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At this moment, it may seem inevitable that historians will turn first to the horrific events of September 11, and their aftermath, when they write their accounts of the United States in 2001. We have all read comparisons between the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and other “turning points” in American history. The Pearl Harbor analogy has probably worn out its welcome with a
media-saturated public, but popular commentators (and some academic historians) have offered past assassinations (Lincoln and Kennedy), economic crises (the Crash of 1929), the bombardment of Fort Sumter, the sinking of the Maine, and other episodes from our past as comparable moments of national concern and self-examination. Most of these analogies may not stand prolonged scrutiny, but the desire to find context for a contemporary tragedy in the relative safety of the past is natural enough. If our ancestors and our republic survived the tests and traumas of history, that suggests that we can surmount them as well, and that our future, if not troubled, may yet be secure.

Many of us at Baylor have also been thinking about this university’s future, and its past, this fall. Troubled and saddened by recent events, and watching as our nation engages uncertainly in a new kind of warfare, we are simultaneously called by the optimistic language of the Vision 2012 document to see the future in positive terms. As Baylor approaches its 156th year, we seek to build on past successes to enhance our university’s national appeal and raise its standing among American colleges and universities. We also seek to pursue those goals in the context of Baylor’s traditional Baptist and Texan heritage. Ideally, this will result in steady, evolutionary change, rather than rupture or conflict, and we will conserve our existing strengths even as we add new ones.

Baylor has been a careful steward of its past, and much of what we seek to accomplish in the next ten years can be seen as a logical outgrowth of the last century and a half of our history. As a historian, I would point to a few of Baylor’s attributes and traditions that I find particularly significant, and suggest ways in which the achievement of the Vision might be guided by them.

**Our History**

Baylor, as the only institution of higher education surviving from the Republic of Texas, has a rich and lengthy past. While we can’t rival the 17th century founding dates of Harvard or William and Mary, we can take pride in being one of the nation’s oldest universities west of the Mississippi, and in the foresight and determination of our Baptist founders. All too many 19th century colleges, most of them church-related, failed to survive beyond their first few years of existence, and though Baylor’s trustees at times had to struggle desperately to find money and students, the university never closed its doors. Any changes we undertake today will inevitably constitute only one chapter in that long history, but we should be careful to preserve the qualities that have ensured our survival thus far, while moving in new directions when past practice no longer serves us.

**Baylor’s Mission**

Most American colleges and universities were founded by religious denominations. Baptists had founded other colleges before 1845, mostly in the South, and many, like Baylor, had the training of ministers as one of their primary goals. But Baylor’s goal of providing education in a Christian context was always an inclusive one—her founders also offered the college to all the people of
Texas, and the first faculty member, Henry Gillette, was an Episcopalian. Admission was not restricted to Baptists, and as early as the 1840s other “Christian denominations” could hold their services in college buildings one Sunday each month. These early decisions lie behind Baylor’s present-day status as a university, rather than a Bible college, and the religious diversity of its faculty and student body. As Baylor works to enter the top ranks of American educational institutions, and broadens its appeal nationally and internationally, that religious diversity can and should increase, without threatening the basic character and mission of the University.

**Women at Baylor**

While we all take the presence of the women students for granted—they have constituted the majority of the student body for some time now—it’s important to remember how revolutionary Baylor’s decision to accept women students in 1845 was. Although a few schools for women had been established (the first, Mount Holyoke, in 1837) their curricula and admissions standards were weak. Most existing colleges, private and public, excluded women. Baptist schools followed this pattern, offering male-only instruction or separate institutes for women. While Baylor accepted many contemporary practices unquestioningly, it joined a bare handful of American schools when it admitted women to its first classes. Though Rufus Burleson insisted on separate male and female campuses (a few hundred yards apart) when he became president in 1851, his sometimes dismissive views of female students were actively challenged by Baylor students, other administrators, and trustees.

If Baylor’s early openness to women in its student body continues today, acquiring Tier 1 status (and respect) will require some attention to the absence or under-representation of women elsewhere on campus. They constitute about a third of the faculty, with too few members in its upper ranks. While four hundred colleges and universities today (including three in the Ivy League) have women presidents (and Princeton now has a woman president and a woman provost), Baylor in 2001 has yet to hire a single woman dean outside the School of Nursing.

**Minorities**

As with gender, Baylor has made more progress in racially integrating its student body than its faculty and administration. The University did not break new ground in this area, following the practice other southern (and Southern Baptist) schools for more than a century and quietly dropping its policy of excluding African-Americans only in the mid-1960s. Today all minorities make up a little over 6% of the Baylor faculty, and a smaller fraction of administrators. The national average in higher education, though, is only around 13%, and is artificially elevated by the faculties of traditionally black colleges and universities. The fact that many other schools have failed to achieve greater ethnic diversity does not relieve Baylor of the obligation to try harder. In fact, it can be argued that its history and Christian mission oblige it to do so.
Controversy
As a Tier 1 university, Baylor will also have to become more comfortable with vigorous debate on campus. Recent controversies over intelligent design and anti-abortion displays, as well as memorable “scandals” that too often brought Baylor unwanted or embarrassing publicity in the academic community, leave the impression that we in the Baylor family have not yet found a way to openly and vigorously disagree in ways that educate, rather than antagonize. While some change for the better has undoubtedly occurred, continuing references to ideas, organizations, and speakers that could “never” appear at Baylor because of “the kind of school we are” reflect a lingering insecurity. Historically, Christian universities and colleges have been at the center of many of our country’s most vigorous national debates and in the forefront of movements for social justice and change. Our commitment to Baylor’s mission should be visible in the wider variety of issues we discuss and visitors we invite, and not in the greater number of those we seek to ignore, or keep away. Our mission should broaden the arena of discussion and debate, and not narrow it.
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