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President E. D. Burton,  
Univ. of Chicago.

Dear Dr. Burton: When Rev. S. J. Skewington, Pastor of the Hollywood Baptist Church returned from the last N. B. Conv. Atlantic City, he announced on Sunday that he would give a report of the Conv. and at prayer meeting the next week following tell the whole truth about a Brother of the denomination—a matter on which his mouth had been sealed for 3 years. At the prayer meeting he discussed briefly the present conflict between fundamentalists and progressive. Then went in detail into the matter of Bayntons charge at Des Moines that the Univ. of Chicago had misused favors in propagation of false doctrine. He told in detail of the interview with Smith Baynton, Main & Skewington present, and charged that you do not believe in the deity of Jesus Christ. I am not able yet to get at this matter. Write is my pastor and I want to be fair to him. But I would like a little on your
side of the affair for you are an old faithful friend
that must have a fair deal in the matter. You may
be too busy to answer this, or think best to leave it
just where it is, but I thought you ought to know about
it. I am working on an art book in morals for High
Schools—brief compass, and am studying this sum-
mer in the Southern Branch of the Univ. of California.

What was the title of the book written by one of the M. P.
Ehgo Professors on God or California. God the basis of
Morality?

Yours with kinder regards,

Rev. Frank W. Wood,
Oct. 10, 1910 Box 840
Los Angeles, Calif.
July 30, 1923.

My dear Dr. Wood:

I thank you for your kindness in writing to me as you have in your letter of July 10 and for its friendly spirit.

There are three aspects of the matter of which you write, of which only one seems to me very important. The first is, what I believe and teach. The second is Dr. Skevington's attitude to me and his reasons for it. The third is the question whether the University is guilty of violation of trust in giving to its President and other officers the liberty of teaching which it certainly does permit and authorize them to exercise.

On this last point, which is the one that I regard as really important, may I call your attention to the paragraph of the articles of incorporation, beginning "No other test", and found on page 22 of a pamphlet which I am mailing you herewith. I think you will see at once that the Trustees of the University cannot under this charter control the utterances of their professors on matters of doctrine, and that so far from being guilty of violation of trust in not doing so, they would be guilty of violation of trust if they attempt to control them. In other words the University was founded in 1890 on a broad platform of religious toleration which forbids control of the opinions of the faculty by any authority of the University. The professors may be unwise in speaking, but the University cannot forbid or control them.
I am writing to express my deepest gratitude for your assistance during my recent visit. Your kindness and hospitality made my stay truly memorable. I am grateful for the opportunity to have had such a meaningful interaction with you and your family.

I hope this letter finds you well. Please do keep in touch and let me know how I can be of assistance to you in the future.

Thank you once again for everything.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
On the first point, I have never considered it my duty as a teacher to propagate my views, but rather to help my students on the way to arriving at their views. And there are many subjects on which I hold opinions on which I have never had occasion to express myself in my classes. On the other hand long ago I determined that when challenged by my peers I would not deceive or evade. It was for this reason that I answered frankly the questions which Drs. Boynton and Skevington and Main asked me, though, as I told them at the time I had never had occasion to express to my students as I did to them because I had never so taught as to lead them to ask the questions which these brethren asked.

I have no record or exact remembrance of that conversation. On the deity of Christ, I presume I said, for it is the case, that my conception of Jesus does not express itself in terms of substance, but of character and of revelation of the character of God. My mind rests content in the affirmation that Jesus is the revelation of God morally, that in his face we see the light of the glory of God, and it finds no help in affirmation of divine substance. I have no quarrel with those who use the term deity, or with their definition of the term whatever it is. But a different language better expresses my thought.

I am quite unable to say why Dr. Skevington feels it necessary to make the statements you report him as making. We
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I am duty required to me my own, on the communication, and if

necessary to make the appearance, you report him to mankind. We
have been — and I hope still are — good friends and I find no fault with anything that he thinks he ought to say about me, for I am sure he is saying it conscientiously. I do very much regret it if he has accused the University of bad faith and misappropriation of funds. For if he makes these statements he is mistaken and they are calculated to do harm.

I am interested in your account of your own work, and wish you large success in it.

I am sorry I do not recognize the book to which you refer, and cannot name its author.

With kindest regards,

Yours truly,

E. D. Burton

EDB/EC

Rev. Joel Franklin Wood,
R.F.D. 10, Box 690,
Los Angeles, California.
have been - and I have written - keep trying - any I thing to
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not to make it competitive - I do not want -
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Yours truly,
[Signature]

Rev. Peter Thomas Noon
R.P. F. Box 490
Los Angeles, California
La Veta, Colo., Aug. 29, 1913

President of Chicago University,
Chicago, Ill.,

Sir:— I have been informed that the Chicago University keeps two Mohammedan Priests teaching the Mohammedan Religion in its employ. Would you mind telling me if this is correct or not, and if it is what your reasons are for doing so.

I do not wish to appear impertinent in asking this. I am a Baptist layman and desire to keep in touch with what our schools are doing.

Yours Very Respectfully,

Eugene S. vonies
Chicago, September 5, 1913

My dear Sir:—

Your letter of August 29th has come to my hand in the absence of President Harry Pratt Judson on a vacation in Europe. The report to which you refer, that the University of Chicago keeps two Mohammedan priests teaching the Mohammedan religion in its employ, is wholly incorrect, and has not even a specious basis in fact. I do not think it would be at all contrary to the principles of the University to listen to lectures upon any religion by representatives of that religion, since by such lectures we might at least hope to learn how representatives of these religions would like to have Christians think of their religion. In fact, however, this has never, so far as I can remember, been done in the case of any non-Christian religion.

Very respectfully yours,

E.D.B. — L. Acting President

Mr. Eugene S. Vories,
La Veta, Colorado.
Ms. Myrtle S.,

I am grateful for your letter of January 28th, and we come to
my mind in the absence of President Harry Hartung's
my letter to you. The report is shipped. The
factors that the University of Chicago keeps in the
prices, especially the Honorarium Extension to the
prime. I do not think it would be of little consequence
in itself. I do not think it would be of little consequence
in itself. I do not think it would be of little consequence.

To the principles of the University to insist on
recognize now and call on him to bear witness at least, hope
recognize him and bear the weight of these College
money to form his representation of these College.
In the case to have administrative skill at Great College.

Best regards.

Very, Respectfully,

Your President.
PARDON SERMON

of

DR. HIRAM W. THOMAS

delivered at

CENTENNARY METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

October 10, 1860.

Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.

By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be

The life within comes forth in many ways. It transfigures the continent;
finds expression in lines of gentleness, of kindness, of love, and sincerity, or
of coarseness, and cruelty, and deceit, that comes at last to rest upon the face,
and mark it as good or bad. The passions of the soul may be seen in the flush
or pallor of the cheek; in the lights or shadows of the eye; in smiles or frowns;
in laughter or tears. Our Savior spoke often of the inner life; of the heart;
and of its outward expression in words and deeds. His thought here seems to be
that the heart is like a fountain, and that its overflows are found in speech;
in words that translate the feelings; that body forth the inner ideas and principles.
And this being so, He says that all these words pass into judgment, and that by
them we shall be justified or condemned.

If from the "abundance", or the overflows, of the heart the mouth speaketh,
it seems neither unnatural nor out of place that I should at this hour give expres-
sion to some of the things that have for a long time filled my own heart; filled
the hearts of this congregation, and filled also so small place in the public mind.

The first thought that must be present to each mind here is that with this
hour my public ministry in this pulpit, as pastor of this church, must, for the
present, at least, come to an end. The full three years in which a minister may,
under our rule, remain in the same charge have expired. The wisdom or unwisdom
of such a rule is not for us to decide. It is a law, and as much must be obeyed.
Personally I think, however, that it stands in the way of our greatest possible
success as a denomination, especially in the large cities, where many of the
best families desire something more permanent in their church and pastoral
relations. It stands in the way also of saving to the church the growing affect-
tions of the children and youth. It is only natural that these should form strong
attachments for their religious teachers; but when these attachments are so fre-
quently and rudely broken off, the heart is apt to lose its finer feelings, and
with this loss follows too often indifference and a breaking away from the alters
it once loved. I could want no better church than should be grown from a good
Sunday school in twenty years. Our positive itinerancy seems to take the whole
matter very largely out of the hands of God only in so far as He can use a minister
for three years in the same charge. It is driving many of our best preachers away
from us; and of those who remain, scarcely one can be found who is not ready and
anxious to exchange the pastorate for an agency, or an editorship, or any work
that will permit him, and especially his family, to know what it is to have a
home. This is not so in other denominations.

These three years in Centenary have not been without points of special in-
terest. They have been years of hard work for me, and of much faithful effort
on your part. The fortunes of a church—its success or failure—are not all with
the preacher, nor with the congregation. It is a joint work, and the results
belong to both parties. Through the mercy of God I have not lost one Sabbath by
reason of sickness; and through the devotion and good will of the people have
never lacked for an audience. Five years ago this church reported some 1,350
members. Three years ago it reported about 900, and the public audience had
fallen away to less than half that number. This, I think, was not your fault, nor
yet the fault of my worthy and able predecessor. The finances had fallen be-
hind, and the church property was in great need of repairs. The times were the
hardest our city had ever known. Many who had once been able to give freely were
pressed sorely to support their families. As I look back now I almost tremble
to think of the difficulties that were to be overcome; for we have all observed
that when a large society begins to break up and scatter, and to go down hill, it
is a most difficult thing for it to recover its tone and spirit again. This task
I think you have largely achieved. There has not been any large gain in member-
ship. It is true we have received by letter and on probation 277, but we lost
by dismissals 240, leaving a gain of only 37. A number of these went to form the new church on Paulina street; others went to distant parts of the city, and 157 went to the country, or to other towns. Of the 37 gained, 16 have gone to the church above. We have been carrying many names whose residence is not known, and the number reported this year will show a decrease from what it was three years ago; and to give the actual fact I think it should be cut down still more. But there has been an encouraging gain in the congregations and in the finances. To meet the old deficiencies on current expenses and to make the repairs on the church and parsonage you have paid about $5,000. This is so much net gain. Your property is now in good shape, and so far as I know you will close the year free from debt, except that which has long been funded; and a small amount—some hundreds of dollars—of this has been paid the present year. The Sabbath school has paid all its debts and has added quite largely to the library. With the better times your financial troubles should be past.

There is one thing that I have regretted every day during these three years; and that is, that I have not been able to do the pastoral work in any even tolerable sense. In every charge I ever had before, I knew personally every member and every family who attended regularly, and the names of nearly every child. Here it has been impossible. My coming to Centenary was coming back to Chicago. It had served two churches before; I had a large acquaintance in what is called the outside circles of society; had been in a sense missionary to all; and this work came into my hands again, and so I have simply done what I could—visiting the sick, comforting those in sorrow and burying the dead. The work of preparing sermons has been great, as all had to be new. I have given considerable time, too, in lecturing. This field has opened out before me, and it seemed only right to try whilst able to work to make a little money in this way for the rainy days that come to all. Moreover, it has seemed a field of usefulness, and that I was helping you and helping the world whilst trying to help myself. But this I can say, that in ten years' lecturing I have missed only four or five prayer-meetings and never one sermon. But to do this many hard rides had to be taken, and many profitable chances let go.

But in any summary like this of work or of results only the barest approximation is possible. Truth and Christian influences are like seed or leaven
A request of yours, the signing of an agreement with the company, has been in process for some time now.

In order to facilitate the process, I would like to bring to your attention the following points:

1. The agreement needs to be signed by both parties to be legally binding.
2. There are certain clauses that need to be reviewed and agreed upon.
3. The timeline for the agreement is quite tight, and we need to ensure that all necessary documents are completed and submitted in a timely manner.

I am available at any time to discuss these points further and to address any concerns you may have.

Thank you for your cooperation and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Best regards,

[Your Name]
sown in the field or hidden away in the great mass of our living humanity. It may disappear from sight; it may seemingly be lost or die, and the sowers may forget their labor. But God forgets not, and truth and love are immortal, and He watches every germ, wherever cast, and will brood over it by the life of His own holy spirit and nurse it into many hearts yet wild and unreclaimed. His word shall not return unto Him void. Many thousand strangers coming from all over the land have worshiped with us here, and the words of this pulpit have found their way through the press to prisons, and palaces, and sick-beds, and to the homes of lonely dwellers far out upon the prairies. We can only follow this wide sowing with our prayers and leave the results to the keeping care of Him who watches over all.

Another thought comes to us all at this hour, and it is useless to try to put it away. I refer to the peculiarly unpleasant and critical position in which I have been compelled to stand for the last two years; unpleasant alike for you and for me. This did not arise from any disturbance or want of agreement in the management of our own affairs, for in these we have dwelt in peace and harmony. It is true that at times little waves or ripples of excitement came to the surface when words were spoken from this desk that to some seemed too broad or too bold. But thoughtful minds weighed these words, and I think in the main your judgment was that only the truth had been told; or at least that such was certainly the speaker's aim.

But the conference felt called upon to take part in our affairs, and in this way the peculiar complications arose.

At the session of the conference two years ago, after my character had been regularly passed—passed without a word of complaint, as it had been for many long years,—my name was taken before a "committee on conference relations." This "committee" was, to me, at least, a new thing in Methodism—a kind of Methodist grand jury, where complaints could be lodged without the one complained against knowing just what they were, or who made them. At least I never knew, nor do I to this day know, who entered the complaints, nor in any definite sense what they were. This "committee" simply reported that "grave complaints concerning the teachings of H. W. Thomas had come to their ears." The conference went into "secret session"—I have been in Masonic lodges for twenty years, and I never
knew one guarded with more seeming care—to consider the matter. Of course I recognize their right and duty to examine my life and my teachings; but I thought the method pursued, if not irregular, was at least peculiar. However, I submitted to it without even a protest. The matter occupied almost the exclusive attention of the conference for, I think, five secret sessions. Speeches were made, criticisms passed, resolutions offered, and votes taken, and all this without anything but rumor and hearsay as a basis. My printed sermons had been before the public for years, but not one was produced as a basis of charge. My poor little life and work were pulled and picked until I grew sick and weary. Resolutions were prepared by different ones for me to sign, but, not suiting me, I would not do it. Finally a request was made that I submit a paper myself. Worn out in body and spirit, and not wishing to play the part of a lawyer—and I could not if I would,—at the hour of midnight I sat down and in thirty minutes wrote out a candid statement of my views, especially on the points where I thought it possible that there might be a difference. I wanted to know if I was orthodox enough for a Methodist pulpit. I wanted something definite upon which to act. I drew up, as it were, a bill of charges against myself, and placed it in their hands. Before this, however, a resolution had been passed saying "that after careful inquiry we are constrained to apprehend that much of the teaching of our brother, H. W. Thomas, is at variance with the doctrines of Methodism, and detrimental to the interests of evangelical religion;" and asking me to give assurance such teachings should not be repeated; or that I "accede to their request and retire from the Methodist pulpits." This was passed by a vote of 99 to 54. It was a substitute for a resolution previously offered, simply asking me to be more careful in my manner of stating religious doctrines.

After taking a day to consider my statement of views, the conference passed lengthy resolutions reaffirming its previous action, censuring the statement itself, and protesting against the utterance of such views in Methodist pulpits as "disloyal to covenant obligations," and closing with the following words: "That, notwithstanding the character of the paper submitted by Dr. Thomas, yet in view of the pledge made by him, setting forth his purpose as to his future teachings, and hoping that he will be faithful to said promises, and that he will respect the judgment of his brethren thus made known to him, and not desiring to cut short his
I am about to join the army and I am feeling very nervous about leaving my family and friends behind. I am not sure what to expect, but I know that it will be a challenging experience. I am grateful to have been given this opportunity to serve my country.

I have been preparing for this day for a long time, and I am excited to be able to contribute to the effort. However, I am also aware of the risks involved and I am praying for safety for myself and my fellow soldiers.

I know that I will miss my loved ones, but I am determined to make the most of this opportunity. I hope to learn new skills and make new friends. I am also looking forward to the sense of accomplishment that comes with serving my country.

Please pray for me and my fellow soldiers as we embark on this journey. I will do my best to serve my country and come back safe.

Thank you for your support.

[Signature]
ministry, which, however, unsatisfactory in the past, we believe may be useful in the future, we deem it best in the interest of charity and peace to take no further action in the premises for the present." The only "pledge" I ever made was in the written statement that I submitted, and was in these words: "Owing to the widespread misapprehension in the public mind as to what I really do believe and teach, I feel that it is but just to the church and to myself to say that in the future I shall endeavor to so express myself as to guard so far as may be against the possibility of being misunderstood; and shall continue as best I can to do the work of a faithful Christian minister." This promise I have tried to keep. And I stated verbally to the "special committee" I believed myself to be in essential accord with the doctrines of the church, with such latitude of expression and belief as were enjoyed by every Methodist preacher, and that I should certainly as an honorable man not remain in the church with the view of creating dissensions. But they knew me, and all who know me at all know, that if I am anything I am honest, and honest in the pulpit, and that as long as I try to preach at all, I must preach what I believe. I belong to an honest family—we were taught strict integrity, and I don't believe that one of my brothers or sisters ever told a willful falsehood, or knowingly cheated a living mortal out of one cent. I despise double-dealing, and I should expect that the spirit of my father and mother would smite me if I lied anywhere, and especially in the pulpit.

With these resolutions and censures hanging over me, I was returned to my work here. You received me kindly, and have, as far as you could, stood by me, and the heart of the great generous public has been so near that in my darkest hours I could feel its warm pulsations of life. It is difficult to conceive of our being placed in a more delicate or trying position. What was I to do? Some say I ought to have stepped out. But I had the interest of twenty-five years' work in Methodism. Moreover, the conference had begun the attack, and I would not go out under censure, and could only wait their further action. But to attempt to do work under such circumstances was very much like a physician or a teacher trying to practice or teach if the boards of medicine or education should publicly pronounce them unsafe. Others say it was hardly honorable for me to remain in the church with views contrary to its doctrines. But that was the very question that
was then, and is now, at issue. I believed then, and I believe now, that I was and am within the pale of a liberal orthodoxy. I was always taught, and by our literature, and from John Wesley himself, that Methodism was the most tolerant of all churches as to personal liberty in thought; that it put its great emphasis on personal piety and holy living; and believing that, I was unwilling to believe that it would make an exception in any case; that it would make formal complaint because of views so moderate, and that were not obtrusively thrust forward, but used in the conscientious conviction of their truthfulness, and for the one purpose of saving men from doubt and sin. And I think it was a great mistake to make all this trouble over so little an affair.

And now, what is the sum and substance of my doubt and unbelief? Have I ever doubted, or cast doubt upon, the existence of the living God? Never. Have I doubted or caused others to doubt the divinity of Christ or the immortality of the soul? Never. Have I ever doubted the great spiritual doctrine of the church in reference to prayer and regeneration, and the witness of the spirit, and holiness of heart and life? Never. You will search in vain through all my printed sermons for one syllable or shadow of doubt on any of these subjects. I have not, myself, read one in ten of these discourses after they were in print; but I know it can not be in them, and for the simple reason that it is not in me. And I claim more, that the final results of my teachings are not to unsettle thinking men, but to settle them; to give them something on which to stand. My methods, it is true, are in the main those of induction and inquiry; leading, or trying to lead, the mind up to a point where it perceives and feels the truth, and hence will embrace it; rather than to declaim and dogmatise and try to force the intellectual or spiritual assent. But I quarrel not with those of my brethren in the ministry who prefer a different course. We must each try to do our work in the way it is given us to do, or that we best can.

But what are the points on which my views may, and I suppose do, differ from some others? These I gave in my written statement to the conference. They relate to three points: The atonement, future punishment, and the inspiration of the scriptures. But let it be remembered that I believe in all these; but my theory or explanation is not the same as that held by many, and I suppose the majority of
The text is not legible due to the quality of the image. It appears to be a page with handwritten text, possibly a letter or a document. Without clearer handwriting or a digital representation, it's challenging to transcribe accurately.
Methodist preachers. I believe in the atonement; but I don’t believe in the penal or butcher theory that makes Christ a sinner—treats Him as a sinner, and punishes Him as such to make good the threatened penalty of a broken law. To me such a view is unreasonable and unjust. It makes God an angry tyrant rather than a loving father. It leaves no place at all for mercy. Most Methodists seek relief in the governmental view which makes the atonement a measure for securing the moral order of the universe. This I can easily accept and believe, if the idea of penal substitution is left out. But neither Mr. Wesley nor Watson ever got fully away from the strictly penal idea of a literal imputation of sin to Christ, and of the punishment of Christ for sin. I believe that God loved the world—loved it just as much as ever Christ loved it; that the love of Christ was but the vicariousness of God’s everlasting love coming forth to seek and to save the lost; to “draw all men unto Him;” to life them out of their sins, and hence out of their guilt and penalty. I believe, O, how deeply I believe, in the divinity of Christ; I believe that He suffered for us, suffered, O, how much more than tongue can tell, that we might know His love; that we might be won to His life; that we might be redeemed from sin and made like Himself; might come in our measure into the same law of love, of vicariousness, and suffering for others. But I do not believe that He was ever punished as guilty, or that the penalty of the law was ever executed upon Him. To me such a belief unsettles the very foundations of all Law and justice. It is a stumbling-block in the way of thousands of honest minds and hearts. I do not believe it nor will I preach it. But the moral or paternal view I do believe. I reached it through much mental struggle and suffering. I rest in it. To me it is the gospel; and that, and that only, will I preach. I expect to live in it and to die in it. And I have not a shadow of doubt that it will yet be the theology of the world. It loses nothing; it saves and harmonizes all. Before this great law of vicarious love, unbelief is reverent and silent; sin feels the rebuke of a Father’s tears, and the penitent is pardoned and welcomed back to His arms. It is a belief that saves, not by cold substitution and imputation, and the punishment of the innocent instead of the guilty; not this, but a belief that touches and moves the very centers of the soul, and in all its practical effects tends to make man like his Savior in love and suffering and sacrifice. But the fact
that others hold any of the old views is no war to my fellowship with them, and I seek to win man to this higher truth by the life of love it keeps ever warm within me, rather than by dogmatizing about it.

Another point of difference is in reference to future punishment. In my statement to the conference I said, and I say now, that I never doubted the fact of after-death punishment, for those who die in their sins. I believe the law, that sin must bring loss and suffering to the sinner, will abide in force forever. I believe that it is founded in the nature of things; that it is everlasting; that it operates in all ages and in all worlds. And I believe also that, as long as any being remains on the side of sin, or is a sinner, so long that being must suffer. There is a sense also in which I think even those who turn to the right may always suffer loss, because of having done wrong. We can not recall wasted years, even in this world; and none of us can be what we might have been had we improved all the past; and this law, I suppose, carries over to the future. And in this modified sense there may be to many souls endless loss. I believe in the strength and integrity of the government of God; that proper punishment will be visited upon all who violate the laws of that government. I believe that God is eternally just, and that His mercy is from everlasting to everlasting. I believe that He is the father of all souls, and that He will deal in a tender love with all. He will do what is right and best for all. But I do not believe in the old, terrible ideas of a literal lake of fire, in which the souls and bodies of men and women shall be tormented forever. John Wesley believed in a hell of literal fire, of material fire. He says there is no such thing as immaterial fire; and in answer to the objection that such a material fire would destroy anybody on which it might act, he says that God has mercifully given us an example that such is not the case, in the asbestos, a kind of flax that no heat could consume. And then he says that if it is not material fire it is something worse. Dr. Williamson, of the First church, says that that is now the theology of Methodism; that it is believed by all except a few ministers who are more tender-hearted than was the Savior. I pity any man who can say such things; and I pity the church, if all save a few tender-hearted preachers believe and teach as he does on that subject. Whatever future sufferings for sin may be, I do not believe in any such a hell of material fire, nor do I believe
that those sufferings can be so severe as such torment, not to say with Wesley
that they are worse, and they they are forever. Such a thought is absolutely
abhorrent and destructive of all ideas of either justice or mercy. Such a thought
makes the idea of God impossible. We cannot with such a picture before us as mill-
ions of His children—those whom He called into being—suffering forever the agonies
of such a hell, think of Him as good; and hence cannot think of Him as God; for to
think of any being less than absolute perfection, or that might be better, is not
to think of God at all. If I believed such a doctrine of future punishment; if I
believed that millions who once lived here were in such torments and must stay
there forever, if I believed that, I should never smile again. If I believed it I
could wish I had never been born; I could wish the world had never been made, that
mankind had never been created. If I believed that, I could wish that the race
might perish from the earth; that star after star might fade out till all the heav-
ens were only blackness. If I believed that, I could wish that the universe might
sink into nothingness and that God himself might be annihilated. I don’t believe
it; and I don’t see how any sensible man who believes in God can believe it. To
teach future punishment in any such severe and terrible literality and endlessness,
is to make infidels and atheists of the people, or to drive sensible men away from
the church in disgust. If it is said that God teaches it in the bible, then so
much the worse for God and the bible. Thoughtful people will say: You can take
both; we will have nothing to do with them. But all these same thoughtful people
are ready to believe in a reasonable God, and in a just government over man, both
here and hereafter.

As to the endlessness of punishment, I have said that the law that punishes
sin is itself endless; and for aught I know, in the other state souls may pass
from right to wrong, or from wrong to right; and in the new creations, that may go
on forever, there may always be souls suffering under the consequences of wrong-
doing. But to say that any one soul, or the same soul, will forever remain in
sin, is more than I can say; and hence I cannot affirm endless suffering for any
soul. I believe that we go out of this world free to good or to evil; and I be-
lieve that if a soul repent and turn to God, even in hell, He will not cast it
away. This whole question is too large a one to be so easily settled in thought
as some might suppose. The character of God is bound up in it. The destiny of millions and millions who have lived in the past, as well as all those who shall live in the future, is bound up in it. Personally I can not limit all of God's saving work to these few years on earth. To me this is only the beginning, and all the vast future is filled with life and love and activity; the love and sacrifice that have passed away from our shores; the love of fathers and mothers, of brothers and sisters; the love of patriots and philanthropists. It is all over there; not hated or quenched by the waters of death, but quickened and glorified. All the love of God revealed in Jesus Christ is over there as well as here. The ministry of all the angels is active there. And to that bright future I look and hasten with the hope that the lost, not found here, may be found there; that many souls bound in sin here may find deliverance there; and that the day may come when all the souls breathed into being by the life of God may be brought into harmony with His laws. And when I look at the faith of the early church I find that it shared this hope very largely in all the early life of the first few Christian centuries. It was orthodox then to share this larger hope. Dr. Beecher has, I think, made it plain that of the six theological schools of those early centuries, four were Universalist in their faith; one believed in the annihilation of the wicked; and only one—the Latin school who had the Roman law—believed in endless punishment for the lost. And I tell you, my friends, there has to come a reopening of this subject, and with this will come modified and more hopeful views of the destiny of our race. The question is: Can a Methodist preacher say these things? Well, our articles of faith have not one word on the subject of endless punishment, nor has the apostles' creed, and that is what I joined under, and have all along felt that I should be true to; and I have felt that I could share the larger hope and not be false. The last general conference added the "Standard Authorities." I have said I can not accept Wesley's sermon on hell, nor can I agree with Watson. He argues that God makes the penalty of sin as severe as possible, and the reward of virtue as great as possible. I suppose He properly rewards or punishes all sorts; but I hardly think He makes any sinner as miserable as it is possible to make a soul; nor that virtue receives the largest possible reward; but rather that there as well as here, things are cast upon a scale that lies between the extremes. But
I am unable to read the text on this page as it is not legible.
this should be said for Mr. Wesley, that in his later years he seems to have come into a larger hope for humanity. And it is a fact, also, that there is scarcely an orthodox German divine of any note in Europe that does not hold to the idea of a future probation, and that belief is based upon the teachings of the Bible. It is true, also, that such is the faith of a large part of the clergy of the Church of England, and of very many of the Protestant Episcopal church in our land. The views I hold would not cause even a ripple of excitement in that church.

There is just one more point, and that is the inspiration of the scriptures. I fully believe, with our articles of faith, that the scriptures contain all things necessary for salvation. I believe that the will of God is revealed in the scriptures. I accept implicitly the teachings of Jesus Christ, though I do not suppose in all cases we have His precise language; yet I believe we have in substance His thought, its consensus, in so far that we may know His mind and His doctrine.

But I do not believe that all parts of all the sixty-six books in the Bible are equally inspired, or of equal authority and value. Nor do I believe that all the books of the Old Testament are critically infallible. Any attempt to maintain such a view is, in my opinion, not only utterly useless, but puts a burden upon the church that makes it weaker and not stronger. The whole question of inspiration has to be reopened. The "verbal theory", in my judgment, has to be given up. Indeed, with most thoughtful minds, I think it has been given up. The popular views of many will have to be modified. And yet I believe the Bible will be more and more revered as the book of God; as heaven's highest revelation and law to man. But this will not come in any intelligent sense by shutting our eyes to facts and to intelligent criticism.

Another question is suggested by this hour. What is to be the policy of the Methodist church in reference to the personal liberty of thought her ministers and members may enjoy? Her antecedents have been from the days of Wesley largely tolerant. Methodism has been a church of song, of prayer, of experience, of warm-hearted piety, and of hard work. No man is in more perfect accord with all this than myself. This is the life of the church. But our denomination has grown to be strong, and wealthy, and popular, and with this, I fear, that there are tendencies to an ecclesiasticism, and to a rigidness, not to say a narrowness of dogma-
tism, that promises not good but evil. Our legislation has pointed in this way for the last dozen years. John Wesley made the conditions of membership to be a simply desire to be saved from sin and to lead a holy life. For a long time, in the most vigorous years of the church, we had only the covenant of baptism and the apostles' creed as a vow and expression of belief on the part of those coming into full communion. But now, if the rule is enforced, each applicant for membership must assent to the whole twenty-five articles of faith. What other orthodox church in this country requires so much? Until last May we had the articles of faith as a rule or test of orthodoxy for the clergy. The general conference at that time added the "Standard Authorities" and made belief in these obligatory upon the clergy. That, I fear, was an unfortunate and unwise step. It is a step in the direction of turning away from the authority of the Bible, and binding men to the traditions of the past. It was just this in the Roman church that made the reformation a necessity. And all this stringency of legislation—this backward movement—is right in the face of the marvelous growth of light and freedom in this wonderful century. It pains me to see and to say these things. I long, and I had hoped, and I still hope, to see our church becoming larger and freer in its thought and spirit; to see it welcoming all men who love song and prayer and purity; to see it open to all the light and growth of the near and great future of our day. Not to be, and to do, this will be to turn the more thoughtful and sincere away from our doors. The human mind and heart in our time must and will be free; and more and more are thoughtful men and women in the church and out of the church calling for room to think for themselves, and that, too, without a priest standing over them to tell them after all just what they must believe, or be denied fellowship. This condition of things is not peculiar to the Methodist church alone; it is present in all—even in the Catholic church the influence is felt. I am told that in this city alone there are not less than 2,500 young men born and baptized in that church, who never enter its doors. The only way to fight the battles of faith in this day is to be open to all the light of science and philosophy and all reason and truth; to be honest; to be filled with the love of God and man; and in this spirit the people are glad to hear, glad to accept, what to them seems true and right. A mighty burden is upon our age—a groaning, a crying for truth and rest that makes the very air sympathetic.
The pulpit of our day ought to stand on the mountain-tops to catch the first rays of the morning; it ought to be low down in the valley of sense, where men feel, but do not think; and everywhere it ought to stand radiant with the light of sincerity and true manly and Christly sympathy.

My friends, this night I close my twenty-fourth year of itinerancy in the west—thirteen years in the Iowa and eleven years in the Rock River conference. Years of incessant toil have they been, and of but little earthly compensation, but rich in the friendships and love of the people. I would not recall them if I could. Our children lie buried in four cemeteries, but the shadows lengthen and we shall soon be with them in the beautiful land. You have been kind to us here, and tenderly considerate in the hours of trial. God will reward you. I know not what our future shall be. For nearly eight years—ever since I preached the funeral of poor Mr. Coon—I have been under some suspicion of heresy. I have borne it all as best I could, and tried to work on; but no one, not even my own family, has known how hard it has been to bear these things; to feel a sense of desertion, a turning against me of the ministers—not all, thank God!—of the church in which I have labored so long. My nature is very delicate and sensitive, and when others could laugh I can only weep. But this I say: I have tried to be true. I have borne these things till every fibre of my soul lies almost bare and bleeding; and I find coming upon me, what is farthest from me by nature, an undefined fear of man—a fear of being struck in the dark; not a fear of all men, thank God!—for only by His Love, and by the help and sympathy of thousands of true, generous souls, have I been upheld.

And now for the future. I shall try to be true to myself; true to my God, and my race; true to the truth He gives me. I must, I will be free—free to live, and think, and grow with the life of my age; and this at any cost. I would rather die in a hovel, with the crown of liberty on my brow, than to wear the chains of a slave in a palace.

And now may the Lord God bless you all; may He bless the thousands who have worshiped with us here, and the many thousands more to whom the words of this pulpit have been borne by the press. And may we all come together at last in the land "far away among the stars," where parting shall be no more.
Dear Brother Blake:

Your second letter did not reach me till my return from my vacation. I did not know just how to answer, not because I do not think we have a good case, but because I do not know just how to place it before you. I am distressed that you (of all men) should be dissatisfied with the University, and I am most anxious that you should see and appreciate our point of view.

We are not indifferent when we see our cherished views assailed, and others advanced which we regard as erroneous. We are grieved and disturbed and if these teachings are advocated in an offensive way, we are indignant. Why then do we not cast out the offender?

That is a fair question and demands a fair and a sufficient answer. In trying to give such an answer there are several considerations that seem to me to be very strong, even conclusive.

1. A great University is instituted for the purpose of prosecuting the search after truth, as well as for purposes of instruction. All graduate departments are seeking to extend the boundaries of knowledge. And as a matter of fact this is being done all the time. New facts are discovered. New theories are advanced. Around these theories discussion centers, often rages fiercely. They are examined and tested in every conceivable way, defended, attacked, developed, modified, sometimes discredited, sometimes in one form or another established solidly.

2. It is in this way that the boundaries of knowledge are enlarged, new truth discovered and new light thrown on truths long accepted. Investigators are constantly making mistakes. They think they have discovered something when
Dear Brother Blake,

Your second letter did not reach me, as I had not seen you in person. I'll give you the good news that you have not failed me in your promise. I am glad of it. The good news is not so important as the promise, and I am glad you have fulfilled it. I provide a bit of a forecast for you, and I think you might be pleased to hear it. I am glad you are going to the University, and I think you will like it. I am glad you are going to the University, and I think you will like it. I am glad you are going to the University, and I think you will like it.

We are not intelligent men, we see and appreciate a few merits.

We are not intelligent men, we see and appreciate a few merits.

We are not intelligent men, we see and appreciate a few merits.

Why then do we not see our old friend?

That is a fair question.

In trying to give such an answer there are several considerations that seem to me to be very strong, even convincing.

A great University is important for the purpose of producing the best sort of truth as well as for purposes of instruction. All graduates of the best institutions are equipped to extend the foundations of knowledge, and as a matter of fact it is one of the best ways to do so.

We have not been able to do this.

We have not been able to do this.

We have not been able to do this.

Let us examine and test in every conceivable way, generally accepted, what we have not been able to do this.

Sometimes, inevitably, sometimes inevitably, sometimes inevitably.

In his book on the problem of knowledge, the author...

If in this way we take the problem of knowledge seriously...

New facts are discovered, and new light thrown on future knowledge. Investigations...

The facts they have discovered something new...
they haven't. They give forth false views. These are examined, discussed, weighed and tested and eventually disproved and as a result discredited and discarded. Sometimes something of real value is brought out. Whatever it is, whether true or false, it must run the gauntlet of critical investigation and discussion. It is in this way that the truth finally emerges and is recognized and accepted. And no other way than this of investigation and discussion has ever been found for extending our knowledge of the truth.

3. Take the Bible. The human mind is so constituted that it is compelled to ask.- Is there a God to make a revelation? Is this God's word? How, when, where was it made? Does this book contain God's word? What does it teach? What do its teachings imply? Have I got all the truth out of it? Or is there yet much to be found out? These and ten thousand other questions must be asked. In the effort to answer them limitless discussion ensues. Little by little out of all this comparison and conflict of views the truth emerges. It can be found and accredited in no other way.

4. Does it not go without saying that all this study and investigation and discussion must be free? If it isn't free it isn't honest. If it isn't free it is worthless. If it isn't free it isn't investigation or discussion at all. It is a fraud, a illusion, a mockery. It is just this denial of freedom of thought and discussion that we Baptists have always fought against. We have always demanded and battled for liberty to think for ourselves and to speak our thoughts. We have never recognized the authority of any pope or assembly or conference to tell us what we might think or what we might say. And it would seem as though an institution under Baptist auspices should be the last place in the world where freedom of investigation and belief and discussion is prohibited.
5. There are grave perils connected with freedom of investigation and discussion, but the denial of freedom is death and destruction. You are concerned about the serious perils of freedom. I am also concerned about them, deeply concerned. They are real and often distressing. False views are entertained and disseminated. But the dangers and damage are for the most part temporary. Freedom cures its own disorders. Further investigation, fuller discussion reveal the falseness of these views and overthrow them. And absolutely nothing else can do this. It is precisely through this conflict of views that truth emerges and is established. I have absolute confidence in the final triumph of truth. And so I have absolute confidence in the final triumph of the essential truths of the gospel. I look without any alarm whatever on the attacks made on the gospel. I sorrow over the temporary harm done, but I know that these very attacks are absolutely certain, in the long run, to result in the strengthening of weak points in the defenses, and in illustrating the glory of the gospel. You question in your last letter to me whether Bible investigation, so called, has advanced the cause of truth. I am quite certain that this is a mistaken view, and that such investigation has advanced the cause of truth immeasurably. It is an undeniable fact that the essential teachings of the gospel are today established in the faith of mankind as they never were before. Modern Science and criticism have worked upon them ceaselessly for a hundred and fifty years not only without injury, but with the result that they are more firmly established and better understood than ever. The very perils of freedom are temporary and in the end are overruled for good.

But deny freedom in a University and what would be the result? Intellectual stagnation or moral dishonesty in the faculty. The loss of all self respecting teachers. The shunning of the institution by all men of real ability and worth.
There are three parties connected with the theme of investigation. You may
consider and proclaim the benefit of the theme in respect of investigation. I am not concerened about the benefit of the theme. They are not of much assistance. False views are not...

I am not concerned. The benefit of the theme cannot be for the most part
inconsistent. The theme cannot be for the most part. Further investigation is not.

Deception cannot be the measure of the views and ideas. And...
The loss of all real students. The virtual closing of the graduate departments, because it is to those departments that the real students come. Utter condemnation and repudiation throughout the scholarly world, which of course is the University's world. The general valuation of the utterances and publications of the institutions professors as unworthy, probably unscholarly and disingenuous, because the utterances of men who were not permitted to utter their real thoughts.

Suppose for example we should cast Professor Foster out of the faculty because of his views as published. What would be the result?

It would become known at once throughout the whole civilized world that The University of Chicago had formally suppressed freedom of speech. The great daily newspapers would be full of cartoons showing groups of professors with padlocks on their mouths, Spof Johnston Meyers telling them what they are at liberty to say, - of liberty slain in the house of its friends, etc. etc. It would be one of the greatest opportunities ever presented to the cartoonists, and would be improved to the uttermost. Editorials would inform the public that professors in this University could no longer think or speak their own thoughts. The reputation of the University as a great School of research would be utterly ruined. Graduate students would no longer flock to its halls in greater numbers than to any other institution in America, as they do now. Self respecting professors of eminence would leave us. Professors of real ability would not come to us. We would be the laughing stock of scholars the world over. And perhaps, worst of all, we should give the lie to the proud boast of the Baptists through past generations that our denomination always has been and always will be the champion of freedom.

I want you if possible to see our position and our embarrassments.
The purpose of this essay is to examine the academic freedom and opportunities for research that the new universities offer. Unlike the universities in Europe, which were primarily institutions for the training of clergy and the advancement of knowledge, the new universities in America were more focused on the development of research and the pursuit of knowledge. The founding of these institutions was driven by a desire to create a space for intellectual inquiry and the free exchange of ideas.

The new universities in America were founded with the intention of providing access to higher education for the many. They were established with the goal of democratizing education and ensuring that all individuals had the opportunity to pursue knowledge. This was a radical departure from the traditional universities in Europe, which were heavily influenced by the Church and were not open to all. The new universities in America were committed to the idea of academic freedom and the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake.

I want you to be aware of the new universities and their significance.
Professor Foster's views are no more acceptable to me than to you. He has disturbed many good men throughout the Christian church. As I wrote you, I do not know a single man who accepts his views. He does not represent the University in the slightest degree in the views he expresses. Scores of our professors are all the time publishing views that are everywhere received with acclaim. Why not judge the University by this great mass of highly valuable publication instead of by the erroneous views of one man? There is all the difference in the world between endorsing a man's views and silently suffering them to be uttered, in order to avoid the crime of denying intellectual freedom. We do not endorse Dr. Foster's views. But we do endure them that we may not be charged with the crime of slaying liberty in the house of its friends. We ought to receive sympathy instead of condemnation. The University ought to be commended instead of being criticized.

You know I think, my feeling toward you,—how great a place in my esteem and in my heart you have always had. Knowing you as I do, I cannot but feel that if you look at all sides of this matter you will not condemn us. Put yourself in our place. That should be easy, for you were the President of our Board and if you had remained in Chicago you would be its President still. Put yourself in our place then and I believe you will feel the difficulty of our position. Would you not say what I say. "This man's views are abhorrent to me. I wish he would take himself off. But am I not in danger of doing a more serious injury by casting him out than by enduring him? If I cast him out I shall be in danger of seriously discrediting and injuring the University. If I endure him, he will discredit himself in no long time. Although he is abusing his freedom, yet for the sake of the very freedom he abuses I will endure him, even at the cost of misconception by good men."

Give the University time Brother Blake and see if the result does not justify its cause.
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I want to add one thing. Do not accept newspaper reports as to what any of us have said. Not always, but almost invariably we are misrepresented. What you have seen about Burton and Soares and Votaw have been pure fabrications. You perhaps saw the report of an interview with me on my return from my vacation in which I was represented as saying the University would need nothing more from Mr. Rockefeller. It was a pure invention. I said nothing remotely resembling this. This is a good illustration. The papers want something sensational and when they print anything sensational about our professors it must be discounted from 90 to 100 per cent.

Forgive this long letter but I am beyond measure anxious that you shall not misjudge the University.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing a clipping from last Monday's Tribune giving excerpts from Dr. Foster's sermon of last Sunday, and also one from the Baptist Record telling how one of our graduates is assisting Evangelist Sunday in his work. It is only a sample of the evangelistic work the graduates of our Divinity School are doing.

Most cordially yours,

(T. W. GOODSPEED)
I want to end one point. Do not expect newspapers to report as to what
my party have said. We have never had a newsagent put almost in
appropriately the microphones.
What you have seen about Britain and Europe and Vietnam have been mere reports.
You cannot see the report of an interview with me on my return from my
vacation in which I was represented as saying the University would need notice
more from Mr. Rockeferter. It was a pure invention. I said nothing remotely
resembling that. This is a good illustration. The parties want something
senseless and men feel that anti-senseless senseless would suit our purposes if
must be discarded from 90 to 100 per cent.
Perceive this long letter but I cannot measure exactly what you
shall not misjudge the University.
I am taking the liberty of discussing a clipping from last morning's
Times giving excerpts from Mr. Rockeferter's version of last Sunday; and also one
from the Daily Record telling me of one of our presidents who satisfies the
membrane of anti-work. I refer only a sample of the European-type work for
courts of our primitive 8000 mile gone.

Most cordially yours,

T. W. GOODWIN.