

7/19/09

Chicago July 8, 1909.

7

President Harry Pratt Judson,
Banff, Alberta, Canada.

My dear Chief:-

After writing what I did yesterday I was astounded a moment ago by an American reporter who came into the office to ask me to confirm my interview in the Journal of last evening. I told him that I was not aware that I had given any interview to the Journal, and he gave me the delightful information that I was credited with saying that Johnston Myers would be dropped from the Board of the Divinity School when his term expired, and further embellishments which are along that line. The fact is that a Journal reporter came to me and I used my formula which I have repeated a dozen times within the last two weeks, that nobody in the University had any authority to say anything about the case, but that the statement which Dr. Harper made in his Convocation Statement of December, 1901, had been since that time the authoritative formulation of the University's position on academic freedom. The statement that I referred to in any way, shape, or manner any action that might be taken by the Divinity Board is a lie out of whole cloth. I do not suppose you need to be told this, but we are simply keeping our mouths closed here, and if you see any newspaper statements to the contrary you may be assured that they are lies like this one.

Sincerely,

Small

The University of Chicago
Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences

ALBION W. SMALL
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
AND
LAW OF UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
ARTS AND LITERATURE
THE AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF SOCIOLOGY

Chicago, Ill., 1907.

President Mark P. Taylor,
Baptist, Chicago, Canada.

My dear Sir:-

After writing what I did yesterday I was
reminded a moment ago by an American reporter who came
into the office to ask me to contribute to the
Journal of last evening. I told him that I was not aware
that I had given any interview to the Journal, and he
gave me the following information that I was credited with
saying that the matter would be dropped from the Board
of the University which was his own explanation of the
embellishments which are along this line. The fact is that
a Journal reporter came to me and I used my formula which
I have repeated a dozen times within the last two weeks,
that nobody in the University had any authority to say
anything about the case, but that the statement which Dr.
Harper made in his house on the 10th of September, 1907,
had been shown that this statement was a distortion of the
University's position on academic freedom. The statement
was that I intended to do my best, and that I intended to
show that the case was a distortion of the University's
position on academic freedom. I do not suppose he would be told
this, but we are clearly bound to make known here, and
if you see any newspaper statement to the contrary you may
be assured that they are like this one.

Sincerely,
Albion W. Small

DANIEL S. GAGE
PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY AND BIBLE

Westminster College

FOUNDED 1849
FULTON, MISSOURI

104

June 8, 1918.

*Academic
freedom*

President Harry Pratt Judson,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.;
My dear Sir:-

The current issue of the "EDUCATIONAL REVIEW",
of which, as you of course know, Butler, of Columbia Univ., is
Editor, contains a reference to the recent dismissal of a cer-
tain Professor from your Faculty, which, it seems to me, ought
to be rebuked in no uncertain terms.
It is on p. 90.

I think that all right-minded men felt that the University
took a course which was ~~not only wise but~~ both wise, and especially
timely, in view of the loose attitude toward the general prob-
lem of "academic freedom." Butler's position is simply rotten,
and should be exposed as such. I hope it will be.

Yours, with apologies for intruding on your
time and for seeming to tell you and the University what your
business is,

Daniel S. Gage

101

Wheaton College
FOUNDED 1829
KULTON, MISSOURI

DANIEL S. GAGE
PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY AND LOGIC

June 8, 1918.

President Harry Pratt Jenson,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.
My dear Sir:

The current issue of the "EDUCATIONAL REVIEW",
of which, as you of course know, Baker, of Columbia Univ., is
Editor, contains a reference to the recent dismissal of a cor-
tain Professor from your faculty, which, it seems to me, ought
to be reported in no uncertain terms.

It is on p. 80.

I think that all right-minded men felt that the University
both wise, and especially
took a course which was not unwarrantable right and
timely; in view of the loose attitude toward the general prop-
erty of "academic freedom." Baker's position is already rotten,
and should be exposed as such. I hope it will be.

Yours, with apologies for intruding on your
time and for needing to tell you and the University that your
business is,

Daniel S. Gage

Chicago, June 10, 1918

My dear Sir:

Your favor of the 8th inst. is received.

I have looked up the article to which you refer, and regard it as not worthy of attention. Thanking you very much for calling it to my notice, I am,

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mr. Daniel S. Gage
Westminster College
Fulton, Missouri

Academic
Freedom

Chicago. Oct 7 1949

Dear Brother Blake

Religious Liberty
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} ~~false and pernicious~~. We are grieved and disturbed and if these ~~false~~ teachings are advocated in an offensive way, we are indignant. Why then do we not cast out the offender?

question
That is a fair answer 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.

in
2. It is 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 they haven't. They give forth false views.

Chicago, Oct 7 1914

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 (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 false and pernicious. We are grieved and disturbed and if these false teachings are advocated in an offensive way, we are indignant. Why then do we not cast out

the offenders?

That is a fair answer 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 presenting 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 raging fiercely. They are examined and tested in every conceivable way, defended, attacked, developed, modified, sometimes discarded, sometimes in one form or another established solidly.

2. It is this way that the boundaries of knowledge are enlarged, new facts discovered and new lights thrown on old things long accepted. Investigators are constantly making mistakes. They think they have discovered something when they haven't. They give 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} ~~this~~ 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 ^f ~~d~~ilusion, a mockery. It is just this denial of freedom of thought and discussion that we Baptists have always ~~f~~ought 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.

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 for the benefit of critical investigation
and discussion. It is this way that the truth finally emerges and
is recognized and accepted. And no other way than this of investi-
gation 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 this 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, limitations disappear. 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 in-
vestigation 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 deception, 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 our-
selves 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 ~~dis-~~^ftruction. 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 over throw them. And absolutely nothing else can do this. It is precisely thro' 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~~^{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 operated upon} assailed them ceaselessly for a hundred and fifty years not only without effect, ^{injuring} but with the result that they are more firmly established and ^{better understood} widely ~~accepted~~ than ever. ^{These perils of freedom are temporary & in the end are}

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. The loss of all real students.

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 carries its own disasters. Further investigation, fuller discussion

reveal the falseness of these views and over throw them. And absolutely nothing else can do this. It is precisely this, 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 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 defense, and in illustrating the glory of the gospel. Your question in your last letter to me whether Bible investigation, as 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 immensely. 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 assailed them ceaselessly for a hundred and fifty years not only without effect, but

with the result that they are more firmly established and widely respected than ever. 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. 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 utterance⁴ and publications of the institutions professors as unworthy, probably unscholarly and disengenuous, 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, - of 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 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 institutional 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 elect Professor Teacher 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, - of Johnston Meyers telling them what they are at liberty to say, - of liberty again 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. Historians 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, 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 embarrassment.

Professor Foster's views are no more acceptable to me than to you.

~~I should like to see Professor Foster resign and take his views elsewhere. I think if I were in his place that is just what I would do.~~ He has disturbed and ^{made} disgusted 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

Program for the future. I should like to see Professor Foster resign and take his
 views elsewhere. I think if I were in his place that is just what
 I would do. He has disturbed and distressed 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 endorse 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 adherent to
 me. I wish he would take himself off. But as I am in danger of
 doing a more serious injury by casting him out than by endorsing him,
 if I cast him out I shall be in danger of seriously discrediting and
 injuring the University. If I endorse 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 endorse him, even at the

cost of misconception of ^{by} good men."

Give the University time Bro. Blake and see if the result does not justify its cause.

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 %.

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

~~Most cordially yours,~~

I am taking the liberty of enclosing ~~two~~ a clipping from last Monday's Tribune giving excerpts from Dr. Foster's sermon of last Sunday. I also one from the Baptist Record telling of 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.

J. W. Goodspeed

