

**STATEMENT FOR THE MINUTES BY NINE TRUSTEES
WHO VOTED *AGAINST* THE RESOLUTION
ADOPTED BY THE WESTMINSTER BOARD ON 3/26/08**

Our votes against the Board action initiated by President Peter Lillback against Professor Peter Enns are for the following reasons: (1) because the recommendation by the president is contrary to the carefully-considered judgment of our learned Faculty on the theological issues, expressed in its adoption and affirmation of the Edgar-Kelly motion after a “fair, just and orderly process” established for that very purpose by President Lillback, as he previously reported (see attached 12/1/06 report); (2) because the action failed to provide an appropriate opportunity for Professor Enns to be heard and persuade the Board and, in our view, fails to satisfy requirements of our governing documents (*e.g.*, the Faculty Manual); (3) because, while theological concerns were mentioned, there was little Board discussion of theological specifics; and (4) because, in our view, the action is *not* for the good of the seminary, and in fact, if carried forward, may well be very harmful to the seminary in several ways.

Tuck Bartholomew
Jim Droge
Craig Higgins
Peter Jansson
Russell Johnson
Keith Mitchell
Leo Schuster
Mike Sharrett
John Williams

1 attachment

**The President's Report to the Board on The Faculty Theological Fellowship and the
Current State of the Faculty Theological Discussions**

Peter A. Lillback
December 1, 2006

Finally, let me state the following: I recognize and affirm that WTS is a faculty run school, particularly so in the theology that it teaches and the curriculum it employs. I believe that the faculty must clarify its theological views in the context of our vows, and our Confession. I cannot establish the theology of WTS. Nor do I intend to do so. My responsibilities are to assure that a fair, just and orderly process is followed to permit the resolution and clarification of the theological debates among our faculty.

My leadership is intended to assure that our students, our alumni, our critics as well as our posterity are well served by the faculty's stating, developing, clarifying and articulating our theological commitments. The outcome of this process is not mine to know or to predict. I can only work to provide a process that is just in terms of order, our commitments, and our duties to be reconciled as brethren in Christ. I will continue to pursue these goals. (pp. 1-2)