

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION¹

The Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) The Southern Baptist Convention came into existence on May 8, 1845 just a few years prior to the American Civil War. David Beale gives a bit of the history behind its formation: "While many factors-social, cultural, economic, political, and religious-contributed to the mid-nineteenth century separation of Baptists in the South from those in the North, the issue of slavery served as the catalyst to complete the separation. Although the Triennial Convention had attempted to establish a noncommittal policy regarding slavery, Baptists in the South felt that they were receiving unequal treatment in the [funding] and in the approval of missionary candidates...[Fourteen years later] in 1859 the convention established its first seminary-Southern Baptist Theological Seminary."ⁱ From that small beginning the Southern Baptist Convention grew to become the largest denomination in the United States, apart from the Roman Catholic Church.

Now I'd like to ask you to "fast forward" a hundred years from those early beginnings of the SBC mentioned above.

A century later the Southern Baptist Convention was heading down the same road to apostasy that the Northern Baptist Convention had followed in the early 1900s. All six of the SBC seminaries had theological liberals teaching in them. They, in turn, were infecting future SBC pastors with error, even though the average member in the pew still believed the Bible and its teachings. Because of this apostasy that was slowly going on in the SBC, for decades faithful Bible-believers had been pulling out of the SBC and either starting new independent Baptist churches or joining previously existing ones. The reason of course was that they wanted to be faithful to the Lord and His Word which states, "What fellowship hath light with darkness or the temple of God with idols. Come out from among them and be separate saith the Lord." (II Cor. 6:12-14). Many battles were fought by conservatives within individual Southern Baptist churches as they tried to get them to leave the convention. And dozens of them did pull out of the SBC, often with great difficulty and at great cost both personally and professionally.

However, beginning in the 1980s the conservatives who still remained within the SBC decided to try to turn things around in the seminaries and clean house and get rid of the liberal professors. To try and accomplish that goal they came up with a plan. The idea was to nominate & try to elect a conservative as president of the SBC every year at the annual national convention for at least the next six or seven years in a row (a new SBC president is chosen annually). Whoever is elected president of the SBC each year gets to appoint new seminary board members to replace those who are rotating off those boards due to the expiration of their terms of service. The conservatives figured that if the Bible-believers could elect a conservative president to lead the SBC each year for at least seven consecutive years, those presidents could in turn slowly purge the seminaries of their liberal board members, totally changing their composition. Then once that was accomplished those newly conservative boards could then hire good new faculty and fire the apostate, liberal professors teaching in those seminaries (several of whom denied such fundamental doctrines of the faith as the virgin birth of Christ, His substitutionary atonement, the inerrancy of Scripture, etc.). To the surprise of many, over the next 10-15 years the conservatives were able to achieve their plan i.e. elect their candidates as president each year. In turn, those presidents have tried to do some "house cleaning" of liberals and apostates from the SBC seminaries.

So the crucial question today is this:

"Is there any reason not to resume fellowshiping and working together with Southern Baptists?"

The short answer:

"There are still very serious theological problems and reasons NOT to fellowship & cooperate with &/or use Southern Baptist speakers, evangelists, and churches."

Advocates of reuniting with Southern Baptists eagerly point out that the late Jerry Falwell & his Liberty University became connected with the SBC in Virginia a number of years ago, and that Cedarville University in Ohio has done so as well. They also point out that Rick Warren, Chuck Colson, Billy Graham & a number of other popular, high profile theologians and leaders within evangelicalism are members of the Southern Baptist Convention, the implication being that their presence makes working with the SBC alright.

I would beg to differ with such proponents of the restoration of ties with the SBC (and advocates include some

1 By Mike Edwards, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, West Indies, c. 2011 Note: British spelling used throughout.

surprising individuals, schools & churches). So allow me to try and briefly explain why I believe conservative Bible believers should continue to stay apart from the SBC.

At the outset I should point out that very recently a number of heated arguments and battles have been fought over this very issue i.e. whether or not fundamentalists should fellowship with and work together with churches & individuals from the Southern Baptist Convention.

One primary example has been the recent Cedarville University controversy. This Christian college in southeastern Ohio created a firestorm of controversy when they shocked everyone in fundamentalist circles by becoming an “officially approved SBC college/university.” What that meant was that Cedarville and the SBC had formally agreed to officially recognize & endorse Cedarville as a school the SBC would now officially recognize and endorse as tantamount to an SBC college/university (since the SBC had no school of their own in Ohio). However Cedarville College (later University) had been an officially approved school of the fundamentalist GARBC since the mid-1900s. It was sort of like a man’s wife leaving him for another man...but still wanting to retain her old husband too, since Cedarville wished to still remain in good standing with the GARBC as well! So from 2002-2005 controversy & debate raged within the GARBC over this decision by Cedarville to align themselves with the SBC. Cedarville, originally a Presbyterian college, had later been taken over by independent Baptists and had a long history with fundamental Baptists and was officially affiliated with the G.A.R.B.C (a fundamental, conservative Baptist organisation begun by Dr. Robert Ketcham & a number of other solid, unbending Bible-believers in 1932). Now suddenly, after 70-80 years as an “approved school” of the GARBC, Cedarville, in a move that can only be called breathtaking, had decided to pursue the new evangelical SBC and had been accepted as an officially approved SBC college. Talk about feeling jilted!

Needless to say that did not go down well with fundamentalists and the GARBC, particularly because Cedarville’s doing so violated one of the GARBC’s clearly stated biblical policies on ecclesiastical separation. This caused a multi-year discussion and debate within the GARBC over the question of whether or not the GARBC should sever their ties with Cedarville since they were no longer able to sign the GARBC doctrinal statement due to their now being affiliated with the SBC. Frankly it was a “no-brainer” as far as the GARBC is concerned, since the official statement & policy of the GARBC was crystal clear. However the Ohio delegation to the GARBC (the OARBC) tried mightily to stop the divorce from happening. First there had been a change/rewriting of the policy governing the “approval system” of the GARBC. Finally when a break with Cedarville appeared inevitable, a variety of stalling tactics were employed to stave off the inevitable for as long as possible. Thankfully the GARBC leadership didn’t cave in or back down, even though they were under intense pressure to do so, and endured several years of parliamentary tricks & maneuvers by the pro-SBC Cedarville supporters. The final result: Cedarville is no longer a GARBC approved school. The reason? They have chosen to become connected with the SBC.

More recently and much more close to home for those of us in the West Indies, two schools we’re very familiar with, Northland International University (previously Northland Baptist Bible College) and Piedmont International University (previously Piedmont Baptist College) have recently had SBC guest lecturers &/or mission representatives & recruiters on their campuses. This has transpired within the past year and half and has caused no small stir among Bible-believing fundamentalists. Why either school would do that is perplexing, to say the least. There would appear to be absolutely no biblical justification for doing that.

Dr. Matt Olsen of NIU attempted to tamp down the controversy in an official public explanation letter which stated in part: “Our Guest Speakers... We invited two speakers that have generated some questions... Dr. Ware is a professor at Southern Baptist Seminary in Louisville. He is a well- recognized teacher and author. We have invited him to teach half of an advanced-degree seminar on a specialty subject our leading pastors need to be fully versed in. Why? Because Dr. Ware has written so skillfully and authoritatively on this particular topic. This seminar is for experienced, mature pastors who are presently in ministry. We see this as appropriate in the academic context and the type of thing we have done in the past for the very same reasons. In fact, most seminaries bring adjunct professors in to address key issues that they believe helpful. Never has this been intended as a move to align with any other group.

We did not see that having these speakers would be a significant problem. Biblically, we worked through a process of decision making and felt these choices and the context in which they were made were consistent with what we have

always believed. Knowing now that these decisions might be confusing, misunderstood, or miscommunicated, we would likely have planned differently. We have no desire to distract from our focus here or on the field of ministry.

We affirm that Northland stands in the historic tradition of Fundamentalism and is committed to remain as an independent, Baptist, separatist institution. We will do our best to serve the local church, which we believe is the primary institution ordained of God to carry out the Great Commission. We respect the autonomy of the local church, the priesthood of the believer, and individual soul liberty. We know that other Fundamentalists will develop different applications based on biblical authority and the principles that flow from it. We will do our best to defer to our brothers in Christ but refuse to be swayed by party politics, threats, and pressures. While deference brings unity, the fear of man paralyzes our ability to serve Christ. In the spirit of Galatians 1, we will serve Christ.

That explanation would appear to employ the “*End Justifies the Means*” philosophy of the Jesuits. i.e. Bruce Ware was an expert on the subject, thus he was asked to come and lecture on the graduate level.

In response, just because someone is a recognized expert on a particular subject doesn't necessarily mean we should have that person speak, lecture, or represent his organisation on campus, in our church, etc. Otherwise why not have Billy Graham (who has blatantly practiced unbiblical ecumenical evangelism for 60 years) come give a seminar on evangelism, or Norman Geisler (who has stated in print that there are no major differences between evangelicalism & Roman Catholicism that he feels should preclude them working together) to speak on apologetics, etc. The Bible contains a number of clear passages regarding not just separation from apostasy, but also separation from disobedient brethren (Mt. 18:15-17; Rom. 16:17; I Cor. 5:1-11; II Thess. 3:6-14; I Tim. ;

The question also needs to be asked, “*Are we to believe that Northland couldn't find a single solid fundamentalist scholar anywhere in the entire United States who could have lectured on that subject?*” That's hard to believe. Or were there other motives behind this, such as the status of having such a “name” individual. Or does the school simply wish to start moving a different direction? These are valid and important questions.

At any rate, my guess is that I don't believe Northland will be doing that again anytime soon, since I believe it has cost the school dearly in terms of financial support, student enrollment, etc.

In regard to Piedmont, the issue is perhaps even more disconcerting. The problem there revolves around the fact that they approved of and invited representatives of the NAMB (i.e. the North American Mission Board of the SBC) to be one of the official mission organisations allowed to recruit and be represented at Piedmont's most recent Missions Conference last fall (3-7 Oct, 2011). That decision truly seems unfathomable, particularly in light of the fact that many of Piedmont's most loyal supporting churches throughout the past have either been churches and pastors who have pulled out of the SBC &/or who have staunchly opposed the SBC due to its unbiblical ecumenism, past liberalism, lack of standards, etc. I have no idea why Piedmont did this and again, only time will tell if this was just a “one off” mistake, or an indication that they are beginning to go a different direction.

So is the SBC question a “tempest in a teapot?” I think not. While some encouraging things have taken place in the SBC, nonetheless **the “jury is still out”** on whether or not conservatives will ultimately be successful in turning the Southern Baptist Convention around to a truly biblical position. There are several valid reasons to still be deeply concerned and take a “wait & see” attitude regarding the SBC:

One reason is because while conservatives have won some highly visible victories, there is still a very large “moderate” faction within the SBC that is not happy (led by influential individuals such as former President Jimmy Carter).ⁱⁱ They are resisting change in a conservative direction and have repeatedly threatened to leave the convention and form their own denomination.

Another reason is that while conservatives have won some victories, those victories have only been on the national level in regard to their seminaries. You see, the way the Southern Baptist Convention works, the SBC seminaries are under the control of the national SBC leadership. So the conservative takeover plan described above has worked well at getting rid of much of the error in the seminaries, firing the worst professors, etc. However, the dozens and dozens of SBC colleges and universities across America are ***not*** under the national leadership's control.

Those schools are under the control of each individual state's separate SBC leadership. I say it again. Those colleges & universities are not under the control of the national governing body.ⁱⁱⁱ It is the state SBC organisations that maintain control over all SBC colleges & other institutions of higher learning within their respective states.^{iv} Consequently things have often changed little if any on the state level. (See footnote for a listing of official SBC colleges and universities as of November, 2011)^v

How that plays out in real life—a particularly appalling example: Baylor University, Waco, Texas. Baylor is a Southern Baptist school, yet **their science department boldly, unequivocally and unapologetically fully endorses the theory of evolution!** They are 100% behind Darwin's bogus teaching that man evolved from an ape-like creature, etc. That of course is in direct and total contradiction to the Word of God (not to mention a large amount of genuine observable scientific data from paleontology, geology, etc, -mwe). Baylor's official statement on this issue, taken directly and verbatim from their website 26 November 2011 reads as follows:

“Statement of Evolution: [sic]

Evolution, a foundational principle of modern biology, is supported by overwhelming scientific evidence and is accepted by the vast majority of scientists. Because it is fundamental to the understanding of modern biology, the faculty in the Biology Department at Baylor University, Waco, TX, teach evolution throughout the biology curriculum. We are in accordance with the American Association for Advancement of Science's statement on evolution. We are a science department, so we do not teach alternative hypotheses or philosophically deduced theories that cannot be tested rigorously.”^{vi}[sic]

The fact that each state SBC organisation controls their respective schools also explains why a number of years ago Baylor University girls could pose naked in a pornographic magazine and receive no significant discipline for doing so, graduating right on schedule. It also explains why lewd posters & alcoholic beverages are part of campus life at Baylor. (This example illustrates another other problem with the Southern Baptist Convention, which is its generally lower standard of personal & ecclesiastical separation from the world)

Another example of the SBC's weak/non-existent stand on personal separation I very recently discovered in January of 2012 while perusing the official website of Piedmont International University (formerly Piedmont Baptist College), Winston-Salem, North Carolina. (Which, as I mentioned above, was when I noticed that one of the mission organisations that they invited and allowed to recruit and be officially represented on campus during their recently completed 2011 Missions Conference was NAMB i.e. “*The North American Mission Board*” of the Southern Baptist Convention). I went ahead and clicked on the link listed on the Piedmont website to make sure this wasn't some other organisation. The link took me to the SBC's official NAMB website. One article, out of many articles posted there, immediately caught my attention (as it was designed to do). It was titled:

“What do Hip-Hop and Church Planting have in Common?”

The article began:

“On a cool fall night in Manhattan, the crowd is overflowing out of Apt 78. The newly opened lounge sits in the heart of the Washington Heights neighborhood and **the people of this community have come out in droves to support local rapper Andy Mineo as he celebrates the release of his latest album.** But for Mineo and his colleague Rich Perez, this gathering is more than just an album release party. The two men are hoping this time in a crowded music venue will serve as an outreach to the people of Washington Heights, the home of their new church plant Christ Crucified Fellowship...

“‘*What defines these people and this neighborhood is a real sense of community and fellowship,*’ explains Rich Perez, pastor and church planter of Christ Crucified Fellowship. ‘*We want to meet them where they are and celebrate what they celebrate Hip hop, the arts, culture, community—these are the things they appreciate and we want to try to use them as a means to lead people to the gospel.*’” The article then goes on to briefly tell Perez's life story, of his growing up there, eventually getting saved, etc.

It continues: “In 2004, Perez, and his wife, along with Andy Mineo started on the journey of planting Christ Crucified Fellowship in the heart of the neighborhood. ‘*We just got this vision to take the gospel and plant it in this community and just allow the church to grow from that,*’ Perez explains... Because of Perez's unique understanding of the ins and outs of the neighborhood, the vision for Christ Crucified Fellowship is quite different than other churches in the area. The team is starting simply, focusing on outreach and community fellowship events like

Mineo's album release to connect with the people in the neighborhood. Currently, their only 'formal' gatherings are various Bible studies hosted throughout the community on a weekly basis. *'What really drives Christ Crucified Fellowship is to know, love and live the gospel of Jesus Christ,'* says Perez. *'For us that means we just get together, we hang out and get to know one another, pray for each other and try to chop up the Word to see how it applies to us in this place, in this neighborhood.'* ...

"Outside of these Bible studies, the team at Christ Crucified Fellowship is focused on creating more outreach events to draw in the community around the things they love. From concerts to book clubs to basketball tournaments, Perez hopes to use these events to rally the people of Washington Heights around the name of Christ in a way that truly speaks to who they are.

'We're not going to bring a steeple into Washington Heights because it's just not relevant to what is happening here,' Perez asserts. *'Our vision for the church is that it reflect the attributes of the people and the community. We want it to be a place where the people of Washington Heights can worship God, get to know Him and live out His mission in a way that makes sense here in this specific community.'* And for Perez and his team, reaching the community tonight means meeting and mingling with them in a crowded lounge full of people coming together to celebrate the music and success of one of their own. This is what outreach looks like in Washington Heights."^{vii}

A few simple, biblical observations about the above SBC/NAMB article:

Unfortunately, what you just read above is what evangelical Christianity is all about today i.e. find out what the world likes and then give it to them. It draws people, no one gets offended, etc. This philosophy permeated that article. For instance: *"We want to meet them where they are and celebrate what they celebrate Hip hop, the arts, culture, community—these are the things they appreciate ...* The team is starting simply, **focusing on outreach and community fellowship events like Mineo's album release to connect with the people in the neighborhood... we just get together, we hang out and get to know one another ...** the team at Christ Crucified Fellowship is **focused on creating more outreach events to draw in the community around the things they love. From concerts to book clubs to basketball tournaments...** to rally the people of Washington Heights around the name of Christ **in a way that truly speaks to who they are...** *We're not going to bring a steeple into Washington Heights because it's just not relevant to what is happening here ... Our vision for the church is that it reflect the attributes of the people and the community... live out His mission in a way that makes sense here in this specific community...* reaching the community tonight means **meeting and mingling with them in a crowded lounge full of people coming together to celebrate the music and success of one of their own."** I would maintain that this kind of ministry philosophy & methodology is precisely what is wrong with Christianity today! Thoroughly postmodern & worldly based.

I would also suggest that the Bible condemns in no uncertain terms what Perez, Mineo are doing i.e. taking something debauched and a primary emblem of the unsaved world (i.e. Rap & Hip-Hop music) and using that as their primary evangelistic tool. I don't even see any indication in the article that Mineo's rap music is Christian in any way, shape or form. It's just labeled rap/hip-hop. Even if it is "Christianized" rap/hip-hop, the association with those types of musical genres immediately eliminates it from any possibility of being pleasing to God or used by Him. The Bible condemns using it. For instance, I John 2:15-17: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life is of the world. And the world passes away and the lust thereof. But he that doeth the will of God abides forever." Cf. Jas 4:4 "Know ye not that friendship with the world is enmity with God? And whosoever will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God. Do you think that the Scripture saith in vain, 'the Spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy.' But He giveth more grace, wherefore He saith, 'God resists the proud and give grace unto the humble.'" Note too such verses as Romans 12:1-2 ("Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you prove what is that good, and acceptable and perfect will of God"); Titus 2:11-12 (For the grace of God that bringeth salvation teaches us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world.")

I also note that the article says "*Date Created 11/15/2011.*" In the article itself it says that they began their church-planting effort in Washington Heights in **2004. So after seven years they state in the article that they have yet to hold a church service!** They state that the only "religious" thing they do is *"just get together, we hang out and get to know one another, pray for each other and try to chop up the Word to see how it applies to us in this place, in this*

neighborhood.” If I may be so bold, I would like to suggest that after seven years of “*getting together & hanging out*” that presumably everyone there should “*know one another,*” and it might be time to go beyond “*hanging out*” and start actually conducting some church services!

Finally, I would point out that throughout the above SBC/NAMB article, the focus, like so much of Christianity today, was not on God, Christ or the Bible, but on figuring out what the people of Washington Heights like and are “*into*” and giving them more of it—a ministry philosophy that I would suggest is completely unbiblical and backwards (cf. I Cor 1-4. For those interested I would suggest reading a 15 page paper titled “*Man’s Wisdom vs. God’s Wisdom*” which I compiled and which are basically the notes from a sermon preached by the author in a variety of countries, churches & situations, beginning in 2003).

As mentioned above, the SBC is in the midst of a bit of a civil war between the liberal and conservative factions within this denomination. It is the largest Protestant denomination in the United States with around 16 million members (nearly the entire population of Australia!).^{viii} The SBC should definitely be classified as “*New Evangelical,*” i.e. usually holding to conservative theological positions (except possibly in some of their colleges &/or seminaries) yet it works with and cooperates with churches and para-church organisations that are not necessarily biblical themselves. Until recently the SBC had people teaching in all six of their seminaries who did not believe a number of the cardinal doctrines of biblical Christianity—though that appears to have been mostly rectified.(?)

However, as mentioned above, there are other serious problems such as: **a)** the standards, practices & teachings in some of the state-run SBC colleges & universities are poor &/or contradict Scripture, **b)** unbiblical ecumenical evangelism & cooperation with groups such as the Roman Catholic Church e.g. Southern Baptists Chuck Colson & Richard Land publicly worked together with Roman Catholic priests and theologians to write & officially endorse the blockbuster ecumenical theological document “*Evangelicals and Catholics Together*” [ECT], etc. That document labeled everyone from either group, particularly the Roman Catholic Church, as regenerated believers and exhorted evangelicals to “stop stealing their sheep.” **c)** You will find that most SBC churches preach the gospel, but do not observe biblical separation either in the personal or ecclesiastical realms (e.g. note the half-century of unbiblical ecumenical evangelism by the SBC’s most famous evangelist, Billy Graham who has been actively working with the Roman Catholic Church, theological liberals, etc., for six decades. During all that time there has been nary a word of rebuke or concern—let alone discipline—by anyone in the SBC. Ditto for Chuck Colson & his Prison Fellowship ministry, whose official position enthusiastically & publicly endorses the using of Roman Catholics in that ministry. The SBC’s unapologetic association and promotion of “Hip-Hop/Rap” music for doing ministry (see above) continues the SBC’s philosophy of worldliness. (cf. Southern Baptist Rick Warren’s music philosophy, etc.)

i. Beale, op cit., p. 174

ⁱⁱ From various news sources that were reporting on the SBC at the time.

ⁱⁱⁱ From the official SBC website: “Colleges and Universities, Explanation of Relationships. ‘The Southern Baptist Convention lists the following colleges and universities as a service to Southern Baptists and the Baptist state conventions with which it maintains a cooperative relationship. With the exception of the five theological colleges associated with our SBC seminaries, the Southern Baptist Convention has no direct connection with any of these institutions. It provides no funding. It elects no trustees. Each institution is related to one our partnering Baptist state conventions. The Cooperative Program is the unified budget plan adopted by the SBC. Each state convention receives Cooperative Program funds from churches in its state or region. The state convention retains a portion of Cooperative Program contributions from its affiliated churches for missions and ministries in its respective state or region. If a college or university receives funding from a Baptist state convention, this funding comes only from Cooperative Program funds forwarded to the state convention by churches in that respective state. No Cooperative Program funds forwarded by the states to the national convention (the SBC) are allocated to a college or university related to any of our partnering Baptist state conventions. The SBC provides no scholarship assistance to any student through the SBC Cooperative Program Allocation Budget. Scholarship awards are coordinated through each respective college or university’s finance office in accordance with guidelines adopted by the individual school. The governance and funding procedures of the five colleges associated with the SBC seminaries are compatible with the Southern Baptist Convention’s bylaws and its Business and Financial Plan.’” (In other words, the SBC national body attempts here to disassociate itself from whatever may or may not be occurring on the campuses of the colleges listed under the following footnote, and refuses responsibility and oversight. They are in essence stating that whatever happens on the campus of the individual SBC colleges & universities in the various states are strictly and solely each state’s responsibility i.e. we have nothing to do with it. It is clearly stated that how each state spends its share of the Cooperative Program funds sent to them is their business, not ours. Where I come from, we call that shirking your responsibilities, or a cop-out *-mwe*).

^{iv} “Responsibility for colleges and seminaries of the denomination is divided between the SBC, which sponsors the seminaries, and the state conventions which operate the colleges and universities.” (Daniel G. Reid, Robert D. Linder, Bruce L. Shelley & Harry S. Stout, “*Dictionary of Christianity in America*” [InterVarsity Press: Downers Grove, IL, 1990], “*Southern Baptist Convention*”, p. 1114

^v Alabama: Judson College, Samford University, University of Mobile; Arkansas: Ouachita Baptist University, Williams Baptist College; California: California Baptist University; Florida: The Baptist College of Florida; North Carolina: Campbell University, Chowan University, The College at Southeastern, Fruitland Baptist Bible Institute, Gardner-Webb University, Mars Hill College, Wingate University; Ohio: Cedarville University (endorsed by the State Convention of Baptists in Ohio); Oklahoma: Oklahoma Baptist University; Georgia: Brewton-Parker College, Shorter College, Truett-McConnell College; Kentucky: Boyce College (undergraduate programme operated by The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary), Campbellsville University, Clear Creek Baptist Bible College, Georgetown College (a ministry partner with the Kentucky Baptist Convention), Mid-Continent University, University of the Cumberlands; Louisiana: Leavell College (undergraduate program operated by New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary), Louisiana College; Mississippi: Blue Mountain College, Mississippi College, William Carey University; Missouri: Hannibal-LeGrange College, Midwestern Baptist College (undergraduate program operated by Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary), Southwest Baptist University; South Carolina: Anderson University, Charleston Southern University, North Greenville University; Tennessee: Carson-Newman College, Union University; Texas: Baptist University of the Americas, Baylor University, The College at Southwestern (undergraduate program operated by Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary), Criswell College, Dallas Baptist University, East Texas Baptist University, Hardin-Simmons University, Houston Baptist University, Howard Payne University, Jacksonville College, University of Mary Hardin-Baylor, Wayland Baptist University; Montana: Yellowstone Baptist College; Virginia: Bluefield College, Liberty University (in partnership with the Southern Baptist Conservatives of Virginia), Virginia Intermont College. Above information taken verbatim from “*SBC.Net – Official Website of the Southern Baptist Convention—One people. One purpose. One click. Colleges and Universities.*” (<http://www.sbc.net/colleges.asp> Accessed and downloaded 28 Nov. 2011 –*mwe*)

^{vi} Statement taken directly from Baylor University’s official website (College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Biology, Statement of Evolution [sic]): <http://www.baylor.edu/biology/index.php?id=77368> Accessed & downloaded 26 Nov. 2011.-*mwe*

^{vii} The article ended with the statement, “Sara Shelton is a writer for the North American Mission Board.”

^{viii} I am of course aware that many Baptists do not wish to be classified as “*Protestants*,” with some pretty valid historical reasons. Another way of saying the same thing would be to state that the SBC is the largest denomination in America apart from the Roman Catholic Church.