong opposition. Certainly in the Memphis area the situation is grave, indeed. Recall if you will the last urgent appeal that was made for all who were interested in 'saving SOUTHWESTERN,' to assemble at the Second Presbyterian Church in Memphis—only about fifteen laymen were present. A similar meeting was held in Westminster which resulted in the presence of about twenty-five laymen. But why attempt to refute an absurdity which everyone ought to know is absurd. It is a matter of common knowledge that it was the prestige and power of men like Dr. Curry, Dr. Vance and Dr. Alexander that saved the day financially for SOUTHWESTERN. If you want to know how much opposition to Dr. Diehl's administration made difficult this campaign, question the men who were on the firing line raising the money.

"As further evidence on our third point may we ask you to refresh your minds about the case of Dr. Horace B. Davis, the choice of Dr. Diehl as a teacher in Economics. The lack of judgment in ever choosing Dr. Davis almost staggers belief. But, excusing that as an honest error, there certainly was no excuse for retaining him one moment beyond the time when he showed open defiance for all that we hold sacred. In chapel services he refused to address God with the reverence and devotion of a Christian and refused to close his prayer with an acknowledgment of our Divine Lord. This soon became the butt of ridicule among the students—some are reported to have even left his class room. These things were done openly and above board in a college which seeks support and confidence as a Christian institution.

Where was Dr. Diehl in all of this? Everyone knows the revolting climax into which this thing ran. An outraged police department arrested Dr. Davis and his wife, threw them into the common jail, and Memphis was later relieved of their presence.

"In light of the fact that others have raised the question about the social life of the students of SOUTHWESTERN, their dances, Sabbath desecrations in banquets, parading, etc., on the Lord's day, etc., we feel at liberty to notice it, now that they have raised the issue—especially since things of their own creation have hurled back contemptuously upon us. It was not in our minds to even allude to these things for all such things adjust themselves in a well regulated institution. It is in this last phase of the matter that we are primarily interested. When your Committee of investigation is appointed, we will gladly put them in the way of getting information about this matter which will be very illuminating, we think, to your Board. Pending its report to you, may we ask you to ponder what you have sanctioned touching student activities and ascertain in how far your sanctions conform to the uniform deliberations of the Courts of our Church.

"In conclusion, may we say that we accept Dr. Diehl and the members of his faculty in their private lives and personal interests to be all they represent themselves to be. If things are otherwise with them, it has not been brought to our attention and certainly we have not sought to discover any such thing. It is not in what they are in themselves, but in what they are alleged to believe, that has occasioned our grouping and this address to you. If we know our hearts, we have only done what we thought was for the best interest of our college. We have no ill feeling toward any man or group of men. It is our earnest prayer that SOUTHWESTERN may steadily come to be a glory and honor to our beloved Church, furnishing the very finest and best possibly trained young manhood and womanhood to lead our Church in coming years."

QUESTIONING OF DR. DIEHL

CHAIRMAN OVERTON: I would like to say, for the benefit of the petitioners, that the Board of Directors of SOUTHWESTERN have chosen Dr. Vance to conduct the proceedings at this point.

DR. VANCE: Before going any further, I think it perfectly proper to call on Dr. Diehl to make any statement that he may desire to make in regard to the special matters that have been presented by Dr. Robertson in this paper.

DR. DIEHL: Just those particular things?

DR. VANCE: I will give them to you.

Dr. Charles E. Diehl was thereupon questioned by Dr. Vance, and made the following responses:

Q.—In regard to the conversation between you and Dr. Curry about the Bible, what have you to say?

A.—I have to say that I never said that I did not believe in the imprecatory Psalms. I said that I did not think the imprecatory Psalms were Christian in spirit. With regard to the first chapter of Genesis, I said I did not think it was a scientific treatise. With regard to the Canaanites, I said

that I was doubtful whether God really meant for Joshua to kill them all. With regard to that—

Q.—(interrupting) All right, what have you to say about the statement that you made to the four ministers when they came to see you?

A.—I told them decidedly that I believed in the vicarious atonement, but that I had no theory of the atonement that satisfied my mind; that it was,—that I thought there was probably some truth in all of the theories of the atonement.

Q.—What have you to say about the statement that you made to Dr. Lacy on the subject of the atonement?

A.—About the salvation of the heathen?

Q.—Yes, or whatever it was.

A.—We were not talking about the salvation of the heathen. We were discussing at the time Plato, and I said that it was difficult for me to think that, of all the millions of people that had lived on the earth, people like Plato, who perhaps had not lived fully as he should and done all that he should, but who had attained perhaps better than we have, who have had the light of the Gospel, that it was hard for me to think about them in an undying hell. That is what I said.

Q.—What have you to say about the remark that you are reported to have made about the Shorter Catechism?

A.—I never said that the Shorter Catechism was “the bunk”. I said that the teaching and requiring of children to learn, study and memorize the Shorter Catechism violated every pedagogical principle, but that I had done that myself when I was a child, that I was such a slave to tradition that I had had my boy learn it, but that I was trying to avoid the pedagogical mistake by going over it with him and explaining it to him. I think the Shorter Catechism is a great piece of work, but it is for adults, and not for children.

Q.—Do you desire to make any remark as to your views on divorce?

A.—I might just say that the speaker said that the minority report to the General Assembly on that subject was not adopted; but neither was the majority report, and no criticism has been uttered against that report, except in this little group. The report came before the Assembly itself, and there were some pretty able men on the committee.

Q.—What about the honorarium to Dr. Edgar Williams?

A.—Yes, I offered Dr. Williams \$100.00 for the work he did. We agreed to pay his expenses, and he sent in his expense account, and I thought we ought to send him a hundred dollars, and I tried to get him to take it, to buy books for his library, and he declined to take it, and I sent it back to him. That is true.

Q.—Is the treasurer's report audited by an expert accountant?

A.—Absolutely.

Q.—Does it include every item?

A.—Every item.

Q.—Is that presented to the Board each year?

A.—It is, and was presented to the Board today. I might say, with regard to the bulletin board, which has been spoken of, that that was a gift of the Senior Class of 1930, and that the signs referred to were given by the students, an action passed by them at the Student Council.

Q.—What about the use of the endowment fund while the university was at Clarksville?

A.—Well, the endowment fund,—every expenditure of the endowment fund was on the advice of legal counsel, and by order of the Board of Directors. Before coming down here, the former treasurer, Mr. George Tayloe, went to Clarksville with an auditor, went over the books, and made a report to the Board.

Q.—Have those funds been restored?

A.—Well, they have been more than made good. I mean to say that we have more in the endowment fund now than we ever had there. I was looking up—

Q. (Interrupting)—Well, let me ask you another question. Was the money with which this restoration was made given to the college in such a way that it was free to be used for any purpose it desired?

A.—It was. It was given for the endowment fund.

REV. MR. LOWE: Was it given to replace endowment, or for endowment?

A.—It was given for both.

REV. MR. LOWE: When the people of Memphis were asked to raise endowment, was it understood to be replacing endowment?

A.—I don't know whether all understood it, but those in the campaign understood it.

Q.—How much of this endowment had been encroached upon before you became President?

A.—I cannot give you the exact figures, but I think it was about \$37,000.00.

Q.—Was Judge Keeble ever asked whether, or not, in the event of the condition of the college making it necessary to use this fund to prevent the closing of the college, that the college could use the fund?

A.—He was.

Q.—What answer did he give?

A.—He said he would advise using it. Not only that, but the attorneys on the other side, the late Governor Peay and Mr. Dancey Fort, made their argument against the removal of the college on the ground that the college was not bankrupt, on the ground that it still had endowment funds and that it had not tried to do its utmost at Clarksville until those funds had been used.

Q.—What have you to say about the \$70,000 which it is suggested was taken from the—?

DR. VANCE: I don't know whether you said endowment fund, or not, Dr. Robertson?

DR. ROBERTSON: Endowment fund.

Q.—(Continuing) From the endowment fund recently?

A.—I think that the Treasurer could report on that. I might say, in reply, that it was an action of the Board of Directors, and I would say—

Q.—Well, explain what it was.

A.—It was the sale of a contract to the Investment Committee, with the pledge that interest would be paid on that.

Q.—Was the \$70,000 sold to the Investment Committee loaded down with any trust feature, making it necessary to use it for a specific purpose?

A.—Not at all. The \$70,000 contract was given for plant fund, into which it went.

Q.—Into which it went?

A.—By this method.

DR. ROBERTSON: It was not endowment fund, then?

DR. VANCE: No sir.

CHAIRMAN OVERTON: You will find in the minutes of the Executive Committee a report by Mr. T. K. Riddick, and I believe I also represented the estate, upholding the validity of that, and also the advisability of it. That is all in the records and minutes, which have been approved by the Board of Directors, and was done by the Executive Committee, I believe, after conference with many people vitally interested in the college. Dr. Diehl is certainly not chargeable with that, if it was done.

Q.—With regard to the promise to the Memphis churches not to call on them, have you anything you wish to say in regard to that?

A.—No, I have not.

Q.—What about the money that was used in connection with the cancellation of the mortgage, and that had to be paid out for attorneys' fees and interest, etc., amounting, I think, to—?

DR. VANCE: Did you give it as \$38,000, Dr. Robertson?

DR. ROBERTSON: About \$35,000.00.

Q.—(Continuing) To about \$35,000? Will you tell us about that?

A.—I did not get that. I do not know what that is about.

DR. VANCE: Well, it is all in the minutes. Mr. Tutwiler, are you prepared to make a statement about that?

MR. T. H. TUTWILER: Yes.

DR. VANCE: Will you state that?

MR. TUTWILER: That is thoroughly set forth in the Treasurer's report. There was a certain amount of money to be paid to the trustee, the Mississippi Valley Trust Company at St. Louis, before this mortgage could be released.

DR. VANCE: Suppose you read that right here, Mr. Tutwiler. I think that is the answer to it, right there in your report.

MR. TUTWILER: The mortgage was originally for \$700,000, and provided, in addition to the payment of semi-annual interest at the rate of six per cent, that a certain portion of the principal should be retired annually, and there was a further provision that, if the bonds were called prior to maturity, a premium of two percent should be paid on all unmatured bonds. As of October 1st, there had become due and payable \$120,000 par value of bonds, and hence there was a balance of \$580,000 upon which a premium of two percent, amounting to \$11,600.00, was paid. In addition, there was a fee paid to the trustee, amounting to \$828.17, and six months' interest, amounting to \$18,750.00, which, together with the principal of \$625,000, totalled \$656,178.17. That amount was deposited with the Mississippi Valley Trust Company on July 1st, 1930. The Board is familiar with the campaign for obtaining the funds and conducting it through the Synods. All agencies, including the general public of Memphis, contributed to its success, but the outstanding accomplishment that made success possible is due to President Diehl, in securing additional subscriptions from three outstanding friends of SOUTHWESTERN, amounting to \$225,000 in cash, the condition being that the balance necessary to pay the entire indebtedness should be raised. There is a statement here outlining all moneys received, and how they were disbursed in connection with that transaction.

REV. MR. LOWE: With reference to that matter, if I may be pardoned, we were told, when we met at the Second Presbyterian Church that we needed about \$30,000. In other words, that we were about \$30,000 short of the amount of money to pay the indebtedness of the college. Afterwards, when we met at Westminster, we were told that we needed \$90,000, and someone asked why, and the answer was that we had to pay certain interest, and a certain premium on the retirement of the bonds, and a certain attorney's fee that was necessary to be paid, and that \$35,000 which was in the bank to have been paid on the indebtedness had been taken out of the bank and used for the current expenses of the institution. That was Dr. Diehl's explanation of it on that Sunday afternoon in the Westminster Presbyterian Church, that that \$35,000 that was in the bank had been taken out and used for current expenses, and since the current expense fund

did not have the money to replace it, that it would be necessary to raise that additional \$35,000. Isn't that true, Dr. Diehl?

DR. DIEHL: In effect, yes. The funds were used for current expenses. I think that there was an advance of the plant funds, as I recall it,—I am not sure about it, but I think there was some money out of the plant fund that was taken for current expenses pending the receipt of the collections on the current funds.

DR. VANCE: Was that restored when those funds came in?

DR. DIEHL: Yes, it was.

MR. TUTWILER: Dr. Vance, I would like to say that, so far as I recall, and I am sure that I am right, that no funds dedicated to the plant have ever been used for operation since I have been Treasurer of the college. While there might have been bookkeeping items that temporarily necessitated the using of the plant funds until moneys in sight came into hand,—that might have been done, simply a bookkeeping matter, but all of these individual accounts have been kept absolutely to themselves.

DR. VANCE: Now, that completes that.

DR. DIEHL: No, there are one or two other things. One, the statement that anyone that preaches about hell makes himself a laughing stock—

DR. VANCE: I didn't know whether you wanted to answer that, or not.

DR. DIEHL: Yes, I will answer that. I was talking about the changed conditions today, about the sermons that Jonathan Edwards preached, when the people used to lean forward and grip the bench in front of them, and I said that the same sermons would not have that effect today, and that people would laugh,—yes, I think I said that they would probably laugh at some of the things, but that does not say that I do not believe in hell, and it does not say that I do not believe that fear is a motive, but I certainly do not think it is the highest motive, or the compelling motive.

DR. VANCE: All right.

DR. DIEHL: It is said that Dr. Wallace Buttrick and Mr. Thorkelson declined to aid SOUTHWESTERN because we had borrowed money from the endowment fund. That is not true. They were disappointed to find that we had done that. They regretted it, but they said they understood the situation, and were quite willing not to let that damn us, provided we never did it again. The reason they did not help us, and the reason they did not give us \$500,000, as Dr. Buttrick wanted to do, and wanted to make that the last act of his official administration, was because of the mortgage indebtedness. That is all.

DR. ROBERTSON: Dr. Vance, in regard to Dr. Diehl's statement about the Catechism violating every rule of pedagogy, you know how a man remembers things after many years, even when it is not especially called to his attention. I do not deny that Dr. Diehl may have made all of those explanations, but when he said that to me, he was riding in my car, to come over to preach in my church, and I said something about teaching the

Shorter Catechism,—teaching it, and not how it was taught,—the value of teaching it, and he turned and said, “You know that the Shorter Catechism violates every rule of pedagogy,” and that is all he did say, and it fell on me like a thunderbolt, and I couldn’t forget it, because I had never heard anything like that in my short life from a Presbyterian minister.

CHAIRMAN OVERTON: How long ago was that, Dr. Robertson?

DR. ROBERTSON: About seven years ago.

QUESTIONING OF THE PETITIONING MINISTERS

DR. VANCE: I would like to ask a few questions of each of the ministers present who have signed this petition, and I hope you won’t resent what I am going to do, and if it is unpleasant to you, say so, and decline to answer, but we feel that it is only fair to Dr. Diehl that we ask these questions, and he will be asked a good many of them himself when his time comes. I will take first Dr. Robertson.

DR. J. P. ROBERTSON was thereupon questioned by Dr. Vance, and made the following responses:

Q.—When were you ordained, Dr. Robertson?

A.—In April, 1888.

Q.—Where did you attend seminary?

A.—At Austin, Texas.

Q.—Do you believe that Dr. Diehl is unsound theologically?

A.—I do.

Q.—What are your reasons?

A.—I have given them in the paper.

Q.—Do you believe he is a reckless administrator of the college funds?

A.—I do.

Q.—What are your reasons?

A.—The reasons given in the paper. I believe that what was done, as stated in there, was done by the Board at his solicitation, in most cases.

Q.—Do you believe that the conditions on the campus are bad, from a moral and religious standpoint?

A.—From what I have heard from some of the best people in Memphis, I think they are.

Q.—Can you give us the names of the people who have given you that information?

A.—Well, Rev. Mr. Lowe and Dr. Dudley, for example, have told me of conversing with people who were out here.

Q.—Did Dr. Lacy ever talk with you on the subject?

A.—Oh, yes.

Q.—Fully, or—?

A.—On that subject, not so awfully much.

Q.—Was that conversation started by him, or by you?

A.—I do not remember now.

*The Reverend H. B. Wade, who was then questioned, stated that he did not know whether or not Dr. Diehl is unsound, or a reckless administrator of college funds, that these matters had been called to his attention, and that he believed, in justice to Dr. Diehl and to the college, they should be cleared up. In reply to a question about the moral and religious conditions on the campus, he said that this matter was not in the petition at all.

Dr. J. J. Hill replied to the question as to whether or not Dr. Diehl is unsound theologically by saying that he had heard rumors that he was not altogether sound; that he has known Dr. Diehl for many years and has had many opportunities of hearing him speak, yet was not absolutely assured of his soundness, especially with reference to the inspiration of the Scriptures. He said he did not have any first hand information as to his soundness or unsoundness, and could not recall any statement of Dr. Diehl's that led him to have doubts on the subject. Asked if he regarded Dr. Diehl as a reckless administrator of college funds, he replied that observation led him to believe that he has not been a wise and economical administrator, that the evidence given in the prepared statement read by Dr. Robertson was sufficient, and that the Board had indicated by hedging Dr. Diehl in with a budget and a finance committee its lack of confidence in his ability as an administrator. With regard to conditions on the campus, he stated that the college had endorsed dancing, an action "contrary to every deliverance that our Church has made," whereas the church does not endorse, but merely *endures*, the practice. Dr. Vance hereupon noted that the college does not endorse dancing, but permits it under regulation.

The Reverend Turney B. Roddy answered Dr. Vance's questions by saying that he regarded Dr. Diehl as unorthodox and as a reckless administrator, for the reasons given in the prepared statement. He said that he regarded conditions on the campus as bad. He denied that he had been approached as to Dr. Diehl's unsoundness by any one.

The Reverend A. C. Dudley was then called upon, but Dr. Hill stated that Mr. Dudley had had to leave on account of a wedding, and the Reverend R. Girard Lowe was next questioned.

Mr. Lowe said that he regards Dr. Diehl as unorthodox, for the reason that he does not believe in the historical and scientific accuracy of the opening chapters of Genesis and does not accept the imprecatory Psalms, and that, though he said he believed in the vicarious atonement, the work of the Holy Spirit, and the sovereignty of God, he later said he had no theory of the atonement. He quoted Mr. William Orr as stating that he was not taught here that the Bible was the inspired word of God. Mr. Orr, who was present, stated that he had not been reported correctly.

* In order to save space, the testimony of the remaining members of the delegation is summarized.

Mr. Lowe further said that he believes Dr. Diehl to be a reckless administrator. In reply to a question about conditions on the campus, he replied that he believed the dances held on the campus are anything but what they ought to be at any place, to say nothing of a Presbyterian institution. He had no personal knowledge, and declined to give the names of his informants.

The Reverend F. D. Daniel, in response to questioning, then stated that he regarded Dr. Diehl as unorthodox because of a sermon preached twelve years ago, which he did not hear, but which was reported as practically denying the question of eternal punishment. He also thinks, if reports are true, that conditions on the campus are bad, but "do not know anything about it myself at all." His sole motive in appearing before the Board, he stated, was to have this whole matter cleared up.

Dr. Vance hereupon made a statement to the effect that the administration is not approving of dancing, but is trying to handle the situation in the best way.

The Rev. James V. Cobb replied to questioning by saying that he had been in Memphis less than a year and a half, that he did not know whether or not Dr. Diehl is a heretic, and that he merely put his name to the petition to request that an investigation be made, and that he had no first hand information.

STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAM ORR

Dr. Vance then called upon Mr. William Orr to state what he had to say concerning the statement attributed to him. He denied that he had said that the college did not teach the full inspiration of the Scriptures, and said that if he were asked about Dr. Diehl's belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures he would say that he had "full confidence in Dr. Diehl's belief in the full inspiration of the Bible." In response to further questioning, Mr. Orr, a former student at SOUTHWESTERN and at present a senior in Louisville Theological Seminary, stated that he had come to Memphis on his own initiative and at his own expense because of his love for his Alma Mater and his desire to see justice done.

FURTHER STATEMENT OF DR. ROBERTSON

Dr. Robertson requested permission to make a statement about Dr. Diehl's recklessness as an administrator, and spoke as follows:

One thing is that, when he became president of the college it was a standard grade college, had been running many years under that \$300,000 endowment, and doing a fine work, and the Board had never been spending that sacred trust before,* and the fact that he spent that endowment at the rate of nearly \$40,000 a year, or let the Board do it, which is a violation of the laws of the land, to spend the principal of an endowment, which is a trust fund, that of itself proves the man to be a reckless administrator.

Another thing I want to say is that he did say to us that he did not accept the imprecatory Psalms as inspired because they did not contain the spirit of Christ.

*See footnote on page 20.

DR. DIEHL'S REPLY

Dr. Vance then called upon Dr. Diehl for his statement.

DR. DIEHL: Mr. Chairman, I think that this is an error about the \$300,000 that Dr. Robertson has been talking about as the endowment fund. If this is going into the record, we want it to be exact.

DR. VANCE: Well, will you give it?

DR. DIEHL: Well, in looking over the minutes last night, I saw that the total assets of the institution, as they were put down, was \$309,000.00, I think.

DR. VANCE: How much of that was endowment?

DR. DIEHL: Well, that is the total assets.

DR. VANCE: I know, but how much of that—?

DR. DIEHL: Well, I don't know,—I would just have to look up the thing, but I do know this, that of that, \$37,000 was put down as non-income producing, which had been spent by my predecessors, and a good deal of it was put down as profit and loss, and a good deal more, as forward movement.

DR. VANCE: Do you mean that the \$37,000 that was spent was put down as forward movement and profit and loss?

DR. DIEHL: Yes, and that \$37,000 which had been spent before I became president must be deducted from the \$309,000, to tell what the assets of the institution were when I went in.

DR. VANCE: Did that \$309,000 include the value of the grounds and buildings?

DR. DIEHL: It included the buildings. I do not think it included the grounds.

DR. VANCE: All right, sir.

DR. DIEHL: That was the report on the treasurer's books.*

*After referring to the books, Dr. Diehl later supplemented his statement with the following figures taken from the official records. When he assumed the Presidency of Southwestern in August, 1917, the endowment amounted in round figures to \$242,000. Prior to this time the Board of Directors had authorized or ratified the encroachment on the endowment funds of about \$59,000. This sum had been spent during the few years previous in launching a forward movement, in repairing university buildings, and in paying debts and deficits.

During the first two years of Dr. Diehl's administration there was no deficit, and no money was borrowed from the endowment funds for operating expenses. Later, when it was planned to move Southwestern to Memphis, it was necessary to maintain the institution as a going concern, and upon the advice of legal counsel, the Board of Directors ordered the bor-

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. DIEHL

Dr. W. S. Lacy, who for the past seven years has been Executive Secretary of SOUTHWESTERN, and who worked enthusiastically in the campaign, spoke to me in July about relinquishing his work. He said that he was growing older, that the work in the field was intellectually demoralizing, was very wearing, and he wanted a position which would not keep him on the road and away from home so much. He offered to go at his own expense for a year or more to a seminary or graduate school to fit himself for a professorship, or for a less wearing executive position than that which he then occupied. There was not the slightest hint of personal dissatisfaction or of theological disagreement in our conversation, and we discussed several graduate schools and seminaries, but I did not encourage him to believe that he would be called as professor of Bible at SOUTHWESTERN. If I had, it is my firm belief that his part in the later uprising would never have occurred. I understood that Dr. Lacy had decided to give up the plan of doing graduate work, and that he proposed to stay in his present position. He left shortly after that on a well deserved vacation, and it was not until some time in September that by chance I found out about Dr. Lacy's spirit of opposition to me. I found out then that for some weeks he had been in correspondence with officials of the Synod of Mississippi with regard to accepting the Superintendency of the Presbyterian schools of that Synod, and that he was preparing to accept that position.

Dr. Lacy presented his resignation to me, and it was accepted by the Executive Committee at its meeting on September 25, 1930. Five days after his resignation had been accepted he wrote a letter, purporting to give the reasons for his resignation, but in reality the letter appears to be written in order that he might have on paper certain strictures against me.* The letter reached me on the evening of October 1st, after Dr. Lacy had left for Jackson, Mississippi, and the receipt of that letter with its contents is one of the most amazing experiences of my life, filled as it is with mis-statements, and revealing a very hostile spirit. This letter Dr. Lacy has circulated to some extent throughout the four Synods, but he somehow neglected to forward with that letter my reply.

During the last two weeks of Dr. Lacy's connection with us he was in Memphis but rarely appeared at the office. It is my belief that he spent a large part of this time in preparing the letter above referred to, and in encouraging and organ-

*This letter, together with Dr. Diehl's reply, is printed in the Appendix, page 37.

rowing of sums from the endowment funds to cover the deficits in operating expenses. If the City of Clarksville had won the suit, as was highly probable, none of the endowment funds could have been transferred. If Southwestern won the suit, it was agreed that the borrowings would be made good, and this has been done. The litigation was drawn out over a far longer period than was ever dreamed, and the litigation itself was expensive.

It should be noted, however, that a condition printed on the subscription cards of the 1920 campaign provided that \$50,000 of the proceeds of that campaign could be used for operating expenses. This \$50,000 for operating expenses was never taken out of the campaign fund, but was borrowed from the endowment fund, because if this had been done and if Southwestern had lost the suit, the Church would have been \$50,000 poorer, for the reason indicated above.

The total income producing endowment in August, 1917, as shown above, was \$242,000.00, and in 1919 this figure remained unchanged, except for a temporary advance made for the erection of the Sanitary Kitchen, which was then in process of construction, pending the collection of subscriptions for that cause. The college was opened in Memphis in September, 1925. During this intervening period, the college was maintained as a going concern, the institution was restored to its place on the list of accredited colleges by the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States, from which list it had been dropped, the bills for the expensive litigation were paid, and the court had required the return to the City of Clarksville of the original \$50,000, which had been given in 1874, on condition that Southwestern Presbyterian University be located at Clarksville, and which was included in the above noted endowment fund. There was brought to Memphis in income producing endowment the sum of \$89,151.56. The income producing endowment now amounts to more than \$435,000.00.

izing the opposition among the Presbyterian ministers of Memphis. Certain it is that four of the local ministers, who were already somewhat alienated, were made acquainted with the contents of Dr. Lacy's letter. These four ministers prepared a petition, and went around on a campaign of salesmanship to the other Presbyterian ministers here in Memphis to get their signatures to this petition. These four ministers appeared unexpectedly in my office on the evening of October 3d. This self-appointed committee was composed of Rev. R. G. Lowe, the spokesman for the group, Rev. A. C. Dudley, Dr. J. P. Robertson, and Dr. J. V. Johnson. Two of these men* on a previous occasion had delicately indicated their judgment of their fitness for membership on the faculty of SOUTHWESTERN, but they were not encouraged in this aspiration.

The members of this committee expressed their warm friendship for me personally, their hearty appreciation for the splendid work which had been done here at SOUTHWESTERN, but informed me that in their judgment my period of usefulness had expired. They said that, at the suggestion of one of the outstanding Presbyterians of Memphis, they were doing me the courtesy to come and inform me of their plans. They presented an indictment which had three counts: First, that in their judgment I was unsound in the faith; second, that I was a reckless administrator of finances; third, that the social activities at SOUTHWESTERN were not in accord with the Church, specifically, that the students went to dances and had dances. They told me that if I would give them my word that I would resign, nothing further would occur. If I did not, they had in their pocket a petition addressed to the Board of Directors, signed by nearly all of the Presbyterian ministers of Memphis, asking for my removal. They assured me that SOUTHWESTERN need expect no further financial help from the churches they represented as long as I remained in my present position. I think that there is no doubt that the visiting committee of four will use their influence, insofar as they can control the gifts from their churches, to make good their statement, but I do not think that this is true of others who signed the paper.

I told these gentlemen that it was quite possible that I did not agree with their point of view in some matters, but that I felt that I was in accord with the standards of our Church, and that I was responsible for my soundness as a Presbyterian minister to the Presbytery of Nashville. They asked me what they should do with this petition, and offered to give me several days to think the matter over. I told them that I did not need any time at all to form a decision, that I did not propose to resign, and that they could do what they pleased with their petition. Some days after that a petition was filed with the Secretary of the Board, but this is evidently a revised petition, in that the present petition is dated October 6th instead of October 3d, and the third count in the petition is changed. Instead of the count concerning the social activities, the third count is to the effect that the Presbyterian constituency of Memphis has lost confidence in the administration of the President of the college. The petition is signed, in addition to the visiting committee of four, by the following six Presbyterian ministers of Memphis: Revs. J. V. Cobb, F. D. Daniel, J. J. Hill, E. M. Nesbitt, Turney B. Roddy,** H. B. Wade, and Rev. W. E. Powell, of Somerville, Tennessee.

It is not difficult to check up on my past. Born into the Southern Presbyterian Church, in the Synod of Virginia, I was ordained by Ebenezer Presbytery in the Synod of Kentucky, and for thirty years I have been a minister of that Church. I

*One of the men here referred to has told me since this statement was made that his remarks on a certain occasion were misinterpreted and that he was not a candidate for membership on the faculty of Southwestern. I accept his statement, and am glad to make this correction.—Chas. E. Diehl.

**In a letter to Dr. Diehl, dated February 5, 1931, Rev. H. B. Wade announced that he had "advised Dr. Robertson and the other men that my name is not to be used in any further pressing of the petition which was sent to the Board."

held three pastorates before accepting my present position. My record gives no occasion for pride, but it is readily available, and there are no secret places from which I am endeavoring to divert the light of publicity. Certainly my record is not that of a brawler, of a belligerent controversialist, nor is it that of a trimmer. If I did not think that I was in accord with the standards of our Church, I would be honest enough to go to my Presbytery and say so.

SOUTHWESTERN has never been a sectarian institution. Even in the old days at Clarksville, when there was a theological department, SOUTHWESTERN resented any suggestion or insinuation that it was a sectarian institution. On the contrary, in its advertisements and in its literature, it claimed that it was not a sectarian institution, but that it was a Christian college, a standard college of higher education. This claim has been iterated and reiterated during all the past years, and it is on the basis of this claim that funds have been secured and students matriculated. One of the effective pieces of literature in the 1920 campaign was a strong address which was made by the Vice Chairman of our Board, Dr. James I. Vance, in the First Presbyterian Church, of Nashville. This address was printed and circulated throughout this entire territory. The following quotation from that address is clear and convincing:

"This manhood factory that I want to sell you is a Christian college,—not a sectarian college, not a school dominated by ecclesiasticism where the effort is to warp the mind into narrow grooves of dogmatic intolerance; and yet, on the other hand, not a school which forgets that man was made in God's image and which concludes that a man is educated who knows nothing of his Maker and whose soul has been left to vegetate as a weed; but a college dominated by the Personality of Christ, whose curriculum is taught from the standpoint of Christian truth, and whose organization is saturated with Christian ideals."

If we were honestly conducting here an avowedly sectarian institution, an institute for propaganda, it would be incumbent upon us to give the fullest publicity to this fact, and to accept no money or students under false pretenses. Under those circumstances, it would be proper to make any theological or social requirements of the officers and members of the faculty which those in authority might choose, however petty these might seem to some. But if the institution in all of its literature claims to be a Christian college, a standard college of liberal arts, offering a liberal education in the twentieth century to students of all denominations, as this college does and has always done, it must be true to its claims. Under these circumstances, a college can and should require that its faculty be composed of men who are genuine and wholehearted in their allegiance to Jesus Christ as their Saviour and Lord. It has a right also to insist that only men be chosen who believe in His deity, including His virgin birth and resurrection. And all of this SOUTHWESTERN does, and has done since 1855, when it became a Presbyterian institution. There is not a man on the official roster of SOUTHWESTERN today who does not thus believe, and anyone who has made or who is making a statement to the contrary is either consciously or unconsciously a falsifier.

Someone has suggested the possibility of consulting the four co-operating Synods to ascertain what theories or doctrines should be held or taught at SOUTHWESTERN. I can think of few things more unwise than that suggestion, unless, as I have indicated above, we desire to change the character of the institution, and make out of SOUTHWESTERN an institute for propaganda, rather than a Christian college. Most unworthy of all is the suggestion that we conform all teachings to this or that particular theory, regardless of the facts in the case, in order thereby to secure money for the college. Venality is not a Christian virtue. If either of these was done, we would in honesty be compelled to return a great deal of money, and we would have to adopt another seal, erasing from the present seal not only the word "Truth," but also the other two words "Loyalty" and "Service." Men differ in their attitudes,

their outlook, and their points of view, and there are some who, by reason of their closed minds, are not honestly seeking to know the truth. Their only mental exercise is the rearrangement of their prejudices. Truth is found only by those who, with open mind and honest heart, reverently and humbly and persistently seek it. Pilate's question, "What is truth?" still baffles us, but the true answer never has and never will be given by a majority vote of an assembly, whether that be a church court, an association of scientists, or a political convention. The idea of determining by a vote of a church court the sort of theory, theological, ecclesiastical, political, social, or economic, which is to be held and taught in a Christian college is the height of absurdity.

In the first place, such an action is unnecessary, for, generally speaking, no specific theories are taught. The facts in each case are presented fairly from a Christian point of view, and the student is encouraged to think matters through for himself, and to come to his own conclusions. Students at SOUTHWESTERN are not dragooned into accepting this or that theory, or forced, upon pain of failure in a course, to put down on their examination papers things which they do not believe. A sectarian institution might conceivably proceed along this line, but it is unworthy of a college which names the name of Christ.

In the second place, such an action would be useless, for the members of the assembly or church court differ among themselves, and very few are sufficiently expert and broadly enlightened to determine which theory perhaps more nearly approximates the truth. That is one reason why the church needs colleges, in order that capable and true Christian men, trained for the work, men who are relieved of the multiplicity of the disturbing duties of the pastorate, may give themselves with wholehearted abandon to discover and teach the truth. The Christian college should lead the way into an ever larger, richer, fuller conception of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. The college, it should be noted, is different from the theological seminary, which does proclaim and endeavor to enforce a definite set of denominational doctrines. However, in this day even the theological seminaries are coming to realize that they are first of all educational institutions, and not mere institutes of propaganda. Even they are recognizing the right of students to think for themselves, and they are coming to realize that the Holy Spirit is still guiding the church into a clearer conception of truth and duty.

In the light of the first charge in the petition, it is a fair question to ask what are the theological requirements for a president of SOUTHWESTERN. There were none laid down in the old by-laws, nor are any set forth in the present by-laws. My two predecessors in office were laymen, and they were not, I believe, questioned at all along theological lines. There is one college of our Church, and only one that I know of, that requires subscription to the standards of our Church for its president and for members of its faculty, while one church college of another denomination that I know of has as its president a member of a different communion. SOUTHWESTERN has no expressed theological requirements other than those indicated above.

When on May 30, 1917, I was asked to accept the Presidency of SOUTHWESTERN, I was interviewed by a committee of the Board composed of Presbyterian ministers, no reference was made by them to any theological requirement. I did not accept the Presidency of SOUTHWESTERN until August, 1917, but I met with the Board of Directors for a conference on May 31, 1917. The following members of the Board of Directors were present at that meeting: Drs. George Lang, W. McF. Alexander, Joseph Rennie, M. E. Melvin, J. S. Foster, R. L. Campbell, George D. Booth, Messrs. W. T. Hardie, Mike Savage, and J. T. Fuller, seven ministers and three laymen. A year or two before that time, when I was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, of Clarksville, a former professor on the faculty of SOUTHWESTERN, Dr. C. W. Sommerville, had done me a grave injustice by circulating over the Church false reports concerning my orthodoxy. On that account he was asked by the Board

invited to attend the meeting, the President took up the whole matter, and stated frankly all the facts in his possession. He offered to resign at that time, and made the point that it would be highly unwise to proceed further with the definite educational ideals which were being proposed for SOUTHWESTERN, if any change in the administration was contemplated, or if it were wise to make such a change. With absolute heartiness and unanimity the Board at that time expressed its satisfaction with the conduct of the institution, and declared that, so far as the then Board was constituted, there was no desire for change. It was only after that vote of confidence and loyalty that there were presented the definite educational ideals of SOUTHWESTERN, which had been carefully worked out, which were adopted by the Board at that meeting, and which were reaffirmed by the Board at its annual meeting last year.

The eleven petitioners avow that they are deeply concerned over conditions at SOUTHWESTERN, and they claim to have information which causes them to make certain charges. The first of these deals with alleged theological unsoundness, the teaching of these views to students in the college, and the resultant endangering or destroying of their faith.

I.

I am charged in the petition with disbelieving "in the full inspiration of the Scriptures." This is rather ambiguous, but probably refers to some particular theory of inspiration, which the writer of the petition himself holds. It should be noted that it is perfectly possible for two men, both of whom accept the fact of inspiration, to differ about the theory and yet both may be true to the standards of the church, for the reason that, while every church believes in the fact of inspiration, neither the Presbyterian Church nor any other church has ever attempted officially to define inspiration or to adopt any particular theory of inspiration for incorporation in its creed.

As Dr. W. L. Lingle, President of Davidson College, in a review of the work of the General Assembly of 1928, reminded the Church: "The Confession does teach clearly the great fact of inspiration, but if you will search its pages again you will probably be convinced that, while it does not deny the doctrine of verbal inspiration, it does not teach it. In fact, it teaches the great fact of inspiration with power, but you will probably end your study of the Confession with the conclusion that the Confession does not commit itself to any theory of inspiration."

Dr. Robert F. Campbell, former Moderator of our General Assembly, in the Sprunt Lectures delivered at Union Theological Seminary last year, and published under the title "Freedom and Restraint," makes perfectly clear in the first chapter, "Authority of the Scriptures," the fact that a man's orthodoxy in the Southern Presbyterian Church does not depend upon the acceptance of the verbal inerrancy theory of inspiration. Likewise, Dr. Francis L. Patton, the Presbyterian Gamaliel of Princeton fame, in the Sprunt Lectures for 1924, published under the title, "Fundamental Christianity," in the second chapter, "The Seat of Authority in Religion," conclusively shows that we have no right to substitute the word "inerrancy" for "inspiration" in our discussion of the Bible.

I believe in the fact of inspiration, that the writers of the Bible were inspired, that "holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," that the Bible is an authoritative and trustworthy and progressive revelation of God's will and nature, given us to test our belief and conduct. It is not a library of universal knowledge, nor are all of its parts of equal value. For example, the Book of Chronicles is not as valuable as the Gospel of John. I believe that the Bible is supremely the revelation of God's love through Jesus Christ our Lord, that "the Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man,"

that it is a unique book, that it is "the only infallible rule of faith and practice," that it is the only book in all the world which answers the question, "How shall man be just with God?"

I believe that Christ alone is "*the* Word of God," that He alone is the final, perfect revelation of God, and that everything is to be judged and measured by His teachings and life. I believe that the Old Testament must be read and interpreted in the light of the New Testament. I believe that all historic, prophetic and didactic revelation of God in the inspired books of the Old and New Testaments is subordinate to His revelation of personal truth and grace in the Christ of the historic gospels; and that whatsoever the former may contain that is incongruous with the revelation of His righteousness, or purity, or love, or truth, in the words and life of Christ, whatever be the explanation of the incongruity, has been virtually superseded, as Christ Himself taught in the Sermon on the Mount.

This faith may not be in accord with the point of view of some of the petitioners, but it is eminently sound, and it is in accord with the standards of our Church.

It is charged that the President "does not adhere to many of the teachings of the standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.; that he teaches these views to students in the college, which views are at variance with our standards, with the result that the faith of some of the students has been endangered, if not actually destroyed, and we apprehend with almost certain danger in the future to the faith of others."

This is an even more ambiguous charge, and I am at a loss to know which teachings of the standards are not adhered to, since, in addition to believing in the inspiration of the Scriptures as stated above, I believe in the divine sovereignty of God, in the deity of Christ, including His virgin birth and resurrection, in the vicarious atonement of Christ, in regeneration by the Holy Spirit, in ultimate sanctification for the redeemed, and in retribution for the unrepentant. This faith is in accord with the standards of the Presbyterian Church, and I am at a loss to know what additional teachings are referred to. Inasmuch as for the past ten years I have not taught any classes, the only way in which I could exercise a destroying influence on the faith of the students is by the public ministrations and private conferences with the students. I deny emphatically that I have exercised an unwholesome influence upon the faith and religious life of our students, and there are scores and hundreds of students who will gladly witness to the truth of my statement.

II.

It is charged that "The President of SOUTHWESTERN is a reckless administrator in the handling of the funds belonging to the college."

The history of SOUTHWESTERN during the past ten years ought to be a general refutation of that charge. More specifically it may be said that the Board of Directors, through its Executive Committee, which is composed of some of the best business and professional men in Memphis, has installed an excellent business system, and that the President is strictly limited in making expenditures by the budget which is carefully and officially adopted by the Board. The Treasurer's report shows that the operating expense for the year ending August 31, 1930, was \$1,536.14 less than the approved budget.

III.

It is charged that "It is our belief that the Presbyterian constituency of Memphis has lost confidence in the administration of the President of the college."

It is my judgment that that belief is not well founded, and this for two reasons: First, the number of Presbyterian students from the churches represented by the petitioners here at SOUTHWESTERN this year exceeds the number of students from those

churches enrolled at SOUTHWESTERN last year. Second, the total number of Presbyterians enrolled in the churches of the signers of the petition represent only a little more than one-third of the Presbyterian constituency of Memphis. If the ministers could speak for all the members of their churches, which they most certainly cannot do, the larger part of the Presbyterian constituency of Memphis would still not be in expressed opposition to the present administration of SOUTHWESTERN. It is entirely probable that there are members in other Presbyterian churches who are not in sympathy with the present administration, but we have reason to believe that this is a small minority, and we know, from voluntary letters and enthusiastic statements of many of the leading members in the churches of the petitioners, that they are not in sympathy with this action of their pastors, and they resent an attempt on the part of their pastors to speak for the members of their churches in this matter. It should be noted that, while SOUTHWESTERN is under Presbyterian control, it has not confined its appeals for gifts to the Presbyterian constituency, nor has it limited its enrollment to Presbyterian students.

As a result of the publicity given to this unfortunate matter, numerous communications have been received. Some of these are letters from former members of the Board of Directors, some of them are from former members of the faculty, many of them are from former students and from people who have been intimately identified with the college. Many of the letters have come from ministers—Presbyterian and others, from the parents of present and prospective students, from people of all denominations and all walks of life. The faculty and the present student body have adopted resolutions, as have other groups and organizations outside the college. It is hardly necessary to say that in no case has a single one of these communications been solicited. They are available for the consideration of the Board, if it is desired to read them.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to that statement, I want to say that, at the spring meeting of the Presbytery of Nashville, I propose to go before that Presbytery and settle this matter of whether or not I am in accord with the standards of the Church.

DR. VANCE: You mean, you do propose to do that?

DR. DIEHL: I do; I am going to do it. I am announcing now that I am going to do that.

CHAIRMAN OVERTON'S STATEMENT

At this point Dr. Vance called upon Mr. LeMaster, the Chairman of the Board, to present certain communications which had been addressed to the Board concerning the effort to discredit the present administration. Dr. Robertson asked that the petitioners be allowed to retire, stating that he knew what had appeared in the papers, and that he was awfully tired. Dr. Vance and Chairman Overton cordially invited the petitioners to remain, but stated that they were at liberty to retire if they did not desire to hear the communications from persons and organizations. Before retiring, Dr. J. J. Hill and Rev. R. G. Lowe questioned Dr. Diehl about his belief in inspiration. This discussion was interrupted by the chairman, who made the following statement.

CHAIRMAN OVERTON: I would like to say this, unless the Board wants to go into it, I don't see how the Board of Directors of the college can pass on a question that is something for people who have studied theology for years, and I just want to say before this Board that, as far as I

am concerned, I think Dr. Diehl has made a very full statement of his belief, and certainly the charges against him have been practically 99 per cent hearsay of people who have heard something, and I do not think that the Board can go into a matter, or should go into the matter of whether or not somebody's particular theory, or some particular point is true. I just don't see how this Board can pass on that. If Dr. Diehl is teaching anything here that is hurting these boys and girls, if they are not getting Christian education, it is something for this Board, but I cannot see how the Board can go into the doctrine of inspiration that the Presbyterian Church believes in.

STATEMENT OF DR. W. S. LACY

The suggestion was made here that Dr. Lacy be heard, and a motion to that effect was made and passed. Dr. Lacy stated that it would take him ten or fifteen minutes to present his statement, and he was allowed fifteen minutes. Later, upon motion of one of the Directors, Dr. Lacy was allowed all the time he desired, and he consumed more than thirty minutes. Dr. Lacy began with a statement concerning his ancestry, affirmed his devotion to the Southern Presbyterian Church, and expressed the kindest feeling towards everyone connected with SOUTHWESTERN. He admitted that he had talked with the petitioners, that he had met with the four men who called on Dr. Diehl, and later met with the eleven petitioners. He was asked by Chairman Overton whether he would file his paper with the court stenographer when he had finished reading it. Dr. Lacy declined to do this, stating that he intended to cut out some things in it. In his prepared statement, Dr. Lacy went over again matters which were contained in his letter of September 30, 1930, which letter is printed as Appendix A of this booklet, and he repeated most of the matter presented by Dr. Robertson in his paper. Dr. Lacy went a little further, in that he charged that it was Dr. Diehl's connection with the institution that was responsible for the fact that the campaigns for SOUTHWESTERN were so long drawn out and expensive, and at times unsuccessful.

He endeavored to show that, so far from being "a remarkable financier," Dr. Diehl had wasted money in the construction of buildings of this type. He affirmed that, while the present construction will endure through the ages, it would have been possible to put up cheaper buildings which would have lasted perhaps a hundred years. If this had been done, he surmised that a saving of \$200,000 might have been effected in the residential group of buildings, and added, "if you had taken this \$200,000 and kept it at compound interest at six percent per annum for one hundred years, it would amount to over \$64,000,000, and I think that that would replace the dormitories."

He stated that the annual budget for operating expenses of the college could be reduced by \$20,000, if janitors and helpers were dismissed, if pro-

of Directors to resign his position on the faculty, and he came from Clarksville to the pastorate of the Westminster Presbyterian Church, of Memphis.

When I appeared before the Board of Directors on May 31, 1917, I told the Board that they ought to think very carefully about whether or not they wanted me in that position, in view of the fact that criticisms of my orthodoxy had been widely disseminated over the Church by a former professor of that institution. The Board replied that that matter had been carefully considered, and that they were satisfied on that score. I then said that, if I accepted the Presidency of the institution, I felt that the Board ought to stand solidly behind me in the matter of criticisms of that nature. Dr. J. S. Foster said, "I think that that is fair, and we have confidence in you, but in order that we may have first hand knowledge, we would be glad to have you state your theological position." I proceeded to give a statement of my faith, dwelling particularly upon my belief in the deity of our Lord, His virgin birth and resurrection, and also my belief in the vicarious atonement of Christ. There was a general discussion, questions were asked and answered, and I was heartily and unanimously endorsed by the members of the Board of Directors. During the years that have passed two of the laymen who were then present, Mr. W. T. Hardie and Mr. Mike Savage, have passed to their reward. Dr. W. McF. Alexander and Mr. J. T. Fuller are the only ones of that group who are still members of our Board of Directors, and they are present in this room. All the ministers who were then present are living, and everyone of them will, I am sure, corroborate the statements here set down, as will also Dr. Alexander and Mr. Fuller.

It would seem that the most that could be asked of the president of a church college in the way of theological requirements is adherence to the standards of the church. This adherence I gave at the time of my election by a frank and voluntary statement, which was not called for by the Board of Directors, but which the Board of Directors heartily approved. That adherence I give today. Under ordinary circumstances, concerning the first charge, my unsoundness in the faith, the Board would probably refer the petitioners to the Presbytery of Nashville, to which I am responsible, and would decide my fitness or unfitness for my office on the basis of my official record. However, in view of the fact that, at my request, the Board did at that initial meeting take up the matter of my theological views, it might again proceed along that line, even though such action is probably not a part of its duties as defined by the by-laws. If it is decided to follow the latter course, I will be glad to answer as intelligently and honestly as I can any pertinent questions.

The other two charges in the petition are undoubtedly matters for the Board to consider. It might also be well for the Board to consider the third count which was noted on the earlier petition, the complaint with regard to the social activities, inasmuch as this seems to be a very disturbing factor to some of the petitioners, and inasmuch as the Board has already had this matter under consideration. We are quite frank to admit that conditions here at SOUTHWESTERN have not attained an ideal state, and that the social activities are engrossing more of the students' time than we desire. However, I think that the pastor of any of our churches would be quite willing to make a similar statement with regard to his church, and I am not sure but that we are succeeding in handling these matters quite as successfully as the churches.

This is not the first time that opposition has arisen to my administration. The present members of the Board of Directors who were present at the annual meeting of the Board at the Chisca Hotel on February 8, 1922, namely, Dr. W. McF. Alexander, Dr. James I. Vance, Mr. B. A. Patch, and Mr. J. D. Duncan, will recall a somewhat similar incident. The President, through Dr. M. E. Melvin, who was conducting the financial campaign, had heard of the opposition to him, an opposition to which some members of the Board were reported to have a sympathetic attitude. At that time, in the presence of Dr. Melvin, whom the President had especially

fessors were fired, and if the remaining professors and other employees had their salaries cut twenty percent. Dr. Lacy objected also to the amount of aid which was being given to worthy students in the matter of scholarships. He stated that Dr. M. E. Melvin, in his campaign in 1921, made this campaign promise, "that it was in the planning of the Board to have a new president," and that "after the first campaign was ended, Dr. Melvin went before the Board, told them this was necessary, indicating that otherwise it would be impossible in later campaigns to get the support that the Synods could easily give. The campaigns of 1924 and 1927-30 proved that he was absolutely correct. Dr. Wm. Crowe, who was one of the earliest and most earnest workers for the building of the new SOUTHWESTERN, came all the way from St. Louis at another time to urge that a change was necessary."

Dr. Lacy again brought up the matter of the purchase of certain dishes for the dining hall, and the purchase of an automobile, stating that Mr. LeMaster was doing his best with the finances, but that he did not know about these purchases. Mr. LeMaster quietly replied, "Well, yes, I did know about both of them, and they were all right."

Chairman Overton asked Dr. Lacy to give any facts in his possession that were not known. He said, "Evidence is what we actually want. We have discussed the general things. If anybody has information about something we do not know, we would like to know about it." Dr. Lacy replied, "Well, if you know all about the finances, these men have stated all the other facts." Dr. Lacy stated that we want a college, not sectarian, but a Christian college, and he affirmed "that in most church colleges more than the larger part of the teaching force is from their own churches," but declared that there is here at SOUTHWESTERN a much larger number from other churches.* At the conclusion of his paper, the Chairman asked Dr. Lacy the following question:

CHAIRMAN OVERTON: How could you go out and solicit money for this college year after year, if you thought in your heart that that money was being used in erecting buildings in which two or three times as much was being spent as should have been? How could you go to Presbyterians and solicit them to give money to this college when you believed that?

DR. LACY: Well, we were supposed to pay for it. Like a church building, when it is completed, there is nothing to do but pay for it.

REMARKS BY DR. A. B. CURRY

Inasmuch as Dr. Curry's name had been brought into the discussion, he asked for permission to say a word. He stated that, as he saw the matter, everything that was really worth considering in the petition was the

* In this, as in other statements, Dr. Lacy was in error. The facts with regard to the church affiliations of the members of the faculty are as follows: There are on the faculty of Southwestern, exclusive of the athletic staff, twenty-five members—eighteen of these are members of the Presbyterian Church; two are members of the Methodist Church; four are members of the Episcopal Church, and one is a member of the Baptist Church.

first question, about Dr. Diehl's attitude towards the Scriptures, the other questions being in the hands of the Board, and "If there is any criticism of any mismanagement, or anything of that kind, it is not to be lodged against Dr. Diehl, but against the Executive Committee and the Board." He affirmed that they are the ones that make the budget, and see to it that he keeps within that budget, and Dr. Curry felt other things might be dismissed as being irrelevant in the charges against Dr. Diehl.

Dr. Curry discussed the question of inspiration in part as follows: "You know, there are at least four or five theories of inspiration. The theory which our church holds is the one known as the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, full inspiration of the Scriptures; that is, that holy men of old wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost: that all of them were so inspired by Him as to secure them against any mistake in what they wrote." He called attention to the distinction "between the Scriptures containing the Word of God, and that they are the Word of God," and stated that he felt there was danger connected with the holding of the former point of view.

Dr. Curry paid a high tribute to Dr. Diehl as an administrator. He said that he thought that Dr. Diehl is one of the greatest college presidents he had ever known, and pointed to the Scriptural standard, "By their fruits ye shall know them," as proof of his statement. He referred briefly to the bringing of the college to Memphis, the responsibility for the success of which was placed largely on Dr. Diehl's shoulders. He pointed to the selection of the college site, the working out of the plan for the college, the directing of the campaigns, the securing of the large gifts, the selection of the able faculty, and the standing of SOUTHWESTERN in the educational world as evidences of efficient college administration.

He said, "It was he (Dr. Diehl) that had a great deal to do with the raising of the money. He got most of the large contributions in this last campaign that put us over. He was in every campaign that was ever formed and carried out; he was behind the scenes, not manifesting himself in a very public way, but still he was there, and in this last campaign of 1930 when we thought that we had gotten all that we could get from every source, and when there was something like \$175,000 lacking, and we were almost in despair, the Executive Committee met here, and we could not see any way out. We had gotten all the money we could from the Synods, and from these large givers, and still there was that much lacking, and gloom spread over us; but Dr. Diehl said, 'Gentlemen, I believe I see the way out. I think we can do it', and, as I remember, Dr. Moore made the motion, 'Let's let him go to it,' and we did, and he went to it. The plan was his, he stuck by it, and it went over, and we got the college. If it had not been for Dr. Diehl in 1930 and his zeal and faith, the mortgage on the college would have been foreclosed, and today we would not have any college at all."

COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING DR. DIEHL

Mr. E. B. LeMaster thereupon proceeded to present certain communications addressed to the Board of Directors concerning the administration of Dr. Diehl, whereupon the petitioning ministers retired, and the above mentioned communications were, upon motion, ordered made a part of the official record of the hearing. (For a list of these communications see Appendix B). Other communications commending Dr. Diehl were also filed but were not made a part of the official record.

SPEECH OF MR. FRANK N. FISHER

Mr. Frank N. Fisher, a member of the Citizen's Advisory Committee, who had been present throughout the hearing, asked for permission to make a statement. He has been intimately identified with every phase of the development of SOUTHWESTERN during the past ten years, and no one in Memphis has worked harder for SOUTHWESTERN or supported it more loyally. Mr. Fisher was wholehearted in his endorsement of Dr. Diehl and his administration. He spoke from first hand knowledge and a deep conviction, and his excellent speech was listened to with rapt attention and was roundly applauded. Upon motion of Mr. B. A. Patch, the Board expressed its appreciation to Mr. Fisher by a rising vote.

CONSIDERATION OF THE CHARGES

At the conclusion of Mr. Fisher's remarks, the visitors retired, Dr. Diehl excused himself, and the Board went into executive session. They carefully considered the evidence which had been presented against Dr. Diehl and the record of his administration during the past thirteen and one-half years. In 1917-18 there were eight members of the faculty and seventy-four students, only fifty of whom were regular students. In June, 1919, there were two candidates for the bachelor's degree, the total assets of the institution were little more than \$300,000, and the college had been dropped from the list of accredited colleges of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States. Today there are twenty-five members of the faculty and some four hundred and forty students, a graduating class of fifty or more, assets of more than \$2,000,000, and full recognition by the most exacting standardizing agencies, in spite of the fact that the educational standards have been raised during this time. These years have witnessed a prolonged period of litigation, the planning and erecting and equipping of a magnificent plant, the securing of an unusual faculty, and the building of a great college. After a full discussion, the following action was unanimously adopted.

The Finding of the Board

In view of his record we feel that the Church owes a tremendous obligation to Dr. Diehl, and that not hearsay, but only the strongest and clearest evidence should be allowed to lodge against such a splendid record. This we have not found in what has been presented to us by Dr. Diehl's critics. On the contrary, we feel that this investigation has not only completely vindicated him from every charge made, but has presented a fresh and convincing demonstration of the vast value of his services to the cause of Christian education.

Particularly we would reply to the petitioners as follows:

As to the belief that President Diehl is "not sound in the faith," and "does not adhere to many of the teachings of the standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.," the Board would respectfully remind the signers of the communication of that of which they are already fully aware, that any effective judgment on such a charge as is herein implied must be rendered by the Presbytery of which President Diehl is a member, and that the attempt to establish the heretical character of any minister of our Church by any other process is in itself contrary to Presbyterian procedure and a violation of Presbyterian law.

The Board is certain also that President Diehl has never been convicted, or tried, or formally accused of anything in his Presbytery. There is no by-law of the college requiring any standard of orthodoxy of the president, nor was there such when Dr. Diehl was called by the Board to be president in 1917. But at that time the Board did go into the question of his theological beliefs and, after a full and frank discussion with him, was satisfied with his orthodoxy. This discussion was entered into at Dr. Diehl's own request, before he accepted the presidency of the college, because there were then in circulation rumors that he was "unsound in the faith." These were found to be false at that time. Our present investigation, which has been made in view of your expressed doubt of Dr. Diehl's orthodoxy, has reached the same conclusion.

We find that Dr. Diehl, instead of "not adhering to many of the teachings of the standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.," adheres to *all* the great essentials in them, including the deity of Christ, His virgin birth, His resurrection, His vicarious atonement and the full and final authority of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as "the rule of faith and practice." In other words, he does hold the system of doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith and Catechism of our Church; which is the utmost that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. requires of any of its ordained ministers. Nothing submitted to us at the hearing just closed is judged sufficient to justify a doubt of the orthodoxy of President Diehl as a minister of our Church.

The second item in the communication declares that it is believed that President Diehl is reckless in the administration of the funds of the college.

If your belief that the college is conducted recklessly is well founded, the blame should rest not on the President, but on the Board and its Executive Committee. The President does not have the power to dispose of the college funds. This is a matter of record and regulation, and nothing to the contrary has been, or can be shown, for such evidence does not exist.

It is a matter of great satisfaction to the Board, however, to be able to state in regard to its administration of the college finances, that so competent a judge of such matters as Dr. Alfred Hume, lately Chancellor of the University of Mississippi, in a carefully prepared statement, which was adopted by the faculty of the college, and recently given to the public, said: "We are greatly impressed with what seems to us a wise and wholesome mean between the extremes of extravagance on the one hand and niggardliness on the other. The aim appears to be to conduct a college, A-grade and first class in every particular." Also we are pleased to be able to state that investigators acting in behalf of certain agencies that closely inspect colleges, especially in regard to their use of funds, have always expressed their satisfaction at the low cost of the high grade work of SOUTHWESTERN. The college is not a cheap college, but it is economically conducted. Only a lack of full information on this subject could have led anyone into the belief that the management is reckless. Nothing has been submitted to us that appears to us to justify this charge implied in your communication.

The last item states the belief that "the Presbyterian constituency of Memphis has lost confidence in the administration of the President of the college." In offset to what has been presented which might tend to justify this belief, we have also before us the fact that the churches represented by the signers of the communication contain only a little over one-third of the Presbyterian constituency in Memphis; the fact that this year the number of Presbyterian students enrolled in SOUTHWESTERN from these churches is larger than it was last year, and the fact that in our files there are many very strong expressions of confidence in the administration of the President, some of which come from loyal and devoted members of the churches of which the signers are pastors.

At this point we desire to quote a few paragraphs from a long paper sent to the Board by one of the SOUTHWESTERN students now in attendance at the theological seminary at Louisville, Kentucky. His statements are heartily endorsed by the six SOUTHWESTERN men now studying for the ministry at Louisville, two of whom came of their own accord to Memphis to appear before the Board in refutation of the charges made against the President.

"The charge is made, if I understand the matter correctly, that Dr. Diehl exerts a bad influence on the students' faith. I simply cannot understand such a statement. Whoever made it either has an impossible notion of faith, or misunderstands the truth, or is dominated by malice. I should hate to think that anybody in this controversy would make malicious charges, and I am sure that our Church does not define faith in an impossible way, so that the only alternative that lies open is that the facts are not understood. Now Dr. Diehl never taught a course while I was in college. Nothing that he ever said in my hearing gave me the idea that he varied in the slightest iota from the conventional Calvinistic position. Most certainly he never said or did anything that would destroy my faith or the faith of anyone I know.

"Those who are to decide about whether or not Dr. Diehl has destroyed the students' faith should be the students themselves. A recent questionnaire that was answered by the graduates since the college moved to Memphis contained forty-eight replies as to the influence of the President upon their Christian faith. Forty-six answered that he had helped their faith, ten declaring that his influence was the greatest single influence in a list, including the Memphis churches which they were required to attend. Two students replied in the negative to this question, and both of them had a personal grudge against Dr. Diehl. Dr. Diehl's influence when I was in college was in the direction of the most positive Christianity. He was constantly urging upon us the necessity of regulating our lives on a Christian basis. He always upheld Christ as the only Lord of life, and did it in a way that made us think about it. He told a group of students where I was present that his deepest concern was for the spiritual welfare of the college, and he made us share his concern.

"He preached the baccalaureate sermon for the Louisville Seminary last year, and the universal sentiment of the hearers was that here was a man who had something to say and who said it well. His theological views as expressed in that sermon met the fullest approval of the students and faculty, and that is saying a lot. It may be that some students have gone through the course at SOUTHWESTERN without any pronounced Christian convictions, but most of them had none when they came. Dr. Diehl's critics doubtless realize that not all of the people who have heard them preach are devout Christians, and that there might be some who have had their faith definitely weakened by their preaching. I have heard orthodox preaching that tended to weaken my faith. People's religious convictions cannot be molded as a potter molds clay. But in the face of the facts as they were when I was in college, the charge that Dr. Diehl destroys the students' faith is simply preposterous, and should not be countenanced for a minute. We have six students at Louisville Seminary that graduated from SOUTHWESTERN. One of them is preparing for the mission field. All of them feel a deep debt of gratitude to Dr. Diehl for his work in connection with the college. All of them are vitally concerned about the religious welfare of the church and the country. And none of them feels that Dr. Diehl's influence is dangerous, or even doubtful. Their conviction is based in each case upon personal observation extending over a period of four years, except for myself, who was there three."

This completes the matters formally before us in your communication, but it may not be out of place to point out that the expressed belief that Dr. Diehl teaches in the college is erroneous. The President of SOUTHWESTERN has had no classes for years. His only opportunity for reaching the students on religious questions is through the chapel services and the commencement sermons. The President speaks very seldom in chapel, though he often conducts the service there. The overwhelming testimony of the students and faculty, present and past, so far as it has been available, is entirely contrary to the statement that his influence has been, or is, dangerous to the faith and spiritual life of the students; nor has it been revealed that his private personal contact with them has had such effect.

The Board would call the attention of its correspondents to the fact that no other major enterprise of our Church, whether the continuous undertakings of our Executive Committees or the operation and sustenance of our fixed institutions, entering the present period of depression and distress with a debt of any sort, as most if not all of them did, has paid its debt in the same period. The fact that SOUTHWESTERN has done this is a significant thing. It calls for thanksgiving to God. But it does not call for

the repudiation of the leadership of the man to whom more than to any other one human being the achievement is due. If the brethren have been heretofore restrained from lodging complaints against the President because he was so evidently indispensable to the success of the movement to stabilize the college, their mouths now should be forever stopped by a mere sense of common fairness to the man whom they have not hesitated to use, according to their own confession in the communication. At any rate the assertion of a lack of confidence in his leadership is absolutely contradicted by the response of Memphis Presbyterians to that leadership in the campaign for the payment of the debt.

In closing we call upon the Presbyterians of Memphis and of the four controlling Synods, as well as all friends of Christian education in the Mississippi Valley, to rally afresh to the support of SOUTHWESTERN. The battle today is not a struggle in the eddies, but a mighty conflict in mid-stream. It does not have to do with the petty differences of sects, but with the life of religion itself. It is a war between atheism and materialism on the one hand and religion on the other. Civilization itself is at stake. Those who believe that religion is vital to civilization, that force is not enough, that inner restraints must be established in human nature if laws are to be respected, the rights of property observed, and life held in esteem, cannot afford to fight each other.

SOUTHWESTERN is doing a work for the Valley and the growing South and America that cannot be measured by money. It, however, needs money. It needs a million dollars for endowment, and another million for additional buildings. We call on the real friends of Christian education to rally to the college and its administration. We ask them to lend a hand. We believe Dr. Diehl to be orthodox; we find him not reckless and extravagant, but an able and faithful administrator; and we regard him as a force for righteousness on the college campus.

(Signed)

JAMES I. VANCE	ROBERT E. CRAIG	BEN A. PATCH
A. B. CURRY	ALFRED C. GLASSSELL	MOORE MOORE
WATKINS OVERTON	JEROME T. FULLER	FRED R. GRAVES
T. H. TUTWILER	D. C. MACGUIRE	J. D. DUNCAN
*GRAYSON L. TUCKER	W. MCF. ALEXANDER	E. B. LEMASTER
*J. V. ARNOLD		

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
SOUTHWESTERN, Memphis, Tenn.

This is to certify that the foregoing record of the proceedings before the Board of Directors of SOUTHWESTERN in re communication of Dr. J. P. Robertson and others against President Charles E. Diehl as of February 3, 1931, including the copy of the stenographic record, and the copy of the communications hereto appended, are correct, and they are hereby printed, published and distributed as ordered by the Board.

Attest:

MOORE MOORE, Secretary.

E. B. LEMASTER,
Chairman of Board of Directors.

*Dr. Tucker and Mr. Arnold, who were absent on account of illness, have expressed the desire to append their names to this statement of the Board.

APPENDIX A

DR. W. S. LACY'S LETTER

September 30, 1930.

Dr. Charles E. Diehl,
Southwestern,
Memphis, Tenn.
Dear Dr. Diehl:

It is true that SOUTHWESTERN will have a large part in determining Presbyterianism in the Mississippi Valley and I am deeply concerned what that determining influence will be. Far be it from me to believe that this Church, which I love with all my heart is perfect, or that it has given the final interpretation to all of God's revelation. However, there are some things that are forever settled.

You insisted on my telling you the "Big Reason" for my going to a more limited and harder service at a great personal sacrifice in salary. I answered directly and told you by word of mouth. However, a decent regard for the opinion of the consecrated ministers and laymen of these synods, constrains me to set these things down with more care and accuracy.

Seven years ago without any seeking on my part I was offered the present position. In conference with you in regard to the matter you said "You will hear I am not sound in the Faith, but I am." Believing this statement I went up and down these synods for several years and when occasion arose trying to reassure our people in regard to you and your beliefs. For it had not then been burnt in on my soul that when some speak of "soundness and Fundamentals," they do not mean that which the Church to which they belong hold as to these things.

A number of your statements of belief are irreconcilable with the standards of our Church, but when you say, "if a person is loving and kind he will be saved *even, if he has never heard of Christ*" my astonishment knew no bounds. Of course, you were speaking of those who had never heard of Christ. To my answer "there is none other name under Heaven, given among men whereby we must be saved" and other such texts, you answered "Oh, that is repeating old formulas." Why then send foreign missionaries, I asked and you replied "Many do not think it is necessary." Of course, it would not be necessary if this strange gospel were true. Evangelism and missions would be paralyzed.

You asked me the other day when I began to be disturbed about these things. Well, just before the campaign in the synods to raise \$1,200,000 was launched you called me in your office and said, "You and Dr. Curry ought to know what I believe and I will tell you what I told Dr. Curry." Among other things you indicated you did not believe in the history or science of the first part of Genesis. You did not believe that God told Joshua and the Israelites to destroy the Cananites. You did not believe in what you called the imprecatory Psalms, and etc. These and other things you said on this occasion caused me to go directly to Dr. Curry, who was next to you in official position and tender him my resignation. Dr. Curry said, "Brother Lacy, the college is toppling and if you get out you will have to tell why and that will kill it. Wait until the campaign is over." Now the college has been saved so far as finances are concerned.

When Dr. Curry asked you how, according to your theory, you could tell which parts of the Bible were true, you answered "sanctified common sense" (maybe you said "consciousness"). If that is all, we would be on a storm tossed sea in a dark

night, without a certain chart and compass and if *personal knowledge and definite acceptance of Christ be unnecessary to salvation*, we would also be without a pole star and the mind of man would be our only beacon and guide.

You are telling to the young ministers that they will make themselves a laughing stock if they preach there is a Hell and that "teaching the shorter catechism is the Bunk."

When you wrote the Minority Report on Divorce which was published in the Minutes of the General Assembly of 1929, pages 146-7 did you not repudiate the authority and teachings of the Bible on this grave subject?

A distinguished professor in one of our theological seminaries said many of the candidates for the ministry from SOUTHWESTERN came to the seminary with modernism. He did not know whether they got it in SOUTHWESTERN, or on the outside.

You insist on my saying that you are honest and I could not help but tell you that I did not think it was honest to use the power, prestige and influence of your high office and the influence which your position gives you, to weaken faith in the Scriptures, and teach Universalism and lay all the emphasis on Christ as a "Norm" rather than on the death of Christ as a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice and reconcile us to God.

Why did you ask me what I thought of one of your leading professors? I answered you that I thought he was a fine Christian gentleman and that your statement that he believed exactly what you believe was the worst thing I ever heard against him. If so, Dr. Diehl, should he teach his present course in a Southern Presbyterian college? In this connection may I say that there are a number of men on SOUTHWESTERN's faculty that would grace the faculty of any college of our Church.

Why have you sought to modify the ownership and control of SOUTHWESTERN? Dr. Curry enlightened you on one occasion as to separation of Church and State and on another occasion in my presence, Dr. Vance told you if it were ever lost to the Presbyterian Church "it would be over his dead body" and Dr. Alexander repeated the statement of Dr. Vance.

No Southern Presbyterian minister for nearly four years has led the annual special services for SOUTHWESTERN students. Denominational colleges of this section have one of their own ministers conduct such services.

Probably no campaign can be made in Memphis this session. Then why plunge the college back in debt from which the recent heroic effort extricated it? At least some of the recent expenditures could have been postponed until the funds were in hand, or at least subscribed. You already have a budget that is considerably larger than last year and Memphis was pledged to take care of budget for last year, but not for this year. You are now having a *much freer* hand with the finances, so why not show some tendency to practice economy? Remember the serious trouble you have had with all former treasurers, as well as others responsible for finances.

To your "quotation" that I have been loyal in my work, but for several years not loyal in sentiment to SOUTHWESTERN: I enter an emphatic denial to the latter statement. SOUTHWESTERN is a vital organ of the Southern Presbyterian Church and while it should not teach our peculiar beliefs to all, it certainly *should not teach anything contrary or subversive to the beliefs of the controlling synods* and I shall continue to keep this end in view. Would it not be right and fair to inform the synods fully and plainly as to what you believe and teach and make it as full and definite as possible? You need no suggestion as to how to do this in the most plausible way. Then let the synods vote their approval, or otherwise, of you as the moulding and determining head of the institution. As a preliminary tryout, it might be well to have our Presbyterian pastors of Memphis vote on this. A man in position to know has said time and again that there is not one of our

Presbyterian pastors in Memphis that holds your views, or that would stand for them. On the other hand every one of them is unequivocally loyal to SOUTHWESTERN as a great Presbyterian college, *and I am loyal in sentiment to Southwestern.*

This letter is not all, but indicates enough to answer your question as to why I am resigning. There are many other questions, similar to some of above, that should be asked of you and that you should answer to the synods, which are supposed to own, control, and direct this college.

So I am handing you my resignation and request you to submit it as my final report and formal resignation to the highly esteemed Board of Directors of SOUTHWESTERN. May they be assured of my abiding interest in SOUTHWESTERN and prayers for God's blessing upon them as they guide its future destiny.

My stand for the "Faith once for all delivered to the Saints" will probably injure me alone, but only as to external things. However, I would not be true, if I took any other course. God still lives and His Word is true, and when the modernists giants of Anak are all dead, the army of the Lord Jesus Christ will still be marching forward on the old lines.

Assuring you that it is a matter of principle and that I have nothing personal against you, and would gladly support you if I could conscientiously do so, I am,

Yours sincerely,

W. S. LACY.

DR. CHAS. E. DIEHL'S REPLY

October 2, 1930.

Dr. W. S. Lacy,
Box 48,
Jackson, Miss.
Dear Dr. Lacy:

Your letter of September 30th reached me yesterday evening, and to say that I am amazed at its contents is to put the matter very mildly. In this letter you are presuming to give your reasons for resigning your position here at SOUTHWESTERN. Some of the matters that you refer to are entirely irrelevant. One of these is your reference to our finances and the serious trouble I have had with "all former treasurers, as well as others responsible for finances." I have had experience with three treasurers. The trouble I had with Mr. C. W. Bailey was due purely to the removal of the institution from Clarksville to Memphis, as you well know. There was never the slightest difficulty about finances. There has been no difficulty about finances with the present treasurer, Mr. T. H. Tutwiler. The only treasurer with whom I had difficulty was Mr. George G. Tayloe, and you felt about him, his attitude, and his methods quite as strongly as I did. You expressed yourself on numerous occasions as vigorously as I did, and you declined to continue in your position here at SOUTHWESTERN, if he had anything to say concerning the direction of your work.

I do not know what you are referring to when you speak of recent expenditures that could have been postponed, nor do I know where you got your information when you state that the budget of the college for this year is "considerably larger" than that of last year. As a matter of fact that is not true, and this same statement applies to a great part of your letter. With the exception of the provision for the salary of Dr. Alfred Hume, which was ordered by the Board at its meeting on June 24, 1930, the budget for next year is \$2,000 less than was the budget for last year.

Your reference to your going "to a more limited and harder service at a great personal sacrifice in salary" does not impress me greatly. You told me that you wanted to take two months off in the summer anyway, and that you were quite willing to take off this time at your own charges. You stated that you would rather

be here at SOUTHWESTERN at \$3,500.00 for ten months than to be on at \$4,200.00 for twelve months service. Your arrangement in Mississippi provides for \$3,600.00 for the ten months service. At least that is what you reported to me, and that would make your salary for the ten months \$10.00 a month more than the rate you were paid here at SOUTHWESTERN. Besides, the fact that you are to be in a position of authority with regard to all the Presbyterian schools in Mississippi seemed to appeal strongly to you.

One question you ask is rather amusing. You ask "why have you sought to modify the ownership and control of SOUTHWESTERN?" That is like the question which the old joker asked his friend, "When did you stop beating your wife?" You know perfectly well, and so does every member of the Executive Committee and Board of Directors of SOUTHWESTERN, that I have never sought to modify the ownership and control of SOUTHWESTERN, but that I gave every ounce of energy I had to keep from having the institution lost to the Church. A question like that, in view of your knowledge of the facts, is rather adroit and exceedingly unworthy.

Your statement, "you are telling to the young ministers that they will make themselves a laughing stock if they preach there is a Hell, and that 'teaching the shorter catechism is the Bunk'" is absolutely untrue. There is no young minister whose veracity is unquestioned who can be found who will corroborate that statement.

My Minority Report on Divorce, as you note, is printed in the Minutes of the General Assembly, and you might have added that I also wrote the Majority Report, all except the last sentence in recommendation No. 5. That Report was studied by some rather able men in our Church, and came before the General Assembly itself. You are the first one that I know of to suggest that the authority and teachings of the Bible were repudiated in that Report.

Your statement that a "distinguished professor in one of our theological seminaries said that many of the candidates for the ministry from SOUTHWESTERN came to the seminary with modernism" is a pretty serious statement, and especially so if your definition of modernism is correct. You will recall that, when I asked you to define what you meant by a modernist, you stated that "a modernist is an unbeliever." We have had a good many fine young men go to the seminaries. Some of them have been alert and forward looking, and some of them have been rather reactionary in their attitude, but none, so far as I know, has been an unbeliever.

In your letter you attribute to me things that I have never said, and credit me with things which I do not believe. The veiled suggestion that I am a universalist, that I do not believe in hell, that Christ is only a "Norm" and not a Savior, that evangelism and missions are unnecessary or unimportant—all these things are absolutely untrue. You refer to the fact that I told you sometime ago that I was in accord with the standards of our Church. I still think that in the main that is true. I am quite frank to admit that I am not in accord with your interpretation of those standards, nor am I in accord with your general attitude and outlook on life. I cannot impress upon you too strongly the importance of your being very careful and accurate in your statements, your quotations and the representations you make of my position. Your letter is the most astounding and disappointing thing that has come my way, and the future can furnish no greater shocks.

Very sincerely yours,
CHAS. E. DIEHL.

APPENDIX B

TESTIMONY OF THE FACULTY

To the Board of Directors of SOUTHWESTERN:

Because of the widespread publicity that has been given to some criticisms of SOUTHWESTERN's president, Dr. Charles E. Diehl, we, the undersigned members of the faculty of SOUTHWESTERN, deem it both a duty and a privilege to bear our testimony in these matters now under consideration.

The questions raised by a number of Presbyterian ministers in the City of Memphis, as set forth in the newspapers, have to do with three issues, namely:

1. Dr. Diehl's theological views.
2. His handling of the finances of the institution.
3. The social life of students.

Before making our statement, we distinctly disclaim any intention of impugning the motives of the aforesaid ministers or of questioning their honesty and sincerity. On the contrary, we are persuaded that these men of God have at heart the interests of SOUTHWESTERN and are actuated by an earnest desire to do God service. We believe that misinformation or misinterpretation may be responsible for our differences and that a fair investigation will fully vindicate Dr. Diehl and restore absolute confidence in him as a man exceptionally well-fitted for the position which he so admirably fills.

In regard to the first of the three points mentioned above, we wish to go on record as unqualifiedly asserting that Dr. Diehl's influence with students is definitely and positively in the direction of emphasizing and elevating spiritual ideals; that it is always his purpose and policy to exalt the Bible, giving it a most prominent place in the curriculum and in the daily program; that his leadership is thoroughly in harmony with the principles and the spirit of the Church; that he is one of God's own noblemen, strong in Christian character, life, and influence; that he is wholehearted in his allegiance to Jesus Christ, joyfully recognizing His deity and ascribing to Him the pre-eminence in all things; that he is evangelical in spirit and sound in every Christian essential, devotedly loyal to Christ and His Church, consistent and enthusiastic, in season and out of season, in teaching the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, clear-cut in his convictions, honest in his thinking, courageous in expression.

As to the second point, relative to business management, while not in possession of details and all the facts, we submit the following based on general, yet careful, observation.

We are greatly impressed with what seems to us a wise and wholesome mean between the extremes of extravagance on the one hand and niggardliness on the other. The aim appears to be to conduct a college, A-grade and first-class in every particular. To this end, buildings and equipment are substantial, beautiful, permanent; the cheap, shoddy and ornate being conspicuous by their absence. These physical characteristics evident everywhere about the campus, are, to some quite appreciable extent, transformed into qualities of character in the making of men and women. Money saved by an unnecessarily parsimonious policy would prove poor economy and a costly investment. "The best is good enough for us" should be the motto of a great church. Education in a church school ought to be every whit

the equal of that in a state school. A church, abundantly able to provide the best, cannot afford to offer anything inferior. It should stand at the top. It ought to be, not a laggard, but a leader.

Another observation, in this connection, touching the financial affairs of the college, is that Dr. Diehl has done a very remarkable piece of work in securing funds to cancel the indebtedness of SOUTHWESTERN. This fact, alone, puts all the friends of the college under lasting obligation to him and stands out as a monument to business ability. When a man has so long borne the burden and heat of the day, when he has carried a load on his heart heavy enough to all but break it, and has, at last, reached the end of a toilsome journey, surely that is not a time to become critical of his efforts, but rather an occasion for unstinted praise and glad thanksgiving.

As to the third, and last count, this much may be said. While not, ourselves, a unit in our attitude toward the dance, we are unanimously of the opinion that the authorities of SOUTHWESTERN could not justify prohibiting dancing on the part of students so long as this social custom receives recognition and approval in the homes of many leading members of our churches and so long as participants in the dance are not subjected to censure or discipline at the hands of church sessions. However much some of us, individually, may oppose the dance, in general, it is our unanimous judgment that no church college can consistently take a position on this question which the church, itself, through the rank and file of its membership and through its office-bearers, does not uphold and maintain.

In view of the foregoing declaration, resolved

1. That we re-affirm our complete confidence in Dr. Diehl which was voted at the regular October meeting of the Faculty Club and that we take emphatic action in endorsement of Dr. Diehl as a man and as an administrator.

2. That copies of this document be presented to the Board of Directors, to Dr. Diehl, and to the local papers.

H. J. BASSETT
ALFRED HUME
W. O. SHEWMAKER
ROBT. W. HARTLEY
C. L. TOWNSEND
ERIC G. HADEN
W. R. COOPER
FRANCES C. HUBER
A. THEODORE JOHNSON
R. P. STRICKLER
ROBERT P. WARREN
WILLIAM O. SWAN

C. H. GRIFFIN
W. R. ATKINSON
M. L. MACQUEEN
M. TOWNSEND
W. C. RASBERRY
M. W. STORN
P. N. RHODES
A. P. KELSO
G. E. WISEWELL
JOHN H. DAVIS
JAS. B. LACKEY
*SAMUEL H. MONK

TESTIMONY OF THE STUDENTS

The charges against Dr. Diehl first received publicity during the Christmas holidays, and there was no opportunity for the students to take concerted action until college re-opened in January. At the regular weekly meeting of the SOUTHWESTERN Christian Union on January 2, 1931, the following Resolution was heartily adopted. On the morning of January 3, after the first chapel service, an enthusiastic meeting of the entire student body was held at which several speeches were made, and the resolution adopted by the SOUTHWESTERN Christian Union was presented.

* Dr. Samuel H. Monk, Associate Professor of English, who is on leave of absence this year, asked for the privilege of appending his name to this paper.

Upon motion, this resolution was enthusiastically endorsed by the student body, and, amid hearty cheering, the President of the student body was directed to certify to this endorsement.

"To Whom It May Concern:

"In reply to the recent charges against President Charles E. Diehl and his administration at SOUTHWESTERN, we, the SOUTHWESTERN Christian Union, wish publicly to express our absolute confidence in his policies.

"We believe that his personal religious faith is above reproach and we know that, by both word and deed, he is a constant influence for the development of the highest type of Christian character on the campus.

PAUL JONES,

January 2, 1931.

President of SOUTHWESTERN Christian Union."

"The above resolution is hereby enthusiastically endorsed by the student body of SOUTHWESTERN.

HARRY L. WALTON,

January 3, 1931.

President of SOUTHWESTERN Student Body."

REPRESENTATIVE COMMUNICATIONS

Scores of communications have been received by those in authority. Some of these were sent to the Chairman or Secretary of the Board of Directors, others were sent to President Diehl, and still others were sent for publication directly to the newspapers. In addition to all this, there were many individuals who called in person or by telephone to express their indignation at the charges preferred and their desire to be of service in this investigation. The limitations of space make it manifestly impossible to print all these communications, but a few representative letters are herewith given, and a list of others from whom formal communications have been received is appended.

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

John W. Young, *Pastor*
GREENVILLE, MISS.

January 29, 1931.

To The Board of Trustees, Southwestern College, Memphis, Tenn.

Gentlemen:

It has been brought to our attention that there has been some criticism of Dr. Diehl, President of SOUTHWESTERN, and that some charges have been made to the Board.

In view of these facts, the Session of the First Presbyterian Church, Greenville, Miss., met in the church parlor on January 28, 1931, and the following statement was adopted and ordered sent to the board of trustees of SOUTHWESTERN.

"Dr. Chas. E. Diehl was formerly pastor of this church and was highly esteemed and loved by the congregation. He has since that time been a welcomed guest in our city and in the pulpit of this church. The session of this church deplores the present controversy touching Dr. Diehl's qualifications and fitness as President of SOUTHWESTERN and herein expresses its continued confidence in him as a minister of the Gospel and Executive of the College."

By order of the session.

H. W. STARLING, *Clerk.*

ST. MARY'S SCHOOL
1257 Poplar Boulevard
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

January 13, 1931.

To the Board of Directors,
SOUTHWESTERN,
Memphis, Tennessee
Gentlemen:

The Patron's Council and the Faculty of St. Mary's School at a recent meeting appointed the undersigned as a committee to submit most respectfully to the Trustees of SOUTHWESTERN a statement of the unqualified confidence of the Council and Faculty in Dr. Charles E. Diehl, the President of SOUTHWESTERN. As citizens of Memphis, some as parents of students in the college, they beg to affirm their hearty endorsement of his administration.

The Council and Faculty wish to express their genuine admiration of the wisdom, the courage, and the faith which Dr. Diehl has shown in meeting the difficulties incident to establishing the college in Memphis; to express their recognition of his sympathetic understanding of the needs of young men and women, and their grateful appreciation of the co-operation and encouragement which he has extended to those who are interested in the cause of education.

It is the earnest hope of the Council and Faculty that this staunch defender of Christian ideals and sound scholarship may long continue as President of SOUTHWESTERN, an inspiration to us all, and an honored guide for the sons and daughters of this community.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) HELEN A. LOOMIS,
For the Faculty of St. Mary's;
(Signed) ARDEANE HEISKELL,
(Mrs. Longstreet Heiskell),
President of Patrons' Council;
(Signed) MARY READ HARSH,
(Mrs. T. W. Harsh).

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN
National Headquarters, 1634 Eye St.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Memphis, Tennessee,
January 3, 1931.

Mr. E. B. LeMaster,
Chairman, Board of Directors of SOUTHWESTERN,
Memphis, Tennessee.

Dear Sir:

The recent criticism of Dr. Charles E. Diehl, President of SOUTHWESTERN, is so unjust that the Memphis Branch of the American Association of University Women feels the obligation of expressing its deep appreciation of Dr. Diehl's accomplishments in the past and its full confidence in him in the future.

Dr. Diehl has created in the college an atmosphere of Christian culture and high academic standards which have influenced the entire community. After watch-

ing the growth of the institution in the face of almost insurmountable difficulties, we feel that SOUTHWESTERN is a great power for good, and that its present strength is the direct result of the outstanding work of Dr. Diehl.

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) CORINNE J. GLADDING,
President;

RUTH B. KIMSEY (Mrs. J. H.),
Cor. Secretary.

January 20, 1931.

Mr. E. B. LeMaster, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Southwestern, Memphis, Tenn.

Dear Mr. LeMaster:

As a Presbyterian, a patron of SOUTHWESTERN and a contributor to the funds which have from time to time been solicited for the support of the College, I am writing you and the Board of Trustees, to express my full confidence in Dr. Chas. E. Diehl, President, in the matter of the charges which have been filed against him.

In the first place, I am the great-grandson of the Rev. Robert Henderson, who, in the early 1820's was pastor of the Presbyterian church at Murfreesboro, Tennessee, who seems to have impressed himself upon his time, and whose sermons have been collected and published, as the sermons of many other prominent ministers were in those early days when newspapers did not publish religious news as our papers do today.

My father, the late Ben R. Henderson, as you probably know, was an elder in the old Alabama Street Presbyterian Church. I have been a member of First church for more than forty years, and my ancestry, as far back as it can be traced, has been Presbyterian.

My daughter attends SOUTHWESTERN, and, therefore, I have been able to get first hand information from the student body as to social activities on the campus and elsewhere, and a general idea of Dr. Diehl's policy at and conduct of the school.

Furthermore, as I stated before, I have been interested in SOUTHWESTERN, not only as a Presbyterian, but as a citizen of Memphis, who believes that the bringing of SOUTHWESTERN here has been the biggest thing for the cultural and spiritual advancement of our people which has occurred in my lifetime, and, therefore, I have liberally contributed, for a man of my means, to the funds which have from time to time been solicited.

I trust you will excuse personal references, but I wanted you and the members of your Board to understand my background in the hope that it would constrain you to carefully consider the comments I am about to make.

In the first place, it has been preached from the pulpits of our church, has been published in the press and stated from time to time that SOUTHWESTERN, while a Christian College, was non-sectarian, and it was on this ground that subscriptions were solicited from non-Presbyterians in Memphis. If it had not been for the subscriptions from the general public—from Jew, Gentile, Catholic and Protestant, the school could never have been built. Therefore, the people of Memphis have a very vital interest in seeing to it, that while the college shall be conducted as a Christian institution, it shall not be hampered by any of the creeds or dogmas of the Presbyterian church, so that faith will not be broken with them. The result of the introduction of narrow sectarianism, or rules of conduct peculiar to adherents of the Presbyterian faith, would be disastrous to the college, and my personal opinion is that one Bryan University in Tennessee is sufficient.

From my investigation and information from the members of the student body, and others interested in the school, I have yet to learn of any teaching, practice, rule or method of conducting SOUTHWESTERN to which I, or any other Presbyterian, could rightfully object.

I notice from the public prints that it has been charged, among other things, that dances are permitted on the campus to which some people object. These dances are limited in number during the scholastic year and my daughter has attended them with my full knowledge, consent and approval, because I know that there is proper supervision at these social functions and they are brought to a close early. I would much rather that my daughter attend dances such as are given on the campus of SOUTHWESTERN than to attend a dance in many private homes.

As to the charge or charges against Dr. Diehl's theology I am not competent to pass. But I have known Dr. Diehl since he has been in Memphis, have discussed religious matters with him, and have discussed him with others, and I, with those with whom I have talked, believe that he is a God-fearing Christian, a right living man and a Christian example for the students under his charge. I believe that Dr. Diehl lives up to that fundamental condition to being accepted in fellowship in our Church, which is that he believes in Jesus Christ and tries to follow the precepts He has laid down as far as a mere mortal can.

In conclusion I wish to express my full confidence in Dr. Diehl as a man, as a Christian, as an educator, as an administrator of the affairs and finances of SOUTHWESTERN, as a Presbyterian and a minister of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Yours very truly,

BRH:D

BEN R. HENDERSON.

THE SOUTHWESTER

Official Weekly Publication of the Student Body of SOUTHWESTERN
MEMPHIS TENN.

208 Calvin Hall,
SOUTHWESTERN Campus.

To the Board of Directors of SOUTHWESTERN.

Dear Sirs:

I have been keeping up in the papers with the effort to remove Dr. Charles E. Diehl from the presidency of SOUTHWESTERN, and I should like to voice my protest to such a move at this time when the matter is coming up for consideration.

While I cannot know enough of his financial policies to say a word for him along that line, as a student of SOUTHWESTERN I feel that I can testify to his worth on the two other grounds on which he has been attacked.

In regard to allowing social affairs of an undesirable nature on the campus, Dr. Diehl is most certainly innocent. He understands his students well enough to allow them enough freedom in their social affairs to show that he trusts them, but he does not allow late parties on the campus. At each party on the campus there is always a faculty member present anyway so they are bound to be kept within the limits of propriety.

In regard to his theological beliefs I only know the results of those views which he puts in practice. Dr. Diehl has always seemed to me a powerful force for the upbuilding of Christian character on the campus. I have consulted with him about the Sou'wester, of which I am editor, and I have come in contact with him

through two years at SOUTHWESTERN. Always he has stood for the highest ideals. The true test of a Christian character is the good it is doing in the world, and, measured by that standard, Dr. Diehl is above reproach. He has not misused his religious influence as president of SOUTHWESTERN.

As one of the students I resent any attack made against Dr. Diehl. The pastors making the criticisms are evidently sincere, but they are on the wrong track. They cannot possibly know as much of Dr. Diehl as we students know, and therefore our support of Dr. Diehl should offset their lack of confidence.

I trust the Board of Directors will act in favor of Dr. Diehl at its official meeting.

Respectfully yours,
(Signed) JAMES HUGHES,
Editor of Sou'wester.

Memphis, Tenn.
1931 Lyndale,
Jan. 30, 1931.

Mr. E. B. LeMaster, Chairman,
Board of Directors,
Memphis, Tenn.

Dear Mr. LeMaster:

I am a graduate of SOUTHWESTERN, a member of last year's class, and I take this means of saying what I feel to be a privilege as well as my duty in behalf of President Chas. E. Diehl.

While I know that there was dissatisfaction, in some quarters, with Dr. Diehl, I must say that I was surprised that members of the ministry of our church could let their own petty jealousies and personal grievances so obsess them that apparently they would forget the nature of their calling as well as the interest of the church they serve. The charges they brought were unjust and altogether unwarranted.

In my four years at SOUTHWESTERN I was very closely associated with Dr. Diehl, more so than the average student. I was interested in the Y. M. C. A., the SOUTHWESTERN Christian Union, and in my capacity as chapel pianist and choir director, I worked with him in arranging programs for the vesper services, chapel services, and the like. It has also been my privilege to be a guest in his home on frequent occasions. So I feel that, knowing him as I do in private life as well as in an official position, I am well qualified to give an estimate of the man.

I would not have attended SOUTHWESTERN but one year had not Dr. Diehl provided the means whereby I might stay and finish my four years. However, I have known him to do just as much for other students.

Dr. Diehl was constantly working on plans of all kinds, seeking for some solution to the problem of the religious life of the students. He has certainly tried everything plausible and no man could have done more. He believes, and I think rightly, that the faculty should serve only to direct the students in such religious matters, to the end that the students themselves be developed.

To me, the outstanding characteristic of Dr. Diehl is the fact that he is always striving for the best in everything,—in college buildings and equipment, in the selection of his faculty, in scholastic standing, and in other things. But above all he is seeking the best and highest in religion.

Personally, I have never come in contact with anyone who has helped me as much in religious problems as has Dr. Diehl. He is never too busy to help a student who is troubled about anything. My faith has been strengthened, my ideals raised, in fact my college career has come to mean something worth while because of Dr. Diehl.

SOUTHWESTERN has a glorious future with such a man at its head. And it is to be hoped that this will be the last bar that will hinder her progress.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) ALBERT M. JOHNSON, '30.

BANK OF COMMERCE & TRUST COMPANY
Office of the Vice President
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

February 2, 1931.

Mr. E. B. LeMaster,
Chairman,
Board of Trustees of SOUTHWESTERN,
City.

Dear Sir:

I am informed that on tomorrow your Board will consider the charges recently preferred against Dr. Diehl and will consider the advisability of retaining him in his present office. The question you will then be called on to consider will not be one of merely local or personal importance—nor will the effect of your decision be limited to the present day and generation. Your action will not only declare to your contemporaries the attitude which you now expect SOUTHWESTERN to occupy in this community and to the world at large but it will largely influence, if it does not dictate, the viewpoint which must be adopted by those who in the natural course of events must be your successors. I think it is therefore the right of those who feel a deep and abiding interest, not only in SOUTHWESTERN, but in the community so largely subject to its influence, to express their views on the impending situation.

Within the last few months my association with Dr. Diehl became intimate because of negotiations which ultimately resulted in relieving the college from its oppressive financial burden. During the many and strenuous situations which confronted us in disposing of the complex problems which arose I found Dr. Diehl alert, sagacious and wise. From my experience with him in this instance I formed the opinion that he was the equal, if not the superior, of many business men whose daily calling leads in other directions than the quiet path ordinarily pursued by a college president. The result of this experience justifies in my mind the conclusion I have reached that from a business standpoint the qualifications of Dr. Diehl for the position he now occupies fully fulfill any requirement that could be expected.

I have learned through the public print, as well as from other sources, that the doctrinal views of Dr. Diehl have been made the subject of criticism. It would be inexcusable temerity in a layman to express an opinion on controverted points of theology, and I shall not undertake to do so. But I cannot forbear the suggestion that differences have frequently originated in ecclesiastical bodies, which have been adjusted without serious results and without the injurious effect to the general organization, such as I think would follow the drastic action contemplated in the present instance. The fact that SOUTHWESTERN is loyally sustained and supported, financially and morally, by those who radically differ in religious doctrine justifies

the expectation that liberality of sentiment will pervade your deliberations and that the faithful, earnest, and effective work of Dr. Diehl will receive your approving decision.

Please excuse the length of this letter as well as my unwarranted officiousness (if it be so considered) in writing it. My deep interest in the educational welfare of this community where I was born, where I have lived for a life time (which has now come to be a long one and where I expect to end my days) as well as my personal regard for Dr. Diehl, has prompted my action.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) S. J. SHEPHERD.

CHICKASAW WOOD PRODUCTS CO., INC.

CHICKASAW COOPERAGE CO.

General Office

MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

February 2, 1931.

Mr. E. B. LeMaster, Chairman,
Board of Directors,
Memphis, Tennessee

Dear Mr. LeMaster:

I have been much disturbed over the charges brought against Dr. Diehl, not only because of the injustice done him, but the damage done SOUTHWESTERN.

It was my intention to ask that I be permitted to go before the meeting of the Trustees to advise them of my feelings, but on second thought, it seems best that I address them a letter through you.

I have made diligent inquiry of other Presbyterians in Memphis as to what they thought of Dr. Diehl, and I am very much gratified to find that, with a very few exceptions, they agree with me.

Walker, Jr., graduated at SOUTHWESTERN a few years ago. He was at Clarksville and moved down here with the college. He is a very faithful Presbyterian and is well grounded in its doctrines. He is a close Bible student, and a young man of the highest principles and character.

In all of his years of association with Dr. Diehl, he did not find that Dr. Diehl was not a good Presbyterian, and a sound believer in the Bible. He found his influence, and that of the faculty, was uplifting from a Christian standpoint.

I have seen quite a lot of Dr. Diehl. I have heard many sermons, and nothing has occurred to make me think that he was not a believer in the Bible, or unsound in Presbyterian doctrines. In fact I have formed the opinion that he was rather "hard boiled" in this respect, if I may be excused for using such slang in a communication to this body.

Presbyterians, and all other citizens as a whole think Dr. Diehl the ideal man for the place.

When I was at Clarksville over forty years ago, there was dancing in the fraternities. It is true that they were across the street and not actually on the enclosed campus, but they were chaperoned by the professors as they are now.

Certainly I would rather that my children go to dances on the campus under the supervision of the professors, than outside where there was no supervision. This is harmless amusement, although I never learned it, and I can see no harm in it under proper conditions.

Now as to extravagance. Read Mr. Farris' report. One cannot but applaud him for his wonderful business ability. I showed it to a successful business man who is not a Presbyterian, and he said, "I wish I could have him finance my business. I think he is a marvel." So do we all think so, and I hope that those who have brought the charges, will see that they were hasty, will give Dr. Diehl the apology that is his due, and will work to build up SOUTHWESTERN instead of tearing it down.

WLW:W

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) WALKER L. WELLFORD.

LIST OF OTHERS WHOSE LETTERS ARE ON FILE

GRADUATES AND FORMER STUDENTS

Harman Ayers, Vicksburg, Miss.
Sam C. Caldwell, Hazlehurst, Miss.
Dr. R. F. Cooper, Holly Springs, Miss.—President, Mississippi Synodical College
Wm. R. Craig, New York City
George W. Currie, Hattiesburg, Miss.
John B. Ferguson, Trenton, Ky.
Dr. Wm. C. Fitts, Birmingham, Ala.
Mercer L. Gewin, DeKalb, Miss.
Warner L. Hall, Louisville, Ky.—now attending Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary
Frederic Heidelberg, Louisville, Ky.—now attending Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary
Alton L. Hicks, Estancia, New Mexico
C. M. Huber, Crystal Springs, Miss.—Patron
Miss Jane Hyde, Memphis, Tenn.
Albert McDill Johnson, Memphis, Tenn.
John K. Johnson, Louisville, Ky.—now attending Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary
Sandy R. King, Durant, Miss.
Joseph Kitchell, Louisville, Ky.—now attending Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary.
Joseph B. Love, Jr., Memphis, Tenn.
Henry M. Lupton, Clarksville, Tenn.—Patron
Wm. H. Lynn, Ripley, Tenn.
Dr. Scott C. Lyon, Davidson, N. C.—Former Professor at SOUTHWESTERN
Crawford McGiveran, Vicksburg, Miss.
A. S. McIlwaine, Columbus, Miss.
Duncan Martin, Memphis, Tenn.
Thornton Moore, Louisville, Ky.—now attending Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary
Wm. Orr, Louisville, Ky.—now attending Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary
Ford Raines, Dallas, Texas.
S. L. Smith, Nashville, Tenn.
Charles Stratton, New York City
Kirby P. Walker, Brooklyn, Miss.
Walker L. Wellford, Memphis—Patron

CLUBS AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of University Women, Memphis, Tenn.
"The Egyptians," Memphis, Tenn.
Memphis Alumnae Chapter Chi Omega Sorority, Memphis, Tenn.
Memphis Chapter SOUTHWESTERN Alumnae, Memphis, Tenn.
Session of First Presbyterian Church, Greenville, Miss.
SOUTHWESTERN Faculty
SOUTHWESTERN Student Body
SOUTHWESTERN Woman's Club, Memphis, Tenn.
Patrons' Council and Faculty of St. Mary's School, Memphis, Tenn.

PRESBYTERIAN MINISTERS

- *Dr. George D. Booth, Natchez, Miss.—Patron
Dr. Samuel R. Braden, McAlester, Okla.
Rev. Frank H. Caldwell, Louisville, Ky.
- *Dr. Walter L. Caldwell, Nashville, Tenn.—Patron
- *Dr. R. L. Campbell, Macon, Miss.
Dr. P. H. Carmichael, Montevallo, Ala.
- *Dr. A. F. Carr, Umatilla, Florida.
Dr. H. V. Carson, Montgomery, Ala.
- *Rev. Geo. W. Cheek, Bowling Green, Ky.
Dr. S. H. Chester, Montreat, N. C.
Rev. Wm. B. Cooke, Staunton, Va.
Dr. Cecil V. Crabb, Clarksdale, Miss.
- *Rev. Wm. Crowe, Jr., Talladega, Ala.
President John R. Cunningham, Louisville Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
Dr. Bruce Curry, Jr., New York, N. Y.
Rev. O. G. Davis, Jennings, La.
Dr. James M. Duer, Clinton, Iowa
Dr. Henry M. Edmonds, Birmingham, Ala.
Dr. G. S. Frazer, Pensacola, Fla.—Patron
Dr. J. S. Foster, Winston-Salem, N. C.
- *Dr. U. S. Gordon, Gainesville, Fla.
Dr. C. O. Groves, Kosciusko, Miss.
- *Rev. Wayne W. Gray, Clarendon, Ark.
- *Rev. James E. Green, Senatobia, Miss.
- *Rev. S. T. Hill, Sardis, Miss.
Rev. E. D. Holloway, Monroe, La.
- *Dr. Harris E. Kirk, Baltimore, Md.
Dr. R. O. Kirkwood, Middletown, N. Y.
Dr. Dean R. Leland, Lincoln, Nebr.
Dr. D. P. McGeachy, Decatur, Ga.
Dr. S. W. McGill, Louisville, Ky.
- *Rev. Homer McLain, Oxford, Miss.
Rev. R. L. McLeod, Jr., Grenada, Miss.
Dr. Minot C. Morgan, New York City
Dr. James J. Murray, Lexington, Va.
Rev. E. C. Newton, Helena, Ark.
- *Dr. Dunbar H. Ogden, New Orleans, La.
- *Rev. D. L. O'Neal, Bastrop, La.
- *Dr. John W. Orr, McLemore Ave. Presbyterian Church, Memphis, Tenn.—Patron

* Alumni of Southwestern.

Dr. Chas. H. Pratt, Louisville, Ky.
 Rev. Frank D. Sheets, Oregon, Ill.
 Dr. L. J. Sherrill, Louisville, Ky.
 Dr. Egbert W. Smith, Nashville, Tenn.
 Dr. Hay Watson Smith, Little Rock, Ark.
 Dr. J. Marion Stafford, Stuttgart, Ark.
 Rev. L. A. Streete, Rosedale, Miss.—Patron
 Dr. Henry H. Sweets, Louisville, Ky.
 Dr. J. M. Vander Meulen, Louisville, Ky.
 Rev. J. E. Wallace, Oxford, Miss.
 •Rev. T. Barton West, Bay Springs, Miss.
 Dr. C. R. Wheeland, Evanston, Ill.
 Rev. R. Murphy Williams, Greensboro, N. C.
 Dr. I. M. Yonan, Neenah, Wisc.

MISCELLANEOUS LIST

John E. Anderson, Holly Springs, Miss.
 E. Y. Andrews, Memphis, Tenn.
 George W. Awsumb, Memphis, Tenn.
 Mrs. C. D. Bailey, Clarksville, Tenn.
 C. W. Bailey, Clarksville, Tenn.—Former Treasurer of SOUTHWESTERN
 H. H. Banker, Memphis, Tenn.
 Mrs. Lem Banks, Raines, Tenn.—Treasurer, Woman's Auxiliary, Grace Covenant
 Church
 Claude J. Bell, Nashville, Tenn.
 Prof. and Mrs. A. L. Bondurant, Oxford, Miss.
 W. J. Britton, Memphis, Tenn.
 Mrs. Kenneth-Brown, University, Va.
 Mrs. Chas. B. Bryan, Memphis, Tenn.
 Mrs. L. M. Bryant, Memphis, Tenn.
 Chauncey W. Butler, Memphis, Tenn.
 S. J. Cassels, Montgomery, Ala.
 J. G. Chastain, Jr., Leland, Miss.—Educator
 L. W. Childress, St. Louis, Mo.
 Miss Frances Church, Memphis, Tenn.
 E. H. Clarke, Memphis, Tenn.
 Dr. James E. Clarke, Nashville, Tenn.—Editor, "Presbyterian Advance"
 James D. Collier, Memphis, Tenn.
 Sam Costen, Memphis, Tenn.—Patron
 George W. Cox, Memphis, Tenn.—Educational work
 Mrs. Wm. R. Craig, New York City
 T. K. Creson, Memphis, Tenn.
 John Crofton, Memphis, Tenn.
 Mr. and Mrs. James S. Davant, Memphis, Tenn.
 Mrs. Natalie B. Dohrmann, Covington, Ky.
 Mrs. Charles Drane, Clarksville, Tenn.
 John L. Eiser, Baltimore, Md.
 Dr. Harry W. Ettleson, Memphis, Tenn.—Rabbi, Congregation Children of Israel
 J. W. Falls, Memphis, Tenn.
 W. V. Fant, Memphis, Tenn.—Patron
 Mrs. Katie C. Farnsworth, Memphis, Tenn.
 S. W. Farnsworth, Memphis, Tenn.
 Leo Favrot, Baton Rouge, La.—Patron

Mrs. David Fentress, Memphis, Tenn.—Vice President, Woman's Auxiliary of
 Idlewild Presbyterian Church
 T. T. Frankenburg, Columbus, Ohio
 H. J. Freeburg, Memphis, Tenn.
 Dr. Clyde Furst, New York City—Secretary, Carnegie Foundation
 Bishop Thomas F. Gailor, Memphis, Tenn.
 H. M. Gassman, Birmingham, Ala.
 Dr. Robert A. George, Memphis—Pastor, First Congregational Church
 Blake W. Godfrey, Jackson, Miss—State Y. M. C. A.
 Mrs. B. B. Goodman, Memphis, Tenn.—Patron
 Mrs. J. C. Greenhill, Clarksville, Tenn.
 Dr. Sutton E. Griggs, Memphis, Tenn.—(Negro Educator)
 John J. Heflin, Memphis, Tenn.
 H. B. Heidelberg, Clarksdale, Miss.—Educator and Patron
 Ben R. Henderson, Memphis, Tenn.—Patron
 W. B. Hill, Memphis, Tenn.
 Ben W. Hirsh, Memphis, Tenn.
 Dr. W. D. Hooper, Athens, Ga.—University of Georgia
 Mrs. T. C. Howard, Covington, Tenn.
 Mr. and Mrs. Allen Hughes, Memphis, Tenn.—Patrons
 E. H. Hughes, Memphis, Tenn.
 Hugh Humphreys, Memphis, Tenn.
 J. A. Hunt, Greenville, Miss.—Patron
 Principal W. O. Inman, Tiptonville, Tenn.
 W. A. Jones, Memphis, Tenn.—Supt. Sunday School Idlewild Presbyterian Church
 Mrs. W. A. Jones, Memphis, Tenn.
 Wharton S. Jones, Memphis, Tenn.—Educator
 Dr. Robt. L. Kelly, Executive Secretary, Association of American Colleges, New
 York, N. Y.
 Dr. Ryland Knight, St. Louis, Missouri—Pastor, Delmar Baptist Church
 Milton K. Knowlton, Memphis, Tenn.
 A. W. Lederer, Memphis, Tenn.—President of Men of Idlewild Presbyterian
 Church
 Mrs. Mary Johnson Lee, Memphis, Tenn.
 Robert M. Lester, New York City—Carnegie Corporation
 Wm. L. Loeb, Memphis, Tenn.
 Prof. F. W. Loetscher, Princeton, N. J.—Princeton Theological Seminary
 Mrs. E. L. McGiveran, Vicksburg, Miss.—Patron
 Judge C. L. Marsilliot, Memphis, Tenn.
 Mrs. W. F. Mason, Memphis, Tenn.—Patron
 A. Y. Meeker, New York City, Kewaunee Mfg. Co.
 Principal W. E. Miller, Memphis, Tenn.—Snowden Junior High School
 W. H. Miller, Birmingham, Ala.
 Dr. J. L. Minor, Cordova, Tenn.
 Mr. and Mrs. Guy Mitchell, Tupelo, Miss.—Patrons
 Sanford Morison, Memphis, Tenn.
 H. L. Morrow, Birmingham, Ala.
 Horatio V. S. Negus, Bound Brook, N. J.
 Wade H. Negus, Greenville, Miss.
 J. Hartman Oswald, Horn Lake, Miss.
 E. P. Peacock, Memphis, Tenn.
 W. A. Percy, Greenville, Miss.
 W. P. Perkins, Senatobia, Miss.
 R. C. Pifer, Memphis—Executive Secretary, Y. M. C. A.

J. M. Robertshaw, Greenville, Miss.
 Prof. Joseph Roemer, Gainesville, Florida—Professor of Secondary Education,
 University of Florida
 B. A. Rogers, Tupelo, Miss.—Patron
 S. J. Shepherd, Memphis, Tenn.
 Dr. N. W. Sherman, Memphis, Tenn.—Patron
 Dr. H. U. Sims, Birmingham, Ala.
 Cleve Smith, Memphis, Tenn.—Patron
 J. Bayard Snowden, Memphis, Tenn.
 Mr. and Mrs. R. J. Stanage, Memphis, Tenn.—Patrons
 Alfred Stone, Dunleith, Miss.
 Dr. J. N. Swan, Baltimore, Md.—Educator
 Rev. M. L. Tate, B.D., Memphis, Tenn.—Pastor, Holy Trinity Church—Patron
 Jack W. Terry, Memphis, Tenn.—Patron
 Dr. Percy W. Toombs, Memphis, Tenn.
 President E. B. Tucker, Austin College, Sherman, Texas
 W. E. Ward, Nashville, Tenn.
 Dr. John N. Ware, Rome, Ga.—Professor of French, Shorter College
 Mr. and Mrs. H. A. Washington, Memphis, Tenn.—Patrons
 Prof. H. A. Webb, Nashville, Tenn.—George Peabody College
 Mrs. L. T. Webb, Memphis, Tenn.—Patron
 H. B. Weisiger, Memphis, Tenn.
 Harry A. Wellford, Memphis, Tenn.
 Dr. Walter M. White, Memphis, Tenn.—Pastor, Linden Ave. Christian Church
 N. E. Wilroy, Hernando, Miss.
 J. W. Wood, Huntsville, Ala.
 Mr. and Mrs. R. P. Woodson, Memphis, Tenn.
 Dr. George A. Works, Chicago, Ill.
 Dr. J. W. Young, Grenada, Miss.